Spring 5-2018

Postwar Churches of Christ Mission Work: The Philippines as a Case Study

Brady Kal Cox
Abilene Christian University, bkc10c@acu.edu

ABSTRACT

There was a large increase in the number of Churches of Christ missionaries and missionary efforts following World War II (WWII). There were also significant changes and developments in American religious culture following WWII—Churches of Christ were not exempt from these changes. This study examines the question of how postwar developments in American religion influenced missionary efforts of American Churches of Christ by looking at examples of American missionaries in the Philippines.

The study relies heavily on primary sources, including letters and news reports from archival collections, Churches of Christ periodicals, and email correspondence with people familiar with the main church leaders during this time. Secondary sources set the larger context of postwar American religious culture, especially using the historiographical model of "big religion," to explain the postwar American religious context. Additionally, secondary sources describe the history of the debate over the use of institutions among Churches of Christ.

American Churches of Christ missionaries brought postwar developments in American religious culture (e.g., institutionalization and professionalization) with them to the mission field. Mainline Churches of Christ trained native preachers and built churches in the Philippines. Their "American" institutions and expectations created problems of reliance on American financial support, which negatively affected their work. Churches of Christ missionaries also brought American theological debates and disagreements with

them to the mission field. The noninstitutional debate among American and Filipino members of the Churches of Christ in the Philippines provides a key interpretive lens for understanding the progress of the churches.

Postwar American Churches of Christ missionaries who went to the Philippines were influenced by developments and changes in postwar American religious life. These changes and developments directly influenced their missionary methods in the Philippines, created problems of reliance on U.S. financial support, and led to the introduction of American theological debates.

Postwar Churches of Christ Mission Work: The Philippines as a Case Study

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School of Theology

Abilene Christian University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

By

Brady Kal Cox

May 2018

This thesis, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Council of Abilene Christian University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts

Assistant Provost for Graduate Programs

Date

5-10-18

Thesis Committee

Douglas A. Foster, Chair

Carisse Mickey Berryhill

Yukikazu Obata

To Christiana.

Thank you for feeding me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members for their time, effort, and encouragement during this process. Dr. Douglas A. Foster guided and supported me throughout my work on this project. Dr. Carisse Mickey Berryhill was very encouraging, and she provided helpful feedback as I struggled through the end of this project. Dr. Yukikazu Obata provided constructive feedback for my work; thank you for participating in my thesis defense through Skype after 10 p.m. in Japan.

I am indebted to the many libraries that I used during my research. First, thank you to the circulation desk and interlibrary loan staff at Abilene Christian University. My thanks to Zeny Maravilla at the National Library of the Philippines (Manila, Philippines), John Mark Wade and David Kiger at the Emmanuel Christian Seminary Library (Elizabethton, TN), and Pam Evans at the Sunset International Bible Institute (Lubbock, TX). Concerning archival materials, I am indebted to Mac Ice and the Center for Restoration Studies at Abilene Christian University (Abilene, TX); Bob Turner, Don Meredith, and the Meredith Restoration History Archive in the L. M. Graves Memorial Library at Harding School of Theology (Memphis, TN); Wanda Dickey and the Special Collections in the William F. Chatlos Library at Florida College (Temple Terrace, FL); Wenxian Zhang and the Archives and Special Collections in the Olin Library at Rollins College (Winter Park, FL); and Kevin D. Arms with the Lake-Sumter State College Libraries (Leesburg, FL).

Conversations, email correspondence, and shared documents with people who lived during the events I describe, or who have firsthand knowledge of the topics I examine in this work were very helpful. Thank you to Charles Gunselman, Ken Gunselman, Roberto J. Braña, Teofilo G. Alcayde, Eusebio Tanicala, Ruth Glori Trinidad, Thelma M. Lopez, Willie Franco, Danilo P. Padua, Dominador Belo, Ken Wilkey, Bob Buchanan, Wynell Lecroy, Charles Sheppard, Bonnie Sheppard, Sonny Guild, Janine Paden Morgan, Connie W. Adams, David Tant, David Edwin Harrell, Jr., and Ron Halbrook, who helped me better understand the material explored in this thesis. Thank you for sharing your experiences and your knowledge with me.

I had opportunities to present research at a number of conferences while working on my thesis. Thank you to Jeremy Hegi and Christopher Flanders for inviting me to present my research at the 2017 Christian Scholars' Conference held at Lipscomb University (Nashville, TN); to the Australian Association for Missions Studies for providing me with the Junior Scholars Bursary, which enabled me to attend and present research at their 2017 conference held at Whitley College (Melbourne, Australia); and to Hiroki Takeuchi for the opportunity to present at the 2017 joint meeting of the Southwest Conference on Asian Studies and the Western Conference of Association for Asian Studies held at Southern Methodist University (Dallas, TX). These opportunities were helpful as I was able to receive feedback concerning my research findings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, I examine the missionary efforts of postwar Churches of Christ. Members of Churches of Christ had engaged in mission work before World War II (WWII). However, there was a dramatic growth in the number of Churches of Christ missionaries following WWII. My research question is: how did postwar developments in American religion influence the missionary efforts of Churches of Christ? I use examples of American missionaries in the Philippines as a case study to explore this question. Missionaries in the Philippines quickly organized Bible Schools, purchased land for and funded the construction of church buildings and schools, and provided benevolent aid to Filipinos. These institutions were reliant on American financial support. They were operated at a financial level above the means of the Filipino people the American missionaries sought to convert and train for ministry.

These methods reflected changes in American religion that were embraced by Churches of Christ. I describe these developments in American religion, and then examine the problems of reliance on U.S. financial aid inherent in the model of mission work introduced by the earliest postwar Churches of Christ missionaries in the Philippines. I describe the attempts of missionaries to correct their approach in order to create a sustainable and realistic method for training native preachers and for forming self-supporting churches. Additionally, I describe the backlash to the methods of mission work reliant on American financial aid that were used by the mainline Churches of

Christ. The noninstitutional churches were united in their efforts to criticize the methods of mission work used by the mainline churches. However, noninstitutional churches succumbed to the same debates that plagued the efforts of the mainline churches before them when the mainline churches stopped engaging in their calls to debate on the topic.

Literature Review

There is a growing body of literature concerning the history of Churches of Christ mission work and missionaries before WWII.[1] However, there has been little scholarly research—proportional to the number of missionaries and missionary efforts—on the history of Churches of Christ mission work and missionaries following WWII.[2] Likewise,

1. Examples of recent works include, Shawn Z. Daggett, "The Lord Will Provide: James A. Harding, J. M. McCaleb, William J. Bishop, and the Emergence of Faith Missions in the Churches of Christ, 1892–1923" (PhD diss., Boston University School of Theology, 2007); Jeremy P. Hegi, "Don Carlos Janes: One-Man Missionary Society" (MA thesis, Abilene Christian University, 2012); Jonathan Straker, "Clara Bishop and the Transfer of Oversight of the Koishikawa, Japan, Work in 1913," *Restoration Quarterly* 54.2 (2012): 91–104; Paul Shupikai Chimhungwe, "The Indigene's Undocumented Contribution to the Growth of the Two Branches of the Stone-Campbell Movement in Southern Rhodesia 1897–1949: A Historical Analysis" (PhD diss., McMaster Divinity College, 2016); Jeremy Hegi, "One-Man Missionary Society: The Indefatigable Work of Don Carlos Janes," *Restoration Quarterly* 58.4 (2016): 211–227; Yukikazu Obata, "Against the Odds: J. M. McCaleb's Missionary Vision of Universality in the Context of Imperial Japan, 1892–1945" (PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2016); James L. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals: The Transatlantic Origins of the Stone-Campbell Movement* (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2017); and James L. Gorman, "The Omission of Missions: Transatlantic Evangelical Missions Culture and the Historiography of the Campbell Movement's Origins," *Stone-Campbell Journal* 21.1 (2018): 5–27.

2. Earlier examples include, Bernard Howell, *Missions: Progress, Stalemate, or Regression?* (Concord, CA: Pacific Publishing House, 1971); Michael Weldon Curry, "Mission Institutions of the Churches of Christ in Southern Tanzania" (MA thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1972); Phillip Wayne Elkins, *Church-Sponsored Missions: An Evaluation of Churches of Christ* (Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1974); and Clinton Brazle, "A Church Growth Study of Churches in North East India" (MS thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1977). More recent examples include, Roy Palmer Domenico, "'For The Cause of Christ Here in Italy': America's Protestant Challenge in Italy and the Cultural Ambiguity of the Cold War," *Diplomatic History* 29.4 (September 2005): 625–654, which examines Cline Paden's missionary work in Italy; Paul Shupikai Chimhungwe, "A Descriptive Chronicle of Transition from Mission to Indigenous Leadership in Two Churches of Christ Institutions (Zimbabwe 1976–1986)" (MA thesis, McMaster Divinity College, 2012); Roy Rhodes, "Germany for Christ: The Churches of Christ and East Germany, 1945–1989," *Restoration Quarterly* 57.3 (2015): 159–172; and the second half of Robert E. Hooper, *If Your Enemy Hungers, Feed Him: Church of Christ Missionaries in Japan, 1892–1970* (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2017). The little scholarly research on postwar mission work is not due to a lack of available archival resources concerning postwar Churches of Christ mission work. See Brady Kal Cox and McGarvey Ice, "A Descriptive Guide to Missions-Related Archival Collections in the Center for Restoration Studies," *Missio Dei: A Journal of Missional Theology and Praxis*

there has been little critical research on the history of American Churches of Christ missionaries in the Philippines.[3] And there has been little-to-no scholarly research concerning the role of the institutional controversy among missionaries of Churches of Christ, except briefly as part of larger projects concerning the history of Churches of Christ. The institutional controversy is well documented in the United States,[4] but very little is known concerning how the institutional debate affected the mission efforts of Churches of Christ outside of the United States.[5]

In this study I will use mission work in the Philippines as a case study of how the Churches of Christ (both mainline and noninstitutional) were influenced by the changes in the postwar American religious context, and how this new context affected their mission efforts. The authors of *The Stone-Campbell Movement: A Global History*,

---

8.1 (2017), http://missiodeijournal.com/issues /md-8-1/authors/md-8-1-cox-ice, for examples of relevant archival materials.

3. The authors of D. Newell Williams, Douglas A. Foster, and Paul M. Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement: A Global History* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2013), 131–133, 275–279, provide a helpful overview of the history of Stone-Campbell mission work in the Philippines. Only chapter VII of Leonardo Baylon Corpuz, "History of Christianity in the Philippines" (MA thesis, Pepperdine University, 1973), 87–106, focuses on Churches of Christ.

4. For example, see David Edwin Harrell, Jr., *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century: Homer Hailey's Personal Journey of Faith* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2000), 39–176; John C. Hardin, "Rock Fights, Quarantines, and Confessionals: B. C. Goodpasture, the *Gospel Advocate* and Keeping Order in Churches of Christ," in *Recovering the Margins of American Religious History: The Legacy of David Edwin Harrell Jr*, ed. B. Dwain Waldrep and Scott C. Billingsley (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2012), 60–83; Russell S. Fountain, "Captive of 'God's Blueprint'--Fanning Yater Tant and the Development of Non-Institutional Churches of Christ" (MA thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1990); and Jack H. Kirby, "History of the Cooperation Issue," *Truth Magazine* 24.36 (September 11, 1980): 585–587. Additionally, Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement*, 161–164, provide an excellent introduction to the institutional controversy; and Richard T. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America* (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2008), 217–253, details the larger debate over modernization among Churches of Christ, which includes institutionalization through emphases on education and mission work.

5. Hooper, *If Your Enemy Hungers,* 242, briefly describes, "A minority of Churches of Christ believed that having a sponsoring church was unscriptural if other churches and individuals funneled support for missionaries through that church." Hooper makes note of the institutional controversy, but he does not devote much attention to the topic.

explain "Though many [manifestations of the Stone-Campbell Movement] are the outgrowth of missionary work and remain relatively small, the missiological and ecclesiological dynamics of these communities and their unique developments of Stone-Campbell identity constitute a whole new field of exploration."[6] Concerning the noninstitutional churches, Harrell explains, "Since the mid-1960s, noninstitutional Churches of Christ have had a more or less separate history."[7] I aim to analyze the history of the Philippine Churches of Christ—an outgrowth of missionary work—and the "separate" history of the noninstitutional churches.

In this thesis I use a variety of published and unpublished primary and secondary sources. The history of postwar Churches of Christ mission work in the Philippines is mentioned in only a few secondary sources. Therefore, the majority of my information comes from a number of primary sources. Many of the primary sources include periodicals published by the Churches of Christ during the twentieth century.[8] Much of my primary source material come from archival sources.

The main source archival source I use is the William Douglass and Charline F. Gunselman Papers located in the Center for Restoration Studies at Abilene Christian University (Abilene, Texas). This collection includes correspondence and other materials from the Gunselmans' time as missionaries in the Philippines. I also reference correspondence in the David Edwin Harrell, Jr. Papers, correspondence in the Benton Cordell Goodpasture Papers, and newsletters in the Philippines World Churches Vertical

---

6. Williams, Foster, Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement*, 7.

7. David Edwin Harrell, Jr., "Noninstitutional Movement," in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, ed. Douglas A. Foster et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 569.

8. Such as *Christian Chronicle, Firm Foundation*, *Gospel Advocate*, *Gospel Guardian*, *Truth Magazine*, and *Searching the Scriptures.*

File, all located in the Center for Restoration Studies; newsletters and periodicals located in Meredith Restoration History Archive in the L.M. Graves Memorial Library at the Harding School of Theology (Memphis, TN), and the Special Collections in the William F. Chatlos Library at Florida College (Temple Terrace, FL); and biographical information about William Douglass Gunselman located in the Archives and Special Collections in the Olin Library at Rollins College (Winter Park, FL).

Scope and Methodology

Scope

I limit my focus to the postwar mission work in the Philippines. I begin with an examination of the changes and developments in American religion following WWII. I use Benjamin E. Zeller's historiographic model of "big religion" as a framework for understanding the changes in the postwar American religious climate. Zeller explains that big religion "is characterized by heightened institutionalization, professionalization, centralization of knowledge, government entanglements, and public support, as well as opposition."[9] I argue that postwar Churches of Christ share these characteristics described by Zeller.

I then examine how these changes—mainly heightened institutionalization, professionalization, and centralization of knowledge—influenced the efforts of Churches of Christ missionaries in the Philippines. Elkins's work serves as the primary impetus for this work. Elkins explained that his book "represent[s] a beginning in the effort to understand the foreign mission enterprise of churches of Christ."[10] I aim to continue this

9. Benjamin E. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion': Reconceptualizing Twentieth-Century American Religion Using Big Science as a Model," *Church History* 80.2 (2011): 321.

10. Elkins, *Church-Sponsored Missions*, vi.

effort. I focus on the work of Ralph F. Brashears and William Douglass Gunselman. I argue that Brashears introduced aspects of big religion into the Philippines and that Gunselman sought to address issues in the Philippine mission work that he believed were caused by Brashears' methods. There are other missionaries that I could have focused on, but Gunselman's archival collection provides unique insight into postwar Churches of Christ mission work.

In the last chapter I examine the backlash to the introduction of these developments in American religion to the Philippine mission work. Concerning the foreign missionary efforts of Churches of Christ, Elkins claimed, "The centralizing tendencies found in the overall mission enterprise were either not widely recognized or not feared, because they never became a controversial issue in the decade."[11] This, however, is not true. I challenge Elkins's conclusion, and I provide evidence that there was indeed a notable controversy in the Philippines due to the centralizing tendencies of the mainline Churches of Christ missionaries. This controversy took place between the two groups from 1955–1975 and then led to debate among the noninstitutional churches themselves.

Methodology

Two assumptions guide my methodology. First, it is impossible to present and analyze *all* of the historical evidence in an objective manner. Historian Richard P. Heitzenrater explains:

> What information we choose to use and how we decide to organize it has a tremendous impact on the choice of a thesis and the credibility of the point we are trying to make. There is no way we can present all the evidence, much less simply say that the picture is very complicated. Our job is to bring a particular point into focus. We must decide what part of the scenery is worth viewing, choose the

11. Elkins, *Church-Sponsored Missions*, 53.

> details that are the most relevant, then determine what focal length, shutter speed, lighting, and background are most appropriate.[12]

There are many other themes or claims I could have focused on based on the archival materials I reference in this work. Cox and Ice note, "archival sources provide a granular scale of information that historical surveys may note or cite, if they are aware of them at all, but can rarely explore in depth or detail."[13] I seek to explore a particular point of focus through the lens of what I have determined to be the most relevant archival materials. I understand that this is just one of many ways to *focus* the lens on the historical evidence.

Second, I do not claim to be writing a "Philippine" history. John Larkin cautions, "Focusing on the Manila area, the seat of Spanish and American authority, reveals only the 'Western' face of Philippine society." My study focuses on the work and influence of Americans in Metro Manila and Baguio City. He continues, "The singular concern with Manila and its environs and the highest echelons of society tends to distort the history of the Philippines as a whole."[14] I am aware of Larkin's concerns. I aim to examine how developments in American religion influenced the efforts of American missionaries. I do

---

12. Richard P. Heitzenrater, "Inventing Church History," *Church History* 80.4 (2011): 746; David Edwin Harrell, Jr., "What Shall We Do With History?," (presentation at the Florida College Lectures, Florida College, Temple Terrace, FL, February 5, 2018), provides a helpful anecdote concerning this matter: "History is designed to tell a story—not to tell what is right. I mean, we can do that in a different venue. When I was writing one of my books about the Restoration Movement, I used to come home at night, and I would tell about some argument that had taken place between brethren, and I would try to reveal as clearly as I could the truth about what each person was saying. But my wife would say, 'Well, they shouldn't be doing that.' And I said, 'Well, I know they shouldn't have been doing that. This is a book about what they did do, not what they should do.' So that is what history is. History is our understanding to know what it is that people have lived by." I do not intend to provide judgement on who was right or wrong. Rather, I intend to understand why those engaged in postwar mission work for the Churches of Christ (i.e., both mainline and noninstitutional) made the decisions that they made.

13. Cox and Ice, "A Descriptive Guide."

14. John A. Larkin, "The Place of Local History in Philippine Historiography," *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 8.2 (1967): 307.

not seek to write a "Philippine" history, but to examine the "Western" face reflected in this period of Philippine history.

Delimitations

The materials I examined for this study provide insight into a number of new topics and themes that could be further explored. Historian Antoinette Burton writes, "Thanks at least in part to the dizzying possibilities of archives old and new, history is never over but renews itself through a variety of new interpretive frameworks."[15] This holds true for my project. I will examine the postwar mission work of Churches of Christ—mainly in the northern Philippines. I use Benjamin E. Zeller's historiographic model—big religion—as a heuristic to explore this topic through a specific lens.

In this study I will not examine the colonial history of the Philippines. The United States played an influential role as the colonial ruler of the Philippines during the first half of the twentieth century. This history, however, is outside the scope of my work. Additionally, there were Filipino members of the Churches of Christ in the Philippines during WWII. Due to the constraints of this study, I will not examine the history of the Churches of Christ during WWII. Lastly, I will not go into great detail concerning the use of racist and demeaning language by American missionaries concerning the Filipino people. This topic deserves an in-depth examination, but it is outside the scope of this initial historical study of postwar Churches of Christ mission work.

---

15. Antoinette Burton, "Introduction: Archive Fever, Archive Stories," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 18.

Definition of Terms

Christian Colleges

Before WWII students were encouraged to attend liberal arts colleges related to the Churches of Christ in order to learn the Bible and to develop morally and spiritually.[16] After WWII many more colleges were built due to higher demand.[17] This sudden higher demand was driven to a great extent by the GI Bill that provided those who served in the military with tuition, thus making college education financially accessible to many for the first time.[18] The Christian colleges associated with the Churches of Christ began to emphasize that they offered an education in which the student would "grow spiritually, socially, physically, and in knowledge."[19] Additionally, the ministerial training in some of the colleges began to expose students to methods of higher biblical criticism.[20] These changes indicated a shift within the liberal arts education that accommodated cultural respectability in lieu of training ministers.

Churches of Christ

The Churches of Christ are a collection of congregations with no formal denominational structure who trace their origins to the 19th century Stone-Campbell Movement. These churches have historically been non-instrumental, and they place an

---

16. Robert Sherwood Hutcheson, "The Philosophy of Christian Education as Evidenced by the Colleges Established by the Brethren of the Restoration Movement" (MS thesis, Abilene Christian College, 1973), 266–269.

17. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith,* 224; and Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement,* 161–162.

18. Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *The GI Bill: A New Deal for Veterans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 86.

19. Hutcheson, "The Philosophy of Christian Education," 428.

20. Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement,* 227.

emphasis on the restoration of the New Testament Church.[21] In this thesis, I will use Churches of Christ to refer to the mainline group of churches in contrast to the noninstitutional Churches of Christ, who became a minority group.

Modernization

Hughes explains, "In the case of Churches of Christ, modernization involved the development of an expanding network of bureaucratized institutions."[22] This modernization included: (1) a shift from reliance on the power of God to reliance on institutions, and (2) a modification of the democratized and individualistic nature of church structure that Churches of Christ had long considered the New Testament pattern. In this thesis, "modernism" and "modernization" will refer to the process of the Churches of Christ adapting to, and often accommodating to, larger cultural trends (e.g., institutionalism, etc.). This was a phenomenon that all religious institutions were experiencing.

Noninstitutional Churches of Christ

By the late 1950s and early 1960s, about ten percent of the membership of Churches of Christ had separated from the mainline Churches of Christ. Harrell explains: "Called 'antis' because of their opposition to church-supported institutions, noninstitutional leaders also criticized schemes that blossomed in the post-World War II

---

21. See Thomas H. Olbricht, "Churches of Christ," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 213–220, for a helpful introduction to the history and development of the Churches of Christ.

22. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith,* 218. W. Clark Gilpin, review of *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America*, by Richard T. Hughes, *The Journal of American History* 83.4 (March 1997): 1401, writes, "Hughes assumes that theology shapes religious practice, and he therefore gives scant consideration to the characteristic piety of the Churches of Christ." It is worth noting this shift to institutions was not necessarily in contrast to a reliance on God, but possibly a reliance on God with an understanding that God would use new methods to accomplish God's promises.

years."[23] These included sponsoring church arrangements, which allowed large congregations to coordinate mission efforts using money from smaller churches. The issues that led to the split had been controversial during the twentieth century but reached schismatic dimensions during the 1950s. Noninstitutional Churches of Christ have had a more or less separate history since the mid-1960s.

Preacher Training Schools

Due to a perceived lack of preachers, and concerns regarding the effectiveness of training preachers in Christian liberal arts colleges run by members of Churches of Christ, preacher training schools were developed beginning with the Latin American Bible School (later the Sunset Church of Christ School of Preaching) in Lubbock, TX, in 1962.[24] Additionally, "Schools of preaching continued a positive law reading of the Bible that was antagonistic toward higher criticism of the Bible," and focused on training pulpit ministers.[25] In this thesis I will refer to preacher training schools in contrast to Christian colleges. Bible Colleges in which all students majored in Bible, seen often in Fundamentalist circles, were seldom used by Churches of Christ in the United States.[26] The Philippine Bible College of Quezon City was modeled after preacher training schools, not Bible colleges.

---

23. Harrell, "Noninstitutional Movement," 567–569.

24. See Ray Bohannan, "The School of Preaching: A New Concept of Teaching in the Churches of Christ" (MA thesis, San Diego State College, 1970), for a discussion of the development of these schools, and Claud Parrish, "A Historical Study of Sunset Church of Christ School of Preaching" (MS thesis, Abilene Christian College, 1965), for more details regarding the early history of the Churches of Christ preacher training schools.

25. Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement,* 227.

26. James B. North, "Bible College Movement," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 92–94.

Quezon City

Located just northeast of Manila, Quezon City served as the capital of the Philippines following WWII (1948–1976). During this period, it was a center for education and health services.[27]

Chapter Outline

I begin this thesis with an introduction that explains the topic and research question. In chapter 2, I discuss the history of American postwar religion, including the developments that impacted the Churches of Christ. Second, I provide an account of the origins of the Stone-Campbell debate over the use of institutions—tracing it to the beginning of the movement. The split between the mainline churches and the noninstitutional churches following WWII played an important role in the history of the mission work in the Philippines. In chapter 3, I provide a description of the missionary efforts of the mainline Churches of Christ in the Philippines—focusing on Ralph F. Brashears and William Douglass Gunselman. In chapter 4, I examine the history of the noninstitutional Churches of Christ in the Philippines, as they reacted to the efforts of the mainline churches.

27. See Michael D. Pante, "Conjuring a Capital City: The Spatial Evolution of Quezon City, 1939–1986" (PhD diss., Kyoto University, 2017), for a detailed account of the history of Quezon City.

CHAPTER II

POSTWAR AMERICAN RELIGIOUS LIFE AND THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST

Churches of Christ experienced a period of growth and transition following World War II (WWII), in both American social context and religious life. Religion grew in popularity and respectability among many Americans after the war. While larger churches and older denominations grew in numbers and bureaucracy, Churches of Christ did the same.[1] In this chapter I explore the postwar context of Churches of Christ. First, borrowing from Benjamin E. Zeller, I discuss the religious context in the United States following WWII. Second, I describe the origins of and the development of the debates over institutions within the Stone-Campbell Movement up through the postwar period, and then I compare the growth and developments among postwar Churches of Christ with Zeller's "big religion" model.

American Postwar "Big Religion"[2]

Following WWII, religion in the United States developed and changed in a number of ways. Zeller contends that these developments included religious revival among mainline churches, a resurgence among evangelical churches, a birth of new religious movements, and a fundamentalist and/or conservative backlash against all of the

1. By using the term, "bureaucracy," I mean to explain that older denominations created larger bureaucratic institutions (e.g., the National Council of Churches), while smaller or younger denominations began to increase their number of extra-congregational structures (e.g., Bible colleges, orphan's homes, etc.).

2. I borrow this title from Benjamin E. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion': Reconceptualizing Twentieth-Century American Religion Using Big Science as a Model," *Church History* 80.2 (2011): 321–351.

new developments. In order to understand better these seemingly disparate changes in American religion, Zeller recommends a new historiographical model. Zeller has proposed adapting a model for the study of changes in the field of science (i.e., "big science") during the same period for the study of religion.[3] Zeller explains, "Big science possesses several defining characteristics and qualities, namely heightened institutionalization, heightened professionalization, centralized knowledge production, increased government entanglements, and growing public support."[4] As I explained in the introduction, historiographic models cannot explain or cover all of the evidence. However, Zeller's model "offers useful traction for understanding the diversity of American religious developments during the postwar period."[5] I will detail and explain Zeller's model for interpreting postwar religious change in the United States in the remainder of this section.

The first characteristic of big religion that Zeller identifies is heightened institutionalization. The birth of the National Council of Churches (NCC) and the popularity of Billy Graham's revivals serve as examples of heightened institutionalization in the postwar American religious climate. While historians have often not understood

---

3. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 322, explains, "With big science as a guide, the concept of big religion offers historians of American religion an analogous manner of understanding the development of institutions, individuals, and movements within American religion, as well as responses and backlashes against them…At its heart, the article is historiographic. It does not claim that an actual organization or historical actor named 'big religion' existed, but that the concept provides traction for understanding what changed in the American religious context after World War II. Big religion does not perfectly describe every postwar religious development, but it does provide a means to understanding some of the most important ones." Zeller's work offers "a model both more accurate in describing the past, and more conducive to creating a 'middle ground' of true Christian dialogue," called for in Douglas Jacobsen and William Vance Trollinger, Jr., "Historiography of American Protestantism: The Two-Party Paradigm, and Beyond," *Fides et Historia* 25.3 (1993): 15.

4. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 321–322.

5. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 351.

the birth of the NCC and the increased popularity of Graham's revivals as part of the same historical pattern, Zeller argues these developments ought to be viewed as part of the same phenomenon.[6] Concerning the NCC, Schneider explains, "For member churches, the Council functioned as an 'established church' of which they were a part. It embodied in a single institution the authority, interests, and activities of a religious establishment otherwise incorporated only in particular denominations."[7] The creation of the NCC represented heightened institutionalization among Protestant denominations loyal to the organization by creating a larger bureaucratic institution to represent previously independent groups. Likewise, Billy Graham's crusades relied on a large and complex bureaucracy. Zeller details the large numbers of staff and volunteers required in order to conduct a campaign and provide follow up once Graham moved on to a different city. The Graham crusades differed from earlier evangelical revivals not in nature, but in degree.[8] This, too, represents heightened institutionalization within the postwar U.S. religious context, as evangelical revivals became more systematized and required larger institutions in order to achieve their goals.

The second quality of big religion identified by Zeller is heightened professionalization. Concerning professionalization among the postwar scientific community, Zeller explains, "The new breed of professional scientist … soon established societies, associations, and networks of likeminded individuals, effectively creating

---

6. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 332.

7. Robert A. Schneider, "Voice of Many Waters: Church Federation in the Twentieth Century," in *Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900–1960*, ed. William R. Hutchison, Cambridge Studies in Religion and American Public Life (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 97.

8. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 338–341.

American scientific guilds."[9] Scientists were responsible for some of the most important technical achievements during the war (e.g., the mass production of penicillin, the atomic bomb, etc.). These achievements were recognized by government leaders, and others with social influence. Magali Sartaffi Larson suggests that professionalization is "an attempt to translate one order of scarce resources—special knowledge and skills—into another—social and economic rewards."[10] Scientists were able to use their newly acquired social and cultural capital to gain further resources and control.[11]

Likewise, the NCC and Graham provide examples of the emergence of a more highly respected group of Protestant church leaders. With the growth of interest in religion following the war, many Protestant leaders sought to capitalize on their social influence. They did this not only in ministry, but often in business. Schneider explains that the creation of the NCC "produced an elite that interacted with political and economic elites."[12] This allowed their interests and concerns to be heard at the political level. For Graham, the creation of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association (BGEA) was emblematic of the growing professionalization of his ministry.[13] The BGEA was the necessary institutional structure in order to carry out the larger evangelical revivals. Both cases of increased institutionalization—attempts to capitalize on social influence—led to

---

9. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 324.

10. Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalization: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), xvii.

11. Daniel Lee Kleinman, *Politics on the Endless Frontier: Postwar Research Policy in the United States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), 52–73.

12. Schneider, "Voice of Many Waters," 98.

13. Darren E. Grem, *The Blessings of Business: How Corporations Shaped Conservative Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 59–70.

an increase in professionalization.

The third characteristic of big religion identified by Zeller is the centralization of knowledge. Zeller cites Kleinman's analysis of the centralization of knowledge production among academically trained scientists following WWII. Kleinman explains, "the university has progressively come to dominate the production and validation of knowledge" in the postwar period.[14] For the NCC and Graham, the heightened institutionalization and professionalization of their efforts centralized the production of religious knowledge in these growing institutions. Like the university scientists, the NCC and Graham's BGEA became centers of creating and validating religious knowledge. This centralization of knowledge was accomplished through decisions that reflected the position or beliefs of the group (e.g., the NCC or BGEA) made by bureaucratic institutions within the group. Because the growing institutions, led by an increasingly professionalized leadership, represented large numbers of churches and members, the institutions were able to make decisions for these larger religious bodies. The size and the professionalism of the NCC and BGEA led to these institutions becoming the centers of knowledge production for the individuals and groups represented by the institutions.

The fourth characteristic of big religion identified by Zeller is an increase in government entanglements. Like big science, big religion was indebted to government fear of encroaching communism.[15] Zeller writes, "While big religion certainly could have

---

14. Kleinman, *Politics on the Endless Frontier*, 26.

15. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 325, explains, the U.S. "government funneled wartime research money to science …[and]… In return the American university and professional scientists pioneered new explosives, poison gases, and submarine detectors (during World War I) and radar and nuclear weaponry (during World War II), all of which crucially assisted in defeating the Central and then Axis Powers." Likewise, the U.S. government sought ways to fight communism by encouraging and supporting the efforts of (mainly Protestant) Christians, and the government often juxtaposed U.S. religion with the godless faith of communism.

existed without the communist threat, communism galvanized the American political establishment as well as social support."[16] Anticommunism provided big religion with an easy inroad to government support and entanglement. Both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower identified American religion as important in the fight against communism. "Politicians certainly saw no reason to criticize what citizens considered as American as mom and apple pie," Zeller explains.[17] Therefore, many political leaders used religious rhetoric and their own religious beliefs in their efforts to gain constituents and achieve their political aims, and few religious leaders had any incentive to question these practices.

Lastly, the fifth characteristic of big religion identified by Zeller is large public support and opposition. One measure of public support was the increase in church membership in the United States following WWII. J. Ronald Oakley explains:

> Year after year the statistics pointed to unprecedented increases in church membership, which grew from 86.8 million in 1950 to over 114 million in 1960. Each year saw record contributions to churches and other religious organizations, construction of new churches and synagogues and related religious buildings, record enrollments in college religion courses, overcrowding in religious seminaries, and growth in the prestige of clergymen.[18]

---

16. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 343.

17. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 345.

18. J. Ronald Oakley, *God's Country: America in the Fifties* (New York: Dembner Books, 1989), 319; James Hudnut-Beumler, *Looking for God in the Suburbs: The Religion of the American Dream and Its Critics, 1945–1965* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 33, concurs: "The statistics indicated that people were formally affiliating with churches at rates faster than the growth in population alone might provide." However, there is opposition to this understanding and interpretation of postwar church growth. Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since WWII*, Studies in Church and State (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 99, explains, "In absolute terms, denominational hierarchies have been able to sustain a larger variety of functions fulfilled by a larger number of professional workers. In relative terms, though, centralized budgets have not expanded." Yes, there were large increases in church membership and church budgets, but for most churches this was relative growth—not absolute growth. Likewise, Robert S. Ellwood, *The Fifties Spiritual Marketplace: American Religion in a Decade of Conflict* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997), 7, claims, "the religious boom of the 1950s, it seems to me, can be understood first of all as a supply-side phenomenon …[Additionally, it is]… certainly related to another reason for postwar religious booms—a booming birthrate."

There were large increases in church membership, church budgets, and in church building projects following WWII.[19] However, there was also opposition to this growth. Zeller explains, "critics questioned individual components of big religion, often those parts that disagreed with their personal theological commitments." For example, fundamentalist groups critiqued the NCC as being too liberal, while other groups (e.g., the Unitarian Universalist Society) rejected the NCC on the grounds that it was too conservative. Those who critiqued big religion typically created new small-scale institutions (e.g., churches or schools) of their own.[20] Many of these critics aimed to avoid what they viewed as negatives inherent in big religion (e.g., heightened institutionalization), but ended up creating their own institutional structures.

WWII did not create big religion, but the postwar period encouraged earlier trends. Much more could be said concerning the postwar American religious context.[21] However, Zeller's historiographic model will be used as a useful interpretive framework for this study. Changes in the American religious environment following WWII heavily influenced Churches of Christ and their missionary efforts. The missionaries that went to the Philippines and other Churches of Christ missionaries unconsciously took these developments with them as they traveled and lived outside of the United States to do mission work. I now turn to Churches of Christ and examine the history of debates over

---

19. For more details concerning how churches managed this growth, see James Hudnut-Beumler, *In Pursuit of the Almighty's Dollar: A History of Money and American Protestantism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 142–186.

20. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 344.

21. For example, see Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American* Religion; Patrick Allitt, *Religion in America Since 1945: A History*, Columbia Histories of Modern Life (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003); and Sarah E. Ruble, *The Gospel of Freedom and Power: Protestant Missionaries in American Culture After World War II* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

the use of institutions from the beginning of the Stone-Campbell Movement through the beginning of the postwar period. Like American postwar big religion, changes among Churches of Christ following WWII can be traced to earlier beliefs and developments. Examining Churches of Christ between their inception and the postwar period will provide the necessary context for interpreting postwar changes among Churches of Christ. I then conclude the chapter by interpreting the development and divisions among postwar Churches of Christ using Zeller's model of big religion.

History of Debates Over Institutionalism Among Churches of Christ

Debates and controversies over the role of institutions have been present within the Stone-Campbell Tradition since its inception. James L. Gorman explains, "When Alexander Campbell became the first president of the American Christian Missionary Society [ACMS] in 1849, his supporters and opponents asked legitimate questions about the consistency of his position on missionary societies."[22] For Campbell's supporters, it appeared that Campbell had changed his position on the matter of missionary societies. However, it is important to note Campbell's early influences and history concerning the support of missionary societies. Arguably, Alexander Campbell's multiple views on this topic set the stage for the later debates and divisions among Stone-Campbell churches over missionary societies and the use of extra-congregational organizations.

Gorman's recent work[23] has provided support for revising this part of Stone-

22. James L. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals: The Transatlantic Origins of the Stone-Campbell Movement* (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2017), 13.

23. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*; James L. Gorman, "The Omission of Missions: Transatlantic Evangelical Missions Culture and the Historiography of the Campbell Movement's Origins," *Stone-Campbell Journal* 21.1 (2018): 5–27; and James L. Gorman, "European Roots of Thomas Campbell's Declaration and Address: The Evangelical Society of Ulster," *Restoration Quarterly* 51.3 (2009): 129–37.

Campbell historiography and provided new insight into the early contexts of both Thomas and Alexander Campbell.[24] Gorman explains that some historians have seen a "first Campbell" who opposed missionary societies in the 1820s, and a "second Campbell" who later embraced the use and support of missionary societies. However, Gorman argues "there was a 'third' or chronologically 'first' Campbell who was drastically different from the Campbell of the 1820s." Gorman explains, "For more than twenty years before the 1820s, Alexander Campbell and his father, Thomas Campbell, received their most influential religious formation in the evangelical missionary movement."[25] Alexander did not suddenly change his mind in regard to the support of missionary societies in the 1820s—he was influenced by larger social and religious changes in the United States. First a look at the Campbells before the 1820s.

Thomas was influenced by the creation of interdenominational missionary societies in Great Britain and the United Kingdom.[26] He began to create structures to support evangelical missions in 1809. The formation of the Christian Association of Washington (CAW) and the writing of the *Declaration and Address of the Christian Association of Washington* are evidence of the evangelical mission influence on Thomas. They resemble the structure of similar groups, including the Evangelical Society of Ulster and the London Missionary Society.[27] Alexander supported and defended the CAW in

---

24. In this section I will refer to Thomas Campbell as "Thomas" and to Alexander Campbell as "Alexander" in order to avoid confusion.

25. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*, 15; Gorman, "The Omission of Missions," 25, asserts, "Alexander's vehement critique of missionary societies in the 1820s has contributed to continual oversight of important influences from the prior twenty years of the Campbells' formation when they supported missionary societies."

26. See Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*, 25–152, for details.

27. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*, 160–161; see Gorman, *Among the Early*

sermons and in print between 1810-1811. However, for a number of reasons, the CAW did not experience success like similar institutions in Ireland and Scotland.[28]

The Campbells began associating with the Baptists in 1812 after concluding that believer's immersion was a divine command. They supported the Baptist missionary movement until at least 1821. For example, the Brush Run Church, led by the Campbells, financially supported the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions from 1816–1821.[29] However, Alexander began to change his mind in 1820. Writing in *The Reporter* between April 1820 and February 1822 under the pen name "Candidus," Alexander rejected the recent growth of moral societies that sought to Christianize culture. Gorman explains, "moral societies were anti-evangelical (i.e., anti-scriptural), because no such societies existed in the Old Testament or New Testament—that made them modern inventions."[30] Alexander opposed moral societies on the grounds that they had no New Testament precedent, and he later opposed missionary societies for the same reason. Additionally, he observed hegemonic tendencies in both.

Alexander publically changed his views on missionary societies in 1823. He started a new journal, the *Christian Baptist*, in which he was very critical of missionary societies. His opposition coincided with larger antimissions movements among the

---

Evangelicals, 162–178, for more details concerning the parallels between Campbell's CAW and other evangelical mission societies in Great Britain and the United Kingdom; Gorman, "Omission of Missions," 26–27, explains, "Although the American context enormously influenced what the Campbell Movement became by the 1820s, a transatlantic purview and attention to earlier years demonstrates that the earliest Campbell tradition articulated in 1809 and shortly after was a direct manifestation of the transatlantic evangelical missions culture rather than something created by anything peculiar to the American context." The following paragraphs will address the American influences on the Campbells.

28. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*, 178–187.

29. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*, 190–194.

30. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*, 194–195, 196.

Baptists.[31] Like the Baptist antimissions movement, Alexander had four main critiques of the missionary societies. He took issue with (1) the elite theological training of the missionary societies in the Eastern United States, (2) their focus on foreign mission work rather than mission work at home (e.g., on the "Western frontier"), (3) the amount of money raised by missionary societies, and (4) that missionary societies were not "authorized" because there was no New Testament example or precedent for their existence. He also believed that the missionary societies perpetuated sectarianism and discouraged Christian unity. Alexander held and publically promoted these views on missionary societies between 1823–1830.[32]

In 1827 the Mahoning Baptist Association, led by Alexander Campbell, hired Walter Scott as an itinerant preacher and home missionary due to the need for ministers on the Western frontier. This was seen as normal for Baptist mission on the frontier; therefore, Campbell supported it. The success of Scott's work, an example of extra-congregational cooperation, convinced Alexander that this method was legitimate. He began to write in support of missionary societies in the 1830s and 1840s. Gorman

---

31. David W. Bebbington, *Baptists Through the Centuries: A History of a Global People* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010), 87–91.

32. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*, 197–203. Gorman argues that this period represents "second Campbell" in regard to his views on missionary societies and extra-congregational institutions. James R. Mathis, *The Making of the Primitive Baptists: A Cultural and Intellectual History of the Antimission Movement, 1800–1840*, Studies in American Popular History and Culture (New York: Routledge, 2004), 65–66, notes that Alexander Campbell shared the Primitive Baptist's objections to missionary societies, which included concerns that "the new organizations, institutions and practices, because of their emphasis on human instrumentality, violated the expressed dictates of God." However, unlike the Primitive Baptists, Campbell held these views while rejecting Calvinism. Campbell and the Primitive Baptists shared a primitivist reading of the Bible but did not share Calvinist convictions—these convictions were the basis for the Primitive Baptist's opposition to missions, as they understood mission efforts to be violating God's design for conversion. For Campbell, missionary societies promoted sectarianism and division among Christians. Additionally, the societies were inefficient and financially irresponsible. While both Campbell and the Primitive Baptists shared reasons for opposing missionary societies, it is important to understand their different motivations for doing so.

explains that the Campbells' oscillation on the matter can be explained by the religious, political, and economic contexts they experienced during the 1820s. However, the Campbells' ambivalence created different groups of supporters among their followers.[33] Due to the development of Alexander's views on the issue, people on both sides of the controversy were able to cite Alexander's previous publications in order to support their views.[34]

The Civil War was another factor that further defined "antipathy toward extra-congregational organizations."[35] The ACMS received support from churches and church members in the South when it was established in 1849. The organization was the Stone-Campbell Movement's only truly national organization at the time. Southern church leaders such as Tolbert Fanning initially expressed hesitant support of the ACMS. However, Southern support for the ACMS changed in 1861 and 1863 when the organization passed resolutions siding with the Union, condemning those in rebellion against the United States government.[36] David Edwin Harrell explains that after the 1861 meeting of the ACMS, the border state moderates were concerned that hysteria due to the war would estrange the Southern churches. However, during the 1863 meeting, "Resolutions were introduced assuring the society's 'allegiance' to the government." This

---

33. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals*, 203–207.

34. Doug Priest, "Missionary Societies, Controversy over," in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell* Movement, ed. Douglas A. Foster et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 535, explains, "Each side appealed to the writings of Alexander Campbell to buttress their position. Those who preferred independence quoted the *Christian Baptist*, while those who preferred cooperation looked to later essays in the *Millennial Harbinger*." This was true at the time, and later when the institutional controversy picked up following WWII.

35. I borrow this phrase from a section heading in Douglas A. Foster, "The Effect of the Civil War on the Stone-Campbell Movement," *Stone-Campbell Journal* 20.1 (2017): 5–16.

36. Foster, "The Effect of the Civil War," 8–9.

foray of the ACMS into politics and loyalty resolutions had both symbolic and real significance.[37]

In response to the 1861 resolution, Tolbert Fanning asked, "How can the servants of the Lord of this section ever strike hands with the men who now seek their life's blood?"[38] That is, how would it be possible for the members of the Churches of Christ in the South to trust and/or fellowship with Northern members who would possibly kill them in battle? Following the Civil War, David Lipscomb explained, "I feel intensely the degradation to the Christian religion and the Lord Jesus Christ, of making his church in any way the tool of the politicians or the partizan [*sic*], to any of the strifes and conflicts of the institutions and governments of the world. The above Society in our esteem did this so far as it was in its power."[39] For Lipscomb, the ACMS had been used for political means, thus polluting the church. This abuse of the ACMS provided support for the Southern disdain of institutions. Foster concludes that this "provided a new, powerful rationale for latent anti-institutional sentiment that had been present in the movement from its beginnings."[40]

The social reasons for the aversion to extra-congregational organizations (e.g., the anti-Southern resolutions of the ACMS) were later forgotten. Foster explains, "Yet even

---

37. David Edwin Harrell, Jr., "Civil War, The," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 223.

38. Tolbert Fanning, "Ministers of Peace in the World's Conflicts," *Gospel Advocate* 7.11 (November 1861): 348. Fanning is most likely making a reference to Proverbs 22:26; Paul Harvey, "The Bible in the Civil War," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in America*, ed. Paul C. Gutjahr (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 366, explains, "During the war itself, the Bible variously provided inspiration, comfort, solace, and motivation both to soldiers and to civilians…They saw in their Bibles justifications for their causes, and plenty of reason to hate their enemies further."

39. David Lipscomb, "I Did Wrong," *Gospel Advocate* 8.11 (March 13, 1866): 170.

40. Foster, "The Effect of the Civil War," 9.

those who had come to resist the society [i.e., the ACMS] before the Civil War, such as Fanning of Tennessee and Benjamin Franklin of Ohio and Indiana, had not made it a matter of fellowship and division until the war resolutions of 1861 and 1863."[41] Foster makes a strong argument for the role of the Civil War in furthering divisiveness concerning the use of extra-congregational organizations. Even though the debate over the missionary society and other church structures would later become seen as strictly biblical and theological matters in the minds of those engaged in the debate, it is clear that the social implications of the Civil War furthered solidified the two sides of the debate.[42] While there was no agreement among the differing groups, the controversy died down after the separation of Disciples and Churches of Christ by the early twentieth century.

One reason the debate over institutions was not more problematic earlier in the 20th century was the general opposition to extra-congregational structures almost universally held in Churches of Christ because of their opposition to the Disciples missionary societies. Another reason was the presence of other controversies. Hughes explains that the "controversy over premillennialism virtually consumed Churches of Christ from 1915–1940."[43] The premillennial debate kept many leaders and writers in Churches of Christ preoccupied. G. C. Brewer did encourage churches to support schools

---

41. Foster, "The Effect of the Civil War," 10.

42. Foster, "The Effect of the Civil War," 10, concludes, "The strong anti-institutional sentiment would continue among Churches of Christ, which resisted supporting extra-congregational organizations such as orphans' homes and the national Herald of Truth radio and television programs. This opposition led to a division after WWII, resulting in a fellowship of noninstitutional Churches of Christ that today make up more than 10 percent of that stream." Also see B. J. Humble, "The Influence of the Civil War," *Restoration Quarterly* 8.4 (1965): 233–247.

43. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith*, 137.

during the 1931 Abilene Christian College Lectures, which led to a series of articles presenting both sides of the issue in the *Gospel Advocate*.[44] Additionally, F. B. Srygley and Daniel Sommer met in Nashville in 1933 and agreed that Bible schools had the right to exist as long as they were not supported by congregational treasuries.[45] However, due to the relatively small number of congregational treasuries supporting the Bible colleges, and the outbreak of WWII, further debate over the use of institutions was postponed.

Postwar Churches of Christ

In the previous section I outlined the history of the controversy over the use of institutions, and the presence of these debates since the beginning of the Stone-Campbell Movement. Concerning the influences that shaped big religion, Zeller explains, "big religion peaked during the postwar era, though it built on earlier foundations."[46] The Churches of Christ reflect this same pattern. Concerning the peak of big religion for the Churches of Christ, Richard Hughes insightfully explains:

> Following World War I, the mainstream of Churches of Christ began its quest for denominational respectability, a quest that accelerated following World War II. In the 1940s and early 1950s, that quest led hundreds of congregations to construct substantial—and sometimes lavish—buildings on important streets in reputable neighborhoods. It led Church of Christ-related colleges to push for their own brand of respectability as they sought accreditation from secular accrediting agencies. It even led some Churches of Christ to court the support and protection of the federal government in the context of a minor crisis involving Church of Christ missionaries overseas.[47]

---

44. D. Newell Williams, Douglas A. Foster, and Paul M. Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement: A Global History* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2013), 162.

45. F. B. Srygley, "Brother Daniel Sommer's Visit to Nashville," *Gospel Advocate* 75.10 (March 9, 1933): 228–229; F. B. Srygley, "Brother Sommer's Visit to Nashville," *Gospel Advocate* 75.15 (April 13, 1933): 348–349.

46. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 330.

47. Richard T. Hughes, "David Edwin Harrell Jr. and the History of the Stone-Campbell Movement," in *Recovering the Margins of American Religious History: The Legacy of David Edwin Harrell Jr.*, ed. B. Dwain Waldrep and Scott Billingsley (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2003), 27.

Hughes' description is a helpful introduction into a comparison of the development of the postwar Churches of Christ with Zeller's model of big religion. In this section I will explain how the changes and developments among the postwar Churches of Christ are reflective of the big religion model described earlier in this chapter. Following WWII, the Churches of Christ experienced heightened institutionalization, professionalization, centralization of knowledge, government entanglements, public support, *and* backlash.

Following WWII there was a dramatic increase in the number of colleges and children's homes affiliated with the Churches of Christ. According to Hughes, "World War II proved to be the single most decisive factor prompting Churches of Christ toward greater modernization and efficiency and toward the expansive program of institution building that took place during the 1940s and 1950s."[48] The war prompted heightened institutionalization in three main areas among Churches of Christ: education, foreign mission work, and general acculturation. GIs returned to the United States to attend college or university, and many attended Churches of Christ schools. The influx of new students raised questions about the nature of the relationships between the colleges and the churches. For example, should the colleges be funded by contributions from individuals or by congregations? The colleges increasingly began to appeal to churches and church leaders for money in order to address the influx of students. This rendered the schools, at least in the eyes of the more conservative members of the Churches of Christ, institutional agencies of the large churches that financially supported them.

Heightened institutionalism also became an issue in mission work. The authors of *The Stone-Campbell Movement: A Global History* explain, "Missions became an

48. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith,* 223.

institutional issue when some larger congregations began to serve as 'sponsoring churches' to whom other congregations or individuals could send contributions for missionaries in targeted fields."[49] The adoption of the sponsoring church model of financial support and oversight of mission work represents a centralization of power and decision making among Churches of Christ following WWII. For a tradition that was historically committed to congregational autonomy, these changes were very important.

Beginning in 1943, G. C. Brewer announced plans for the Broadway Church of Christ (Lubbock, TX) to "sponsor" evangelistic efforts in Europe following the end of WWII. By the end of 1945, a number of churches volunteered to become clearing houses for contributions to missionary efforts and benevolent organizations overseas. The Broadway Church hosted a lectureship in 1946 that promoted the method of sponsoring churches and congregational cooperation. The Union Avenue Church of Christ (Memphis, TN) volunteered to sponsor mission work in Japan in August 1947, and the Crescent Hill Church of Christ (Brownfield, TX) agreed in March 1948 to sponsor Cline Paden's effort in Italy. By the end of the 1940s, churches had volunteered to sponsor and oversee mission efforts in Japan, China, Korea, the Philippines, Holland, Germany, Italy, and France.[50]

---

49. Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement,* 162.

50. David Edwin Harrell, Jr., *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century: Homer Hailey's Personal Journey of Faith* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2000), 80–86; M. Norvel Young, ed., *The Lubbock Lectures on Mission Work* (Lubbock, TX: Broadway Church of Christ, 1946); Ira Y. Rice, Jr., *We Can Evangelize the World*, 2nd ed. (Nashville: Williams Printing Company, 1966), 39–60; Paul Allen Williams, "Missions, Missiology," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 538, explains, "Following World War II some congregations became clearing houses for support of mission efforts in Germany, Italy, and Japan. Called 'sponsoring congregations,' they solicited support from other churches and individuals and administered funds for establishing churches and sustaining missionaries. Opposition to the sponsoring church method contributed to an anti-institutional schism on Churches of Christ in the 1950s and 1960s."

The third area of heightened institutionalization identified by Hughes is general acculturation. At the beginning of the twentieth century the Churches of Christ were generally poor and on the social margins, often located in rural areas or small towns. The construction boom among postwar Churches of Christ is emblematic of the acculturation of Churches of Christ following WWII. For example, Powell and Young authored a book with instructions and guidelines concerning these building projects.[51] Additionally, at least ten new junior colleges were established following the war, and many of the previously established colleges expanded with new buildings during this period. Many churches launched elaborate new building campaigns and moved into more affluent areas of town. Hughes concludes, "Churches of Christ settled into their cultural environment and felt increasingly at home in the world in which they lived."[52]

During the 1940s members of Churches of Christ began to have increased access to graduate theological education. This exposure to higher graduate education led to a growing professionalization among Churches of Christ leaders, as many received doctoral degrees from highly reputable universities. People such as W. B. West, Jr., LeMoine Lewis, and Jack Lewis, received doctoral degrees in theological studies, church history, and New Testament, respectively. These leaders encouraged others to pursue doctoral studies, which led to a growing number of scholars trained at the graduate level who returned to teach at Churches of Christ colleges during the 1950s and 1960s.[53]

---

51. James Marvin Powell and M. Norvel Young, *The Church is Building* (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1956); Thomas H. Olbricht, "Congregational Life," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 232, describes, "After World War II, fellowship spaces in church buildings became popular in larger congregations, with meals and other activities often held before or after services."

52. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith*, 224.

53. Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement,* 226–227.

At the same time, the rapid growth of Churches of Christ following WWII produced an increased need for ministers. The colleges were unable to meet the demand of churches for trained ministers, which led to the development of preacher training schools. Originally created to meet the demand for ministers, these schools became "safe" places to train ministers. Many of the colleges had begun to introduce students to higher biblical criticism. The preacher training schools taught only Bible, focused on training ministers, and did not offer accredited degrees.[54] These changes in the Bible colleges, and the conservative response by the preacher training schools, reflect the gradual professionalization among leaders of the Churches of Christ.[55]

Members of the Stone-Campbell Movement historically avoided engaging with the government; some refused to participate in government (e.g., voting).[56] However, these views began to change during the twentieth century. Olbricht explains, "After World War II missions outside the United States accelerated exponentially. Military personnel and civilians involved in the war had become both promoters of missions and

---

54. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith*, 330–333; Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement,* 226–227; Claud Parrish, "A Historical Study of Sunset Church of Christ School of Preaching" (MS thesis, Abilene Christian College, 1965), 55–58, explains that the school would not admit students who had just finished high school and/or who did not have prior college education. The preaching school was to offer advanced and specialized training for those who desired to become ministers.

55. Coy Dee Roper, "A Study of the Training of National Preachers on the Mission Field" (MS thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1977), 108, describes, "from around 1950 on, two developments occurred which seemed to lead away from the traditional kind of preparation which the Churches of Christ had utilized: (1) training schools of preaching, and (2) training in graduate schools of religion." Harrell, *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century*, 182, asserts, "By the 1960s most of the colleges aspired to higher levels of professionalism and sheltered young professors fully engaged with modern scholarship."

56. Michael W. Casey, "Pacifism," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 586, describes that Tolbert Fanning believed that Christians should not vote or participate in government, and that David Lipscomb adopted the same views after the Civil War. This conviction was based on the belief that "God had instituted his own government to rule and control humans. However, rebellious humans established political systems to conduct the affairs of government free from God's rule and dominion."

missionaries."[57] The experiences of many members of the Churches of Christ while serving in the military during WWII encouraged them to become missionaries and/or support others who would. This increased interest in mission work led to increased engagement with the U.S. government. A specific example of the Churches of Christ welcoming government entanglement includes their missionary efforts in Italy.

Following WWII, Cline and Harold Paden began planning to go to Italy as missionaries. Harold had served with the U.S. Tenth Mountain Division in Italy during WWII, and he returned to the United States with the conviction that he needed to help address a spiritual need in Italy. Cline, who was a conscientious objector during the war, was inspired by his brother to join the mission effort in Italy.[58] They secured financial support from the Crescent Hill Church of Christ (Brownfield, TX), and then Cline traveled to Italy in 1947 to complete an exploratory trip. The brothers, their wives, three other couples, and two unmarried missionaries arrived in Naples, Italy, on January 14, 1949. They purchased two buildings and opened an orphanage.[59]

The Churches of Christ missionaries were viewed as a threat to Italy's Catholic way of life. Italian government officials believed the Communists and Protestant missionaries were working together and were therefore a threat to Catholic Italy. Cline Paden's church was noted as the most suspicious church in Italy in 1953. The Padens were often harassed. For example, shipments of equipment for the Padens ended up in

---

57. Thomas H. Olbricht, "Churches of Christ," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 217.

58. Janine Paden Morgan, email message to author, February 8, 2018.

59. Roy Palmer Domenico, "'For The Cause of Christ Here in Italy': America's Protestant Challenge in Italy and the Cultural Ambiguity of the Cold War," *Diplomatic History* 29.4 (2005): 633; Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement,* 360–361; and Young, ed., *The Lubbock Lectures*, 6–7.

Italian police auctions, they were attacked by crowds while in their Jeep, the brake line in their car was cut, and someone placed a mine under Cline's Jeep. Actions such as these encouraged Churches of Christ ministers to travel to Washington in order to express their support for the Padens' work in Italy. By February 1948, Washington realized that it could no longer ignore the discrimination on American missionaries in Italy.[60]

Domenico explains, "From the end of the world war, U.S. government response to reports of mistreatment of Protestants had evolved from one of caution to that of clear support for evangelicals like Paden."[61] This was true for the Padens, as fellow Texans who took interest in the Padens held key positions in Congress (e.g., Tom Conally, chair of the Senate foreign affairs committee; and Sam Rayburn, speaker of the House of Representatives). U.S. ambassador to Italy, James Dunn, informed the Italian Foreign Ministry office of Washington's "special interest in the Paden case."

Likely in response to the closure of a Church of Christ, *Gospel Advocate* editor B. C. Goodpasture contacted Pat Sutton, a Tennessee member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Sutton replied to Goodpasture, "Many thanks for your kind letter concerning my efforts in behalf of our missionaries in Italy. I agree with your views and intend to do what I can to be of assistance along the lines that you write. Your recommendations are most helpful and always appreciated."[62] It is evident that leaders in

---

60. Domenico, "'For The Cause of Christ Here in Italy,'" 634–640.

61. Domenico, "'For The Cause of Christ Here in Italy,'" 640.

62. Pat Sutton to B. C. Goodpasture, November 12, 1952, Benton Cordell Goodpasture Papers, 1854–1991, Center for Restoration Studies MS #464, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX (hereafter cited as MS #464). Likewise, in Ralph T. Henley to B. C. Goodpasture, September 12, 1961, MS #464, Churches of Christ missionary, Henley, explained, "The [Israeli] government has refused to renew my visa, although it expired back in April, but they have refused to deny it officially. They have told me that I must accept an 'indifinite [*sic*] status' with no visa…The American Consul-General, a wonderful friend to us, has told me that the

the Churches of Christ were appealing to government officials for assistance with the effect that the American government was politically pressuring foreign governments concerning the status of the Churches of Christ missionaries—entangling the churches with the government in unprecedented ways.

The final characteristic identified by Zeller of big religion include both public support and backlash. Concerning the popularity of the Churches of Christ during the postwar period, Harrell writes, "The Churches of Christ shared in the postwar religious boom among American evangelical churches; indeed, the group gained recognition as one of the fastest growing religious bodies in the nation."[63] The membership of the Churches of Christ had increased from 433,174 in 1926 to between 900,000–1,000,000 in 1960—an indication of substantial growth.[64] This growth in the size of membership, coupled with the increased cultural respectability and affluence of Churches of Christ, was not viewed positively by all of the members.

The characteristics of big religion embraced by mainline Churches of Christ incited backlash from the more theologically conservative members of the denomination. As Zeller explains, "Critics questioned individual components of big religion, often those parts that disagreed with their personal theological commitments."[65] This occurred among the Churches of Christ as well, manifesting itself as the institutional controversy.

---

only thing which kept me in the country this long was the pressure our brethren turned on in the [United] States and that now the Israeli government was afraid to actually expel me from the country, although they would like to do so."

63. David Edwin Harrell, Jr., "Noninstitutional Movement," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 568.

64. Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement*, 151, 161.

65. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 344.

Hardin explains that the institutional controversy "revolved around two issues: (1) the degree to which congregations could scripturally cooperate with one another, and (2) the proper relationship of congregations to church-related institutions."[66] Regarding the former, the controversy initially focused on mission work; and concerning the latter, the focus was on colleges and schools.[67] The institutional controversy following WWII led to a division among the Churches of Christ. Hughes explains, "Those who held most tenaciously to the democratic vision did so in the name of the primitive church. They believed that to shift from democratization to institutionalization would be to abandon the entire primitivist vision upon which Churches of Christ based their very reason for existence."[68] This group—the noninstitutional churches—refused to abandon what they believed to be the New Testament pattern for the church.

The more conservative members of the Churches of Christ, who later became the noninstitutional churches, began to push back against the changes embraced by postwar Churches of Christ (e.g., heightened institutionalism). Harrell points to the "Rock Fight" incident as the beginning of the final phase of the institutional controversy. Concerning

---

66. John C. Hardin, "Rock Fights, Quarantines, and Confessionals: B. C. Goodpasture, the *Gospel Advocate*, and Keeping Order in Churches of Christ," in *Recovering the Margins of American Religious History: The Legacy of David Edwin Harrell Jr.*, ed. B. Dwain Waldrep and Scott Billingsley (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2012), 67.

67. It is important to note the role of the controversy over the Herald of Truth in the larger debate over church institutions. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient* Faith, 240, writes, the battle over the Herald of Truth "helped solidify the division between mainstream Churches of Christ and their anti-institutional antagonists." See Tim Sensing, "Herald of Truth," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 383–384, for details on the history of the Herald of Truth. Concerning orphans' homes, Wade E. Osburn, "Children's Homes and Orphanages, 2. Churches of Christ," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 172, explains that like other extra-congregational institutions (e.g., Bible colleges), orphans homes were viewed as inappropriate because they received their support from several congregations. Typically, those who opposed the church support of orphans' homes were among the noninstitutional churches.

68. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith*, 218.

the situation of the Padens in Italy described above, Cled Wallace criticized the Padens' methods. Wallace wrote, that the Padens had been on the "receiving end of some rock-throwing." Responding to the broader social and cultural changes among the Churches of Christ, Wallace could not believe that members were appealing to the U.S. government for help on the matter. Likewise, he was criticizing the sponsoring church method, which he viewed as unbiblical. While many among the noninstitutional churches agreed with Wallace, they believed his article was ill-timed. Wallace was reiterating the Churches of Christ historical commitment to cultural separation, but his response damaged the noninstitutional cause by criticizing the growing denominational pride among mainline Churches of Christ.[69]

During the 1950s, the noninstitutional controversy continued. While the *Gospel Guardian* continued to voice the noninstitutional perspective, the *Gospel Advocate* and *Firm Foundation* only offered rebuttals and provided little space for publishing "both sides" of the matter. Goodpasture, editor of the *Gospel Advocate*, began to pressure preachers to pick a side in the debate (i.e., openly embrace or renounce 'antism'). Goodpasture published "confessions" from those who publicly denounced the noninstitutional perspective, and often recommended these preachers for jobs at churches. Debate among American Churches of Christ over institutional issues began to die down near the end of the 1950s, influenced by the "quarantine" instituted by Goodpasture. He published a letter from an anonymous elder who recommended that the *Gospel Advocate* publish a list of divisive preachers (i.e., preachers sympathetic to the noninstitutional

69. Harrell, *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century*, 117–120; Cled E. Wallace, "That Rock Fight in Italy," *Gospel Guardian* 36.1 (January 19, 1950): 1, 5; and William E. Wallace, "Rock Fight in Italy," *Vanguard* 9.7 (July 1983): 12–13.

perspective). Goodpasture's publication of this letter, and his encouragement to church elders to carefully screen new preachers, resulted in Goodpasture's publication of comments from readers who supported marking noninstitutional preachers. The controversy became vitriolic, with many leaders attacking one another rather than focusing on the issue itself. By 1958, the division was inevitable, and in the early 1960s around ten percent of the Churches of Christ made up the *new* noninstitutional Churches of Christ.[70]

What was the main cause of this division? Clearly theological issues were at stake (e.g., differing interpretations of the Baconian hermeneutic used by the Churches of Christ). Harrell offers a sociological interpretation of these events. He believes that the Churches of Christ split along sociological lines. That is, the lower-class noninstitutional members were taking issue with the growing wealth and education of the members of the mainline churches. The noninstitutional churches viewed the embrace of modernization and cultural affluence as an unhealthy denominational mentality.[71] Hughes offers a similar explanation. He explains that the Churches of Christ made their peace with the spirit of the age. Hughes continues:

> This became especially apparent in the aftermath of World War II, when the mainstream of the Churches of Christ increasingly abandoned its nineteenth century moorings in the interest of modernization, and sought, in a variety of ways, to enter the mainstream of American culture as a "respectable denomination." Many who maintained their allegiance to the value of the nineteenth century Churches of Christ saw this as nothing less than betrayal of the restoration vision. A bitter fight ensued, but when the dust finally settled in the late 1950s, the mainstream of Churches of Christ had essentially purged from

---

70. Harrell, *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century*, 120–145; Hardin, "Rock Fights, Quarantines, and Confessionals," 60–83; B. C. Goodpasture, "An Elder Writes," *Gospel Advocate* 96, no. 46 (November 18, 1954): 906; B. C. Goodpasture, "They Commend the Elder Who Wrote," *Gospel Advocate* 96.49 (December 9, 1954): 962; and William E. Wallace, "Onward Processes of the Movement (I)," *Vanguard* 10.6 (June 1984): 20–21.

71. Harrell, *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century*, 167–175.

> their ranks those they labeled the "antis"—shorthand for "anti-institutional" Churches of Christ.[72]

With Zeller's historiographic framework of big religion as a lens, the backlash of the noninstitutional churches is more understandable in the larger American religious context. These churches took issue with the sociological and theological changes they viewed among the mainline churches, and decided it was best to break away. Rather than losing influence, "The noninstitutional churches of Christ in the 1960s and 1970s displayed a strong camaraderie as they went about the task of building new churches."[73] This is important to note in the next two chapters.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have provided context for postwar American religious culture, and a historiographic framework (i.e., big religion) for understanding the changes and developments that took place following WWII. I then traced the debates over the use of institutions from the beginning of the Stone-Campbell Movement up to the postwar period. Finally, I detailed the changes among postwar Churches of Christ using the lens of big religion, and I described the backlash that took place because of the postwar developments.

Zeller's model helps explain and describe changes among postwar Churches of Christ. However, it is not perfect. Zeller asserts that professionalization did not occur "at the ground-level of ministers, priests, rabbis, and preachers, who had already

---

72. Richard T. Hughes, "Why Restorationists Don't Fit the Evangelical Mold; Why Churches of Christ Increasingly Do," in *Re-Forming the Center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present*, ed. Douglas Jacobsen and William Vance Trollinger, Jr. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 211. Hughes uses the pejorative term "antis," used by many during the institutional debate, for the group that became the noninstitutional churches.

73. Harrell, *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century*, 175.

professionalized during the preceding century."[74] This is not true for the Churches of Christ who began to adopt the norms of American society and to professionalize among their church leaders and ministers more so after WWII. The professionalization of the postwar Churches of Christ also included the religious bureaucracy (e.g., "oversight" of missionary efforts) described by Zeller.

This chapter provides the context necessary for exploring the missionary efforts of the mainline Churches of Christ in chapter 3, and the noninstitutional Churches of Christ in chapter 4. I will examine how the postwar changes among Churches of Christ in the United States influenced their missionary efforts in the remainder of this work, using the Philippines as my case study.

74. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 331.

CHAPTER III

MAINLINE CHURCHES OF CHRIST MISSION WORK IN THE PHILIPPINES

This chapter will briefly provide historical context for Churches of Christ mission work in the Philippines before World War II (WWII). I will then detail the postwar growth in mission efforts by mainline Churches of Christ in the Philippines and examine how postwar changes in the American religious context influenced Churches of Christ mission work in there. The religious developments in the United States—including heightened institutionalization, professionalization, and centralization of knowledge—created problems when introduced to the Philippines without consideration for cultural differences between the two countries. Churches of Christ missionaries sought to recreate the structures they were familiar with in the United States and introduced aspects of big religion into the Philippine Churches of Christ. However, some missionaries who inherited this model moved to dismantle pieces of it. This is not an exhaustive study of Churches of Christ in the Philippines, but a case study on the introduction of postwar American religious structures into Churches of Christ in the Philippines.[1]

1. This chapter will focus on Churches of Christ mission work on the northern Philippine island of Luzon. Other Churches of Christ missionaries engaged in similar work on other islands in the Philippines during the same period. For examples see Timoteo B. Almonte, "From the Philippines," *Firm Foundation* 62.40 (October 2, 1945): 11; F. T. Hamilton, "The Seventeenth Street Church of Christ Philippine Mission Fund," *Firm Foundation* 64.18 (May 6, 1947): 9–10; M. Carman, "Report of Mindanao Mission for June, 1948," *Firm Foundation* 65.30 (July 27, 1948): 1–2; "Philippine Progress," *Firm Foundation* 67.29 (July 18, 1950): 14; Orrin W. Utley, "Philippine Work," *Firm Foundation* 70.16 (April 21, 1953): 5; Donald E. Bone, "Let's Trade in the Eye Dropper," *Firm Foundation* 74.24 (June 11, 1957): 374; Everett W. Evans, "A Great Opportunity," *Firm Foundation* 74.47 (November 19, 1957): 745; Charlie Garner, "Work in Southern Philippines Will Hurt When Perrys Leave," *Christian Chronicle* 16.24 (March 24, 1959): 4; and Ronnie Sadorra, "Cotabato -- The Neglected Province," *Christian Chronicle* 17.36 (June 14, 1960): 2.

Prewar Mission Work

Missionaries from Stone-Campbell churches first arrived in the Philippines at the beginning of the twentieth century. Herman P. Williams, W. H. Hana, and their wives arrived in Manila in 1901. Doctors Cyrus L. Pickett and Leta M. Pickett arrived within a year to begin medical mission work. Leslie and Carrie Wolfe moved to Manila in 1907. These first Stone-Campbell missionaries were supported by the Foreign Christian Missionary Society (later the United Christian Missionary Society).[2] Holland credits Wolfe as playing an important role in the early efforts of Churches of Christ missionaries. Holland explains, "A number of early converts by such men as H. G. Cassell were to come from Wolfe's people because of the spirit of searching for the truth he had instilled in them."[3]

Wolfe split from the United Christian Missionary Society due its comity agreement with the Methodists and acceptance of open membership. He was committed to baptism by immersion and opposed denominationalism and ecumenism.[4] J. M. McCaleb, a Churches of Christ missionary in Japan, stated approvingly that Wolfe "encourages our coming in and establishing churches without its [i.e., music] use, saying that he endorses everything we do."[5] Even though Churches of Christ missionaries

---

2. Ross B. Wissman, "A Lone Wolfe in the Pearl of the Orient" (MDiv thesis, Emmanuel School of Religion, 1998), 14–17; Elpidio S. Batalla, "A History of Davao Bible Seminary: Its Role in Church Growth of the Churches of Christ in Mindanao, Philippines" (MA thesis, Emmanuel School of Religion, 1981), 22–26; and Ronald J. Holland, "The Church in the Philippines," term paper, Sunset School of Preaching, 1982, 2–4.

3. Holland, "The Church in the Philippines," 5.

4. D. Newell Williams, Douglas A. Foster, and Paul M. Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement: A Global History* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2013), 132–133, 275; and Batalla, "A History of Davao Bible Seminary," 26–33.

5. J. M. McCaleb, *On the Trail of the Missionaries* (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1930), 33.

disagreed with Wolfe's use of instruments in worship services, they shared many other beliefs. Wolfe's efforts provided assistance and groundwork for early Churches of Christ missionaries.

George S. Benson is credited as being the first Churches of Christ missionary in the Philippines. Benson had been serving as a missionary in China but was forced out of the country in 1927 due to war. While living in Hong Kong waiting to reenter China, Benson met with George Pepperdine who encouraged him to preach in the Philippines until China was reopened to foreign missionaries.[6] Benson preached in Mindoro for nine weeks in 1928, resulting in the formation of a church and the construction of a church building. He then returned to China. Pepperdine encouraged H. G. and Marie Cassell to continue the work Benson had started, and they arrived to replace Benson in October 1928.[7] The Cassells were in the Philippines between 1928–1945. The only other missionary from U.S. Churches of Christ in the Philippines before WWII was Orville T. Rodman, who spent five years working with the Cassells (1933–1938).[8] Efforts by Churches of Christ missionaries struggled due to the collapse of the global economy in

---

6. Eusebio A. Tanicala, "Church History – Philippines (Brief Outline)," manuscript in author's possession; Teofilo G. Alcayde, "The Church of Christ in the Philippines: Its Involvement in Community Development, 1990–1991" (EdD diss., Baguio Central University, 1992), 43–48; and J. C. Reed, "Mission Work in the Philippines," in *The Harvest Field: An Account of Evangelistic Work of Churches of Christ Throughout the World By A Group of Students of Abilene Christian College*, ed. Howard L. Schug and Don H. Morris (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian College Press, 1942), 50–51.

7. George S. Benson, "Word from the Philippines," *Gospel Advocate* 70.39 (September 27, 1928): 927; George S. Benson, "Word from the Philippines," *Gospel Advocate* 70.46 (November 15, 1928): 1094; and W. P. Reedy, "H. G. Cassell Going to the Philippines," *Gospel Advocate* 70.46 (November 15, 1928): 1094–1095.

8. Timoteo B. Almonte and Frank Trayler, "Mission Work in the Philippines," in *The Harvest Field*, ed. Howard L. Schug and Jesse P. Sewell (Athens, AL: Bible School Press, 1947), 229–237; Ralph F. Brashears, "The Church in the Philippines," in *The Harvest Field*, ed. Howard L. Schug, J. W. Treat, and Robert L. Johnston, Jr. (Athens, AL: The C. E. I. Publishing Co., 1958), 231; and L. E. O'Neal, "Working for Christ in the Philippine Islands," in *Abilene Christian College Bible Lectures 1953* (Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1953), 54–55.

1929—which affected all mission efforts—and the internment of missionaries by the occupying Japanese army in 1943.[9]

Postwar Mission Work

There was a large increase in the number of Churches of Christ missionaries in the Philippines following WWII.[10] Experiences during WWII influenced and encouraged some American soldiers and chaplains to become missionaries and return to the countries where they had previously been stationed. Concerning the interest of American evangelicals to become missionaries after WWII, Douglas Elwood explains, "A number of American G.I.'s and chaplains, while stationed in the Philippines during World War II, became convinced of a need for evangelizing the country, and upon returning to the United States raised funds from among interested independent mission agencies."[11] Members of Churches of Christ shared these convictions, and some of them quickly returned to the Philippines as missionaries.

---

9. H. G. Cassell, "Philippine Evangelism," *Firm Foundation* 65.7 (February 17, 1948): 7; Woodrow Phillips, "Introduction: Missions in the Restoration Movement," in *Unto the Uttermost: Missions in the Christian Churches / Churches of Christ*, ed. Doug Priest, Jr. (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1984), 11, writes, "The depression of the early 30's and World War II were harsh barriers for all foreign mission work in the Restoration movement.… Several direct support missionaries were held in the Philippines as prisoners of the Japanese."

10. Phillip Wayne Elkins, *Church-Sponsored Missions: An Evaluation of Churches of Christ* (Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1974), 6, claims, "it is evident that there was a dramatic growth both in membership and in the number of missionaries sent out immediately following World War II, i.e., 1947 to 1953."

11. Douglas J. Elwood, "Varieties of Christianity in the Philippines," in *Studies in Philippine Church History*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969), 373–374. Elwood lists as an example members of the Far Eastern Gospel Crusade, which was associated with the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association. Sarah Miller-Davenport, "'Their blood shall not be shed in vain': American Evangelical Missionaries and the Search for God and Country in Post-World War II Asia," *The Journal of American History* 99.4 (2013): 1109, 1113, also uses the Far Eastern Gospel Crusade as an example of increased evangelical fervor following WWII. Miller-Davenport argues, "the postwar evangelical revival was predicated on a conceptual shift—from separatism to engagement—among a core of evangelicals who believed worldwide conversion would go hand in hand with American expansionism." This shift from separatism to engagement described by Miller-Davenport is part of the evangelical resurgence Zeller identifies in his model of big religion.

Postwar Churches of Christ mission work relied heavily on American financial support and focused on building and funding schools and churches.[12] This pattern aimed to replicate models of church and education that the missionaries were accustomed to in the United States. Phillip Elkins explains:

> Some missionaries began with the assumption that every congregation needs its own full-time church-supported minister and church building. This assumption, which the fellowship accepted for American churches, was frequently transferred to the overseas church. That there could be a healthy indigenous church without subsidized leadership or a building was largely unrecognized.[13]

In the Philippines, this method quickly created problems of financial dependence on the United States and an expectation of American financial support for Filipino preachers. Ralph F. Brashears, who arrived in the Philippines in 1948, provides an early example of the implementation of this method. Brashears and other missionaries introduced aspects of American big religion into Churches of Christ mission work in the Philippines, including institutionalization, professionalization, and centralization of knowledge.

Brashears completed his undergraduate studies at Harding College (Searcy, AR) and Central State Teachers College (Edmond, OK). He took courses for a master's degree in education at Oklahoma University (Norman, OK) and taught in high schools and worked as a preacher in Oklahoma before being drafted into the military. During his three years of military service Brashears served as a chaplain's assistant and a medical soldier.

---

12. Elkins, *Church-Sponsored* Missions, 62–77.

13. Elkins, *Church-Sponsored Missions*, 79; Joy Oyco-Bunyi, *Beyond Accreditation: Value Commitments and Asian Seminaries* (Bangalore, India: Theological Book Trust, 2001), 7, explains, "Theological educational institutions in Asia were established in response to the pressing need for trained church workers generated by the Western missionaries' efforts and dedication in evangelism and discipleship…Implementing a sophisticated rationale for theological education was not the primary impetus; it was responding to a concrete need. The early missionaries, therefore, although lacking training in educational philosophy and practice, started theological schools that were basically patterned after what they had back home."

He spent eighteen months stationed in the Pacific during WWII. He visited the Luna Junior College while stationed in the Philippines, where he later began his mission work. After being discharged from the military, Brashears married and completed an MA at Pepperdine College (Los Angeles, CA).[14]

Brashears focused his efforts on teaching the Bible and developing ministers. His work after returning to the Philippines in 1948 was teaching Bible classes at Luna Junior College, a private school in Tayug, Pangasinan. The school allowed Brashears to create a department of religion.[15] He had some success, starting six Churches of Christ, and beginning a monthly publication called *New Testament Christianity*. Due to health issues, the Brashears family considered returning to the United States. Instead they moved to Baguio City, known for its better climate at a higher altitude, in 1952. Brashears continued teaching daily Bible classes in Baguio College like he had at Luna Junior College. Brashears explained, "because of much disturbance and inconveniences we rented a space large enough to seat about sixty persons near the school [i.e., Baguio College] and continued our Bible classes which we call Philippine Bible College."[16] This

---

14. Jack Hardcastle, "Getting Acquainted With Our Preaching Brethren," *Firm Foundation* 64.24 (June 17, 1947): 5; and Batsell Barrett Baxter and M. Norvel Young, eds., *Preachers of Today: A Book of Brief Biographical Sketches And Pictures of Living Gospel Preachers*, vol. 2 (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Press, 1959), 48.

15. Ralph F. Brashears, "A Golden Opportunity in the Philippines," *Firm Foundation* 65.15 (April 13, 1948): 11; and Ralph F. Brashears, "Brashears to the Philippines," *Firm Foundation* 65.27 (July 6, 1948): 9.

16. Ralph F. Brashears, "The Philippines," [1954], Philippines, World Churches Vertical File, Center for Restoration Studies, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX (hereafter cited as Philippines WCVF); Wade Ruby, "A Fruitful Field," *Firm Foundation* 67.6 (February 7, 1950): 6; and Ralph F. Brashears, "Churches of Christ in the Philippines," *Firm Foundation* 70.45 (November 10, 1953): 12; The authors of Williams, Foster, and Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement*, 275–279, provide a helpful overview of the history of Stone-Campbell mission work in the Philippines. However, some of the information concerning North American Churches of Christ Bible schools requires further detail. For example, on page 278 they write, "In 1948, missionaries from North American Churches of Christ established the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City." This statement requires clarification based on Brashears' own description in the sources

represents an early introduction of institutionalization into Churches of Christ mission work in the Philippines.

Further evidence of institutionalization includes Brashears's emphasis on building schools and churches early in the efforts of the postwar Churches of Christ missionaries. After renting a larger building in Baguio in 1955, Brashears began to appeal to American members of the Churches of Christ for large sums of money in order to purchase land for the growing Bible school and church. He explained, "I have two things I want to do: build as many new churches as possible, and work out a training program, especially for leaders in the church, which will insure loyalty and maturity for years after we are gone."[17] He estimated that it would cost at least $100,000 to purchase land near the colleges in Baguio City.

Four years later in 1959, Brashears continued looking to raise money for the purchase of land for a Bible school. He explained to his American financial supporters, "We are not asking for millions or one hundred thousand, but $50,000 to establish a good high quality loyal Bible school among many people who are still in religious darkness and can never hope to see the many well equipped Christian schools you are so well

---

above. It is not clear when Brashears began to call his Bible classes, "Philippine Bible College." However, the school did not begin in Baguio City. Brashears's first years began in 1948 at Luna Junior College in Tayug. The classes were then taught in Baguio City when the Brashears family moved there in 1952.

17. Ralph F. Brashears, Newsletter and Enclosure (Why We Need a Church Building in Baguio City, Philippines), November 4, 1955, Philippines WCVF. Ralph Brashears, "Philippine Help Lacking," *Firm Foundation* 72.32 (August 9, 1955): 520, wrote, "The land near the center of the city where the college students can be reached would cost about $50,000. A building suitable for these purposes would cost about $50,000 also. This cost, in comparison with buildings for education and worship in the United States and in other mission fields, does not seem too expensive." Brashears asked for $50,000 just a few months before. In Ralph F. Brashears Newsletter, July 27, 1955, Philippines WCVF, he explained, "We are sending out just 500 letters. If each congregation receiving this letter will send just $100, we can buy a lot in reach of the college students of Baguio City and the whole Philippine work will be placed on a solid basis."

blessed with in the U.S."[18] Brashears's repeated requests to fund these building projects reflects his insistence on the use of "American" institutions as necessary in the conversion of Filipinos to the Churches of Christ.

Brashears was concerned about the image and the efficiency of the Churches of Christ in the Philippines. He claimed, "Work can be done with poor tools, but the speed and quality is [*sic*] increased by the use of good equipment. We are inevitably in competition with the denominations who are teaching error and building up their human organization." Later in the article, Brashears wrote, "Nowhere are we farther behind other religious groups than in adequate training facilities for church leaders. We look like pigmies beside giants. We look like mudpuddles beside seas."[19] The following year, Brashears wrote, "In addition to our monthly needs, the College needs an auditorium for assembly and worship, as well as classrooms for daily Bible classes. The whole building complete will cost from $30,000 to $40,000 [*sic*]."[20] These comments are reflective of the competitive nature of mainline Churches of Christ who were comfortable with new developments in American religious culture. Brashears believed large building projects were necessary in order to succeed in training Filipinos to be preachers, and in order to attract Filipinos to the Churches of Christ. These beliefs are indicative of his assumption that his American model was superior to working within the established norms and means of Filipino culture.

---

18. Ralph F. Brashears, "Funds Needed for Baguio Building," *Philippine Mission News* 2.6 (December 1959): 1, Philippines WCVF; and Ralph Brashears, "If Philippine Work Continues, More Land Needs to Be Bought," *Christian Chronicle* 17.2 (January 5, 1960): 2.

19. Ralph F. Brashears, "Church Building at Baguio Vital Necessity," *Philippine Mission News* 4.2 (June 1961): 4, Philippines WCVF.

20. Ralph F. Brashears, "The Economics of Missionary Work," *Philippine Mission News* 5.1 (February 1962): 4, Philippines WCVF.

Brashears set a precedent for paying Filipino preachers with funds from the United States. This choice reflects the professionalization of Filipino Churches of Christ preachers. Concerning the students at the Philippine Bible College, Brashears wrote, "Twenty-five dollars ($25) per month will keep them preaching every Sunday and training during the week for full time work in the church."[21] This money included costs for their education, but also money to pay them for their preaching. Similarly, in regard to ministers who had finished school, Brashears explained, "each [preacher] will need P100 each per month, or P150 if he has a family. After one year, if the work is successful, there will be a need for a church building."[22] This was equivalent to $50 or $75 per preacher per month—more than most Filipino families made per month at that time. The expectation that Filipino preachers would be financially supported by churches and Christians in the United States reflected an increasing professionalization of their position. Instead of relying on local Filipino members of Churches of Christ for funding, the preachers could expect comparatively large incomes from American financial supporters.

The reliance on American funding to pay Filipino preaches forced the American missionaries in the Philippines to seek control of how the money was distributed. That is, Brashears "oversaw" the work of the Filipino preachers. Brashears felt that he had to oversee the payment of Filipino preachers in order to regulate and check their work. This oversight enabled Brashears to confirm whether or not the preachers were preaching

---

21. Ralph F. Brashears Newsletter, [undated], Philippines WCVF.

22. Ralph F. Brashears, "An Equitable Evangelistic Policy," *Philippine Mission News* 2.1 (January 1959): 2, Philippines Folder, Meredith Restoration History Archive, L. M. Graves Memorial Library, Harding School of Theology, Memphis, TN (hereafter cited as Philippines HST).

proper doctrine and helped him insure that the preachers were in fact preaching. This placed Brashears in a position to determine who received money, which took the decision away from the American individuals or churches who sent the money. Rather than rely on the past model used by the Churches of Christ—churches supporting their own preachers, or a church supporting a traveling evangelist—Brashears felt that he had to assume this position. Those sending financial support were too far away to confirm that the support was being used properly.

Brashears explained in a newsletter, "it is better for Churches of Christ in the States to send the money to the American missionary in the field and he can deal personally with the Filipino worker, from the beginning.… This may conflict with some people's 'missionary theory' of how financing should be done, but I am sure that it can be done thus and still please God."[23] This oversight of Filipino ministers reflected a growing control of knowledge and financial resources among the American missionaries in the Philippines. Rather than American churches or individuals directly supporting Filipino ministers, or the Philippine churches supporting their own ministers, the American missionaries put themselves in a position to judge which ministers were teaching what the missionaries deemed correct and would therefore receive financial support.

---

23. Ralph F. Brashears, "On Supporting Filipino Preachers," *Philippine Mission News* 2.4 (August 1959): 2, Philippines HST; likewise, in Ralph F. Brashears Newsletter, [undated], Philippines WCVF, he explains, "I believe we can achieve the best results if the money is sent regularly to me. It is necessary for me to supervise the preaching program and correct any faults that appear in their work." Brashears placed himself in a position of oversight in order to determine who was worthy of receiving funding, and who needed to receive correction; Victor N. Broaddus, "The Indigenous Church," *Word and Work* 90.6 (June 1996): 168, explained in 1961, "It has been our aim from the beginning to plant only indigenous churches in the Philippines. This means that no church or local preacher is subsidized by funds from abroad. We realize that this method moves slowly, but the results are more solid." Broaddus was a missionary for the premillennial Churches of Christ who disagreed with big church centralizing tendencies that relied on U.S. funding to create sustainable churches in the Philippines.

Brashears expressed some of the rationale for this model when he cautioned:

> Preachers working out in the field must be selected carefully. If they have been converted from a denomination, they should be tried for a while before they are recommended for economic support. No one should be promised before he is baptized. Six months to a year is short enough for observation. Then if he appears to be good, his support should be small until time proves his ability and earnestness, and conditions prove that he needs more. Hasty, liberal support may cause others to try for a job.[24]

Brashears explained that often preachers would leave one denomination for another if they knew they could acquire a raise. However, he described a process through which preachers could acquire adequate—or, possibly more than adequate—support. Reflecting on the problem of paying preachers, Charles Gunselman explained, "Whenever the Baguio grads left school, they were given $50 per month indefinitely (at that time, a living wage)."[25] Even with this cautious procedure, the school Brashears started was known for the ease in which one could acquire a salary upon graduating from the program.

Mission Work in Manila

Ralph Brashears attempted to implement the same structures described above in Manila. He helped begin a Bible school in Manila that was associated with the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City, and he encouraged the construction of church buildings in Manila. However, he was recalled to the United States before he was able to see these goals to their completion. In this section I will describe the context of the mission work in Manila, explain Brashears's removal from the Philippine mission work, and then explain how the issues associated with Brashears's methods in Baguio City played out in Manila

24. Brashears, "The Church in the Philippines," 240.

25. Charles Gunselman, email message to author, October 5, 2016.

and Quezon City. While the examples in Baguio City provide important background information, the extant archival record makes the postwar mission efforts in Manila and Quezon City a better case study for how the implementation of aspects of big religion—institutionalization, professionalization, and centralization of knowledge—influenced Churches of Christ mission work.

Brashears began an effort to establish a church and a Bible college in Manila in 1956. He explained that due to the success of the premillennial church in Manila, he and a student would begin work in Manila "until a true church of Christ is established."[26] Brashears described plans to build a church, but explained that these plans were being delayed due to a lack of funding "for a building suitable for worship."[27] Brashears was splitting his time between Baguio City and Manila. He would teach Bible classes at the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. He would then travel to Manila and teach Bible classes at the Bible College on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, and then preach on Sunday. Brashears described this as "a somewhat general typical routine of my work."[28] Due to division of Brashears's efforts, Ennis Franklin moved to Manila in 1959 in response to Brashears's request for assistance with the work of the Philippine Bible College in Manila.[29]

The work in Manila was off to a positive start when a controversy arose. The

---

26. Ralph F. Brashears, "Philippines," *Firm Foundation* 73.48 (November 27, 1956): 771.

27. Ralph F. Brashears, "Churches of Christ in Luzon," [March 1956], 3, Philippines WCVF.

28. Ralph F. Brashears, "Typical Monthly Activity," [January 1957], 1–2, Philippines WCVF.

29. Ennis N. Franklin, "Will You Share in My Adventure?," *Philippine Mission News* 2.4 (August 1959): 1, Philippines HST; Ralph F. Brashears, "Come to Manila," *Firm Foundation* 75.20 (May 20, 1958): 315; James E. Smythe, "Southwest Congregation in Los Angeles Sponsors Franklins in Philippines," *Firm Foundation* 76.19 (May 12, 1959): 297; and "E. N. Franklins Arrive For Work in Philippines," *Christian Chronicle* 17.3 (October 20, 1959): 3.

church at Pi y Margal divided due to a disagreement regarding church leadership, which also led to a split in the Bible school. Franklin explained to a prospective missionary, William Douglass Gunselman, "You should know that the work which was established in Baguio was hurt because the missionary was a sodomite."[30] Eugene White, an elder at the Inglewood Church of Christ (Inglewood, CA) wrote to Gunselman, "There is no question that Brashears engaged in homosexual activities." White explained, the activities occurred "over a period of years, spread over most of his life. His activities in this regard in the Philippines are fully documented, including his own letters of confession, as well as taped interviews with a young Filipino whom he introduced to the practice."[31] From the rest of this letter it is clear that Brashears was caught and admitted to engaging in homosexual acts with some of the Filipinos during his time in the Philippines. Due to this, the Inglewood Church of Christ requested that he return to the United States.

This controversy and division left a power vacuum in the church leadership in Manila as some of the Filipino leaders still supported Brashears while others opposed him. For instance, White explained to Gunselman, "the men in Baguio feel that [Paulino Garlitos] is undermining the work, and that they are not able to work with him as long as

---

30. Ennis N. Franklin to William Douglass Gunselman, December 31, 1963, William Douglass & Charline F. Gunselman Papers, 1942–2009, Center for Restoration Studies MS #389, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX (hereafter cited as MS #389).

31. Eugene White to William Douglass Gunselman, March 25, 1964, MS #389. White continues, "I think it is best that this information not be talked about too much. Nevertheless, this is true, all the missionaries know it and the sponsoring congregations. The former missionary influenced Filipino teachers against the new missionaries in Baguio resulting in the Filipino teachers (most of them) moving out of Baguio and coming down to Manila. They took over the Sampaloc church and established what is known as Manila Bible Institute. There is a possibility that a missionary working in Q.C. [i.e., Quezon City] could 'reach' these brethren, which would really do a lot of good." White believed that Gunselman might be able to help address the issues created by Brashears between the Filipinos in Manila and the American missionaries in Baguio City.

he keeps his present attitude [i.e., his support of Brashears]."[32] According to Franklin, this was true. He claimed, "Ralph Brashears without my knowledge, raised a large support for them [i.e., Paulino Garlitos and his followers], so that they were able to take over the upstairs apartment."[33] Somehow Garlitos was able to afford to rent the apartment above the Philippine Bible College in Manila. Ray Mayhue, an American missionary in Zamboanga, cautioned his financial supporters, "We want to warn you about an organization known as the Philippine Christian Foundation.… This is an unscriptural foundation trying to do the work of the Church."[34] A note on this document asserts that Brashears was responsible for this organization. This would explain how Brashears was able to continue to raise financial support for the Filipinos who still supported him after he returned to the United States.

Franklin described other aspects of the situation and context in Manila and Quezon City for Gunselman before he arrived and provided suggestions for Gunselman's work. Franklin was convinced that the efforts in Manila and Quezon City—specifically the Bible schools—required more attention from the American missionaries. Concerning the work with the Bible school in Manila, Franklin cautioned, "if you are expecting a well established school (Bible) [*sic*] in Manila then you are expecting too much. The

---

32. Eugene White to William Douglass Gunselman, March 25, 1964, MS #389. Ennis N. Franklin to William Douglass Gunselman, March 21, 1964, MS #389, explained, "Paulino Garlitos…is 'outs' with the Baguio brethren since he has cooperated with Brashears so much."

33. Ennis N. Franklin to William Douglass Gunselman, December 23, 1966, MS #389.

34. Ray L. Mayhue, "Philippine Report," (March 1963), Philippines WCVF. In this example, Mayhue uses the term "unscriptural" to assert that the work of the foundation was illegitimate because it was an institution seeking to do the work of the church but was not under the oversight of a church. Depending on how much Mayhue and his audience knew and/or Mayhue's rhetorical aims, the use of "unscriptural" could have could have a second meaning. It could also be a reference to the immoral acts committed by Brashears while a missionary in the Philippines. Brashears's sins in the Philippines could tarnish his leadership of the foundation and make its work unscriptural.

work is in its pioneering stage."[35] Franklin described the school in Manila:

> We have a small Bible school here. At one time we had around 40 students, but only have about a dozen or so today. Recently, we have emphasized the evangelistic and personal work rather than the school part. This is left up to the discretion of the missionary. Our main Bible school on Luzon is the Philippine Bible College in Baguio where there are four American missionary families. It is six hours drive from Manila. But a small school is also needed in Manila.[36]

The decline in the number of students was most likely due to the controversy and fallout over Brashears. Even with these issues in mind, Franklin still believed that Manila was an influential location for the Churches of Christ.

The location of Manila and Quezon City served an important role in Franklin's recommendations. Michael D. Pante explains, "Not only was Quezon City the postwar capital; it was also a center for education and health services, a transportation hub, a model city for housing projects, and a sporting and entertainment mecca." Due to the destruction of Manila during WWII, politicians considered a new location for the capital, and chose nearby Quezon City.[37] Franklin understood the growing importance of Quezon City. Franklin explained, "the church is making a mistake in failing to establish a foothold there for the future. A small congregation and school are in Quezon City now."[38]

---

35. Ennis N. Franklin to William Douglass Gunselman, May 31, 1963, MS #389.

36. Ennis N. Franklin to William Douglass Gunselman, May 2, 1963, MS #389.

37. Michael D. Pante, "Conjuring a Capital City: The Spatial Evolution of Quezon City, 1939–1986" (PhD diss., Kyoto University, 2017), 4, 166, 176; Ben B. Ngaya-an, "Mission Policies of the Episcopal Church in the Philippines (ECP), 1901–1980: Their Contribution to the Regional Character of the Church" (PhD diss., Middlesex University, 2015), 151, explains that for the Episcopal Church, "Establishing a mission centre in Quezon City in the period when it was being deliberately developed as the new capital city made the Church visible to Filipinos." In William Douglass Gunselman to Richard E. Stephens, July 24, 1967, MS #389, Gunselman explains, "Just about everything in the Philippine Islands centers around MANILA! Whether it is education, business, travel, or anything else! It is too ad that the church has been so long in getting established here. Like in Paul's day, if we could get a good strong church here in Manila, the Gospel could be spread to all parts of the islands!"

38. Ennis N. Franklin to William Douglass Gunselman, December 31, 1963, MS #389; and Ennis N. Franklin to William Douglass Gunselman, May 2, 1963, MS #389.

Franklin encouraged Gunselman to buy a large house in Quezon City before the prices rose and to convert it into a church and Bible School. He believed that establishing a mature church and a strong school in Manila or Quezon city was important for the future of the Churches of Christ in the Philippines.

William Douglass Gunselman in Quezon City

William Douglass Gunselman and his family moved to Quezon City, Philippines, in December 1964 to serve as missionaries. The Gunselman family was instrumental in creating and directing the Philippine Bible College of Quezon City. The goal of this effort was to address the perceived lack of trained preachers in the Philippines by training Filipinos to be preachers and ministers. The Philippine Bible College of Quezon City was forced to close after seven years (1965–1972) of training Filipinos for ministerial work due to a number of external factors. Gunselman inherited a model from Brashears reliant on the use of institutions, U.S. financial support, and a centralization of knowledge in the oversight of the American missionaries. Gunselman was caught in between trying to correct and address problems connected to the model of big religion that he inherited from Brashears. He also received criticism from noninstitutional Churches of Christ. The rest of this chapter will focus on the former, and chapter 3 will examine the latter.

Gunselman was interested in going to the Philippines in 1964. At the time, there were only three American teachers at the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City, and one of them was scheduled to return to the United States during 1964. Therefore, the missionaries in Baguio were interested in having Gunselman work at the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City for one year, and then move to Manila. Gunselman believed that he was well qualified to serve in this role. In a letter to the elders at the Sanford Church

of Christ (Sanford, FL), Gunselman claimed the missionaries "in the Philippines have written me and practically begged me to come because of my experience in school work."[39] Gunselman had received an MA in School Administration from George Peabody College for Teachers (Nashville, TN), worked in various roles as a teacher and school administrator, and had been a preacher for multiple congregations among the Churches of Christ following his undergraduate education at Harding College (Searcy, AR).[40] Due to Gunselman's experience in education and preaching, he believed that he was well qualified to join the effort to train native preachers.

Gunselman's main goal for his missionary efforts in the Philippines was to train native preachers. In an untitled draft of a script Gunselman recorded for the elders at the Inglewood Church of Christ, he described his goals for his time in the Philippines:

> Our training and experience has largely been in the field of education and that makes us very much interested in working in something along the educational line. So we have determined that wherever we go – whether it be to Baguio or whether it be to Manila – that our work will be directed toward helping young men to learn to preach. From what the brethren have told us … this seems to be the most needed thing.

Later in the letter, Gunselman made a pragmatic argument for training local Filipinos to be preachers:

> But we do plan, as I say, to work in the field of training young men to preach. I don't believe we are ever going to be able to send enough people to the Philippines or to any other country of any size to do a whole lot. We can't do all the teaching and all the preaching that need to be done. We need to train those

---

39. William Douglass Gunselman to Spruell Beall, Nestle Lines, and Jim Steakley, November 26, 1963, MS #389.

40. Rollins College Faculty Application Form, William Douglass Gunselman, 45E Faculty & Staff Files, Archives & Special Collections, Olin Library, Rollins College, Winter Park, FL; Charline F. Gunselman, "At Rest, Gunselman," *Gospel Advocate* 114.37 (September 14, 1972): 590–591; Kenneth Gunselman, email to author, October 6, 2016; and Charles Gunselman, email to author, February 27, 2017.

> people – the natives – to preach to their own people. And I believe in the long run we will accomplish more for them.[41]

This account clarified his goals for the mission effort before he left for the Philippines. He believed that this was the best plan based on accounts from previous missionaries and his own experience as an educator. These goals reflected a growing professionalization of Filipino Churches of Christ preachers. The Philippine churches needed well-trained preachers as the American churches would never be able to send enough missionaries to evangelize all of the Philippines.

Gunselman described the specifics of his plan with Franklin. After deciding against moving to Baguio City for a year and then to Manila, Gunselman chose to move to Quezon City. He explained that he planned to live near the colleges in Quezon City in order to try to work with college students. He would offer Bible classes in his house or provide a place for a church to meet there if there was interest.[42] This may have been a reflection of his conversations with Bill and Bettye Beck, who were missionaries in Thailand. Gunselman explained, "The Becks in Thailand say it is difficult there for the church not to be an 'American' institution. I've heard this elsewhere. It would seem that our greatest help would be to create situations so that what native ability there is could be used to the utmost, and to train others."[43] While his goals did reflect, perhaps

---

41. [Untitled draft of script] to the Elders at Inglewood Church of Christ (Inglewood, CA), [undated], MS #389. I am not aware of an extant copy of this tape. However, in the Elders at Inglewood Church of Christ (Inglewood, CA) to William Douglass Gunselman, February 10, 1963, MS #389, the elders do acknowledge that they received the tape: "We received the tape which you made and each of the Elders have listened to it. We appreciate the effort which you had put forth in making it. The tape is a big improvement over a letter."

42. William Douglass Gunselman to Ennis N. Franklin, February 25, 1964, MS #389.

43. William Douglass Gunselman to Ennis N. Franklin, March 14, 1964, MS #389.

unconsciously, American trends in professionalization, Gunselman recognized the need to contextualize these efforts in the Philippine context.

Gunselman desired to work with the established Churches of Christ Bible schools in Manila but knew he would create a problem if he chose one over the other. He explained to Franklin, "Each of them asked me to work with them, and I knew that if I worked with either of them, I would immediately find myself in difficulty with the other. So I refused to work with either group! I did however, suggest to each of the two groups that if they would disband their school, I would begin one. BOTH groups agreed to this procedure."[44] This was not exactly what Gunselman had planned before his arrival, but he believed this decision was necessary in order to continue the educational efforts of the Churches of Christ in Manila—an important location.

Phillip Elkins describes two different kinds of educational institutions employed by Church of Christ missionaries in the 1960s and 1970s: Bible training centers for church leaders and prospective ministers, and a college-level liberal arts education.[45] Gunselman's efforts fall under the former category. For instance, in an effort to receive financial assistance from Churches of Christ in the United States, Gunselman wrote, "We have been very pleased with the looks of things since this term of school has started. This, of course, is not actually a 'college', as we usually think of college. It is more nearly an extension of the Sunday Bible school."[46] Likewise, Gunselman explained to Barney D. Morehead, "I can see nothing that would produce results for the church like

---

44. William Douglass Gunselman to Ennis N. Franklin, January 11, 1968, MS #389.

45. Elkins, *Church-Sponsored Missions*, 67–69.

46. William Douglass Gunselman to Church of Christ (Port Lavaca, TX), August 13, 1965, MS #389.

providing living facilities for students who come here to go to college. This of course is what we are doing now. We are teaching Bible classes, both in the morning and evening, to those students, most of whom plan to preach."[47] Gunselman's model was more similar to a preacher training school than it was to a college-level liberal arts program.

After Gunselman created the Philippine Bible College of Quezon City he began to face a number of problems that hindered his efforts to train preachers. The main issue was the expectation that Americans would financially support Filipino preachers. Writing to his brother, Gunselman explained, "Brother Brashears and others got the idea across that if they [i.e., the Filipinos] would preach, the Americans would 'foot the bill.' So we have gobs of non-preaching 'preachers' who will not preach for the non-paying churches." Concluding, he claimed, "We are the only missionaries teaching people to earn their own living and to preach anyhow."[48] Gunselman believed that Brashears, the missionary whose efforts preceded him in Manila, created this expectation and that later the missionaries in Baguio City continued this practice. There was an expectation that Filipinos could contact members of the Churches of Christ in the United States in order to secure funding.

Filipinos seeking American financial support sent Gunselman letters with the hope of identifying people to contact in the United States Primitivo T. Granil had made requests to the Alpine Hills Church of Christ (Mobile, AL) with hopes of receiving monetary support from the church or its members. Gunselman replied to Granil, "I am not expecting anyone to quickly come forth with full support for you, simply because you

47. William Douglass Gunselman to Barney D. Morehead, January 27, 1965, MS #389.

48. William Douglass Gunselman to Marshall Gunselman, December 10, 1968, MS #398.

left the Wesleyan Methodist Church and now have decided to be in the church of Christ."[49] The reliance on American financial support by the missionaries who preceded Gunselman in the Philippines set an unhealthy and unsustainable expectation.[50] Many Filipinos sought out Gunselman's school in order to receive free schooling with no interest in becoming a minister, or they hoped to make connections with people who might send them money to "support their ministry."[51] Granil is a later example, but his example reflects the issues Gunselman faced in the Philippines.

Gunselman reorganized the Philippine Bible College of Quezon City to fit the needs of the Filipino students that he worked with and to address the problems he saw in previous efforts to train native preachers. One of the problems that Gunselman faced was the fact that the preaching school model that was prevalent in the United States (e.g., the Sunset School of Preaching) did not allow for students to pursue secular studies that would give them skills to financially support themselves. In his study on preaching schools run by Churches of Christ in the United States, Bohannan notes, "the study load in the school will not permit a student to do any outside work for maintenance of himself or his family."[52] The preaching school model in the United States assumed that the

---

49. William Douglass Gunselman to Primitivo T. Granil, May 13, 1971, MS #398.

50. For instance, in William Douglass Gunselman to John L. Wheeler, February 8, 1969, MS #398, Gunselman wrote to Wheeler, a missionary in Ceylon (i.e., modern-day Sri Lanka), "I do hope that you will work in such a way that the people there will feel responsible for carrying on the work themselves, without a large flow of money from the U.S. The people in the Philippines have been almost ruined by this. For years, it was just a matter of 'You do the preaching and we'll do the paying,' so Philippine Christians have never yet learned very much about supporting the cause of Christ from their own funds!"

51. In William Douglass Gunselman to John L. Wheeler, May 12, 1969, MS #389, Gunselman explained, "Another of our problems is that some want to come and stay with us because it is free or almost free, and then they don't do anything about it after we have spent a lot of time and money on them."

52. Ray Bohannan, "The School of Preaching: A New Concept of Teaching in the Churches of Christ" (MA thesis, San Diego State College, 1970), 82.

preacher would receive financial assistance from family members, use prior savings, or have support from their home church with the expectation that they would return to preach.

This model was not tenable in the Philippines. Due to the lack of Churches of Christ in the Philippines and to the relative poverty compared to the United States, one could not expect the Filipino students to secure funding like one might expect American students to do in the United States. The students enrolling in Bible schools in the Philippines were not guaranteed a position with a church after finishing their degree. Therefore, earning a degree, which would guarantee no skills for a student to provide for his or herself financially, while expecting non-existent churches to fund their effort, was an unreasonable option.

Gunselman understood that he could not expect to train Filipino students to preach and send them off without a way to support themselves financially. A weakness that Parrish identified in the Sunset Preaching School was that the school did "not offer any such courses to broaden the preacher's education to prepare him to preach in a society where general education is emphasized and received by many."[53] Gunselman also recognized this weakness, and he modified the way his school would offer courses. Gunselman's oldest son, Charles, explains that his father's work, "wasn't a preacher's school per se, but it also served that purpose. The main idea was for the Filipinos to reach their own people and not be beholden to any missionary or support from the US."[54] Gunselman's answer was to create and direct a preaching school that trained students in

53. Claud Parrish, "A Historical Study of Sunset Church of Christ School of Preaching" (MS thesis, Abilene Christian College, 1965), 65.

54. Charles Gunselman, email message to author, October 11, 2016.

the Bible, yet also encouraged students to engage in study at local universities in order to acquire knowledge and skills that would enable them to support themselves financially or receive the education necessary to be respected in society. Gunselman believed this would address reliance on American financial support.

Gunselman designed and created a structure in which two classes were taught in the morning and two classes later in the evening. This enabled students to attend secular universities in Manila during the day, offering an opportunity to simultaneously attend the Philippine Bible College of Quezon City and earn degrees from both institutions.[55] This model preceded J. C. Choate's published advice regarding secular education in relation to Bible training. Choate advised, "In my estimation they [i.e., the students] should look to their own local schools and colleges for their secular education. Then for their religious education, they will have to study on their own and look to the local missionary for additional teaching and training. Then if there are two or more missionaries present perhaps a Bible School can be set up to offer special courses of training."[56] This is exactly what Gunselman did. He created a model in which students could attend secular universities while also receiving training in Bible and ministry from American missionaries and Filipino teachers. This model indicated Gunselman's efforts

---

55. In William Douglass Gunselman to Ken Wilkey, July 4, 1970, MS #389, Gunselman stated, "I can understand the problem of using church money to teach secular things and the inherent problems of such an approach to the [Inglewood] elders. But our situation is a bag of problems, anyhow. They should have suggested a workable alternative!" Gunselman did not believe it was biblical to use "church money" (i.e., money donated by members of Churches of Christ for mission work) to fund "institutions" (e.g., colleges). Therefore, he used the "church money" to teach Bible classes for free at the Philippine Bible College of Quezon City (i.e., a work of the Church of Christ—overseen by elders), and he left the secular course work and training to the other colleges in Manila.

56. J. C. Choate, *Missionary Problems* (Winona, MS: J. C. Choate Publications, 1971), 59. In William Douglass Gunselman to Roberto J. Braña, [undated], MS #389, Gunselman encouraged Braña, "I would like to see both you and [Elizar G.] Glori go ahead and finish your college work outside [the Philippine Bible College], so that you will be in a position to earn your own living."

to decentralize the oversight of Churches of Christ missionaries in the Philippines by enabling Filipinos to provide for themselves financially.

Another aspect of Gunselman's model was that he required students to engage in work in order to earn their room and board at the Philippine Bible College of Quezon City. Gunselman sought to train students in secular skills by requiring that each student engage in work around the college (e.g., in the kitchen, in the garden, etc.). These activities helped the students develop what he believed to be necessary skills for providing for themselves in the future. In exchange for this work the students could pay for their room and board. In a description of the school one of Gunselman's students wrote, "We also want our students to learn how to work, for we believe Christians who have not learned how to work are not worthwhile."[57] This was their response to the students who were interested in or expected to receive a free education, free housing, or free food.

Gunselman encouraged his son, Charles, to open an ice cream business. His brother, Marshall, provided the family with the ice cream machine. Once Charles figured out how to acquire the supplies for the machine, the business was rather successful, and it provided jobs for the students. These students were able to work with Charles, learn business skills, and earn money, which they could then use to pay for things like room, board, and school supplies. Gunselman hoped the skills would help the Filipino students become financially self-sufficient. Instead of relying on American scholarship money for their education, he required that they earn their education through work.[58]

---

57. Revelina S. Belo, "Philippine Bible College of Quezon City—Its Goals and Aims," *Philippine Mission News* 3.1 (January 1971): 2, MS #389.

58. Charles Gunselman, email to author, October 10, 2016.

Gunselman's experience with his unique school model influenced his research for the dissertation that he completed while in the Philippines. Reflecting on the concept of requiring his students to work, Gunselman concluded, "The Bible college administrators should take seriously the need of Bible college students, to learn to earn. Not only will this be useful to the student himself, but the college, in turn, will receive funds, which have been earned by the student, rather than having to subsidize, by one means or another, the student in order to make it possible for him to attend the college."[59]

Gunselman was concerned about training native preachers, which included making sure the Filipinos he worked with and trained would be able to support themselves financially once he left the Philippines. If they were not able to do this, he felt that his efforts would be a waste. Gunselman aimed to adjust the typical American preaching school model to better fit in the Philippine context. This is indicative of his goal to correct the reliance of Churches of Christ missionaries on the institutions they had introduced and their emphasis on the professionalization of preaching. Gunselman wanted a model that enabled Filipinos to support themselves financially, and that did not rely on the presence of American institutions.

There is evidence that many of the practices and policies in place at the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City were ineffective. Charles Gunselman explained, "Years later those same missionaries [in Baguio City] admitted that they got the work off on the wrong foot, making it too much about money."[60] It appears that the admission

---

59. William Douglass Gunselman, "Status of the Ten Evangelical Bible Colleges in the Philippines with a Proposed Program for Their Improvement" (EdD diss., Manuel L. Quezon University, 1971), 139–140.

60. Charles Gunselman, email message to author, October 5, 2016.

Gunselman referred to is an article that was published in *Firm Foundation* in 1975. The authors, all American missionaries in the Philippines during the time Gunselman was in Quezon City, confessed to the negative effects that American money had on the Philippine church. Reliance on American money had stifled local support. They concluded, "It is our conviction, after much personal meditation and discussion, after listening to preachers here, and much observation, that termination of support from America for *local preachers,* is a necessity."[61] Gunselman had made this observation years earlier and sought to address the problem by changing the model for ministerial education at the Philippine Bible College of Quezon City.

Conclusion

Brashears serves as an example of an early postwar Churches of Christ missionary who imported elements of American big religion into the Philippines through missionary work. Through his efforts in Baguio City, and his goals for similar institutions in Manila, Brashears was influential in assuring that the Philippine Churches of Christ would institutionalize and professionalize and that he would control knowledge—overseeing decisions concerning the payment of preachers. I do not think he made these decisions with malicious intentions. However, his decisions and methods reflect that he had not considered *Filipino* ways of training ministers and building Churches of Christ. Gunselman's efforts in Quezon City reflect an attempt to contextualize the models of training and paying preachers that he inherited from the missionaries before him.

---

61. Ray Bryan, Don Huddleston, Robert Buchanan, and Doug LeCroy, "Proposed Plan for Philippine Self-Support," *Firm Foundation* 92.13 (April 1, 1975): 11. The article was published in April, but the letter was originally dated January 27, 1975; it was also published as, "Proposal for Philippine Self-Support," *Philippine Mission News* 18.2 (March 1975): 1, 3, Philippines WCVF. My thanks to Sonny Guild for bringing this letter to my attention, and for providing me with a scanned copy of the original letter.

Gunselman challenged the reliance on American financial support, and he expected his students to work to support themselves. He did not believe his efforts were worthwhile if the Filipinos he trained were unable to provide for themselves when he left.

This chapter affirms part of Zeller's big religion model. Zeller explains that big science became inaccessible to laypeople as control and production of knowledge were centralized, and he argues that this later occurred in big religion.[62] In this example of Churches of Christ mission work in the Philippines, Brashears's creation of institutions (i.e., institutionalization) and payment of Filipino preachers (i.e., professionalization)—aspects of big religion—made his work inaccessible to the lay American financial supports. They had to trust Brashears to serve as an overseer (i.e., to control knowledge), which was a new development for Churches of Christ. This control of knowledge made his work inaccessible as he was the only American who understood, or believed he understood, how the new methods of missionary work functioned.

62. Benjamin E. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion': Reconceptualizing Twentieth-Century American Religion Using Big Science as a Model," *Church History* 80.2 (2011): 324–325.

CHAPTER IV

NONINSTITUTIONAL CHURCHES OF CHRIST MISSION WORK IN THE PHILIPPINES

The noninstitutional Churches of Christ formed as the backlash to the postwar mainline Churches of Christ, which had embraced big religion. Zeller explains, "critics questioned individual components of big religion, often those parts that disagreed with their personal theological commitments."[1] The previous chapter examined the postwar missionary efforts of the mainline Churches of Christ in the Philippines. This chapter will focus on the backlash to the efforts of the mainline missionaries—the work of the noninstitutional Churches of Christ.

Concerning the developments among Churches of Christ described in chapter 3, Phillip Elkins claims, "The centralizing tendencies found in the overall mission enterprise were either not widely recognized or not feared, because they never became a controversial issue in the decade."[2] This assertion, however, was not true in the Philippines. In this chapter I will examine the controversy that took place in the Philippines due to the centralizing tendencies (e.g., the use of institutions, financial oversight of native preachers by American missionaries, etc.) of the mainline Churches of

1. Benjamin E. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion': Reconceptualizing Twentieth-Century American Religion Using Big Science as a Model," *Church History* 80.2 (2011): 344. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 321–322, explains that the backlash of more conservative groups to developments (e.g., heightened institutionalization, professionalization, and centralized knowledge production) serves as an important characteristic of the historiographic model.

2. Phillip Wayne Elkins, *Church-Sponsored Missions: An Evaluation of Churches of Christ* (Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1974), 53.

Christ. First, I will provide historical context for the presence of the noninstitutional perspective in the Philippines. I will provide examples of the backlash against the efforts of the mainline Churches of Christ. Then I will examine the debate that occurred among members of the noninstitutional Churches of Christ after the mainline Churches of Christ admitted fault in their methods.

The Beginning of the Noninstitutional Churches of Christ in the Philippines

The institutional debate arrived in the Philippines while it was abating in the United States. Jim McDonald described, "During the conflict in the 1940-1960s of the institutional battles here in the United States, the work in the Philippines fell largely under the influence of institutional brethren."[3] Wilbert Enostacion further explained, "The dividing issues came after 1955. Some U.S. missionaries came to preach the gospel and oversee some native works; this sparked the issues of division."[4] The Churches of Christ had separated over the institutional controversy in the United States yet continued the debate over the matter in the Philippines.

Romulo B. Agduma is considered to be one of the first Filipinos to adopt the noninstitutional beliefs through the efforts of Americans. He was baptized as a member of the Churches of Christ in 1943, and later studied at the Zamboanga Bible College—a Churches of Christ Bible school funded and directed by the mainline churches on the

---

3. Jim McDonald, "The Work of Our Lord in the Philippine Islands," *Truth Magazine* 45.4 (February 15, 2001): 14.

4. Wilbert Garingo Enostacion, "The Gospel in the Philippines," *Guardian of Truth* 34.7 (April 5, 1990): 198. Enostacion continued, "One of the early native preachers first to notice such departures from the Pattern, was Romulo Agduma of Cotabato in far flung town of Mindanao; later on Victorio R. Tibayan of Southern Tagalog region also recognized the error. They stood opposed to all changes in N.T. [i.e., New Testament] church doctrines and practices, calling for book, chapter and verse for every doctrine and practice, especially the support of institutions from the church treasury, the sponsoring church method of organization, and general benevolence to the public."

southern Philippine island of Mindanao. Agduma began to question some of the practices of the Churches of Christ and he asked for a copy of J. D. Thomas's, *We Can Be Brethren.*[5] In 1957 Jady Copeland subscribed Agduma, a Filipino preacher, to the *Gospel Guardian.* After studying "the issues of the sponsoring church type of cooperation and the building and maintenance of human institutions as societies by churches of Christ through which to do their work of benevolence," Agduma became convinced that the noninstitutional churches held the correct biblical beliefs.[6]

There were also Americans in the Philippines who held noninstitutional views. Wallace H. Little was a member of the American Air Force stationed at Clark Air Force Base, north of Manila. He was informed that the church near the Air Force Base was "liberal concerning the 'present issues'" and he was aware of the fact that he might not be welcomed by the church members due to his beliefs.[7] According to Little, the church near Clark Air Force Base engaged in a number of unscriptural practices, including operating under the oversight of the elders at the Inglewood Church of Christ and sending money monthly from the church treasury to financially support the Philippine Bible College. Little believed these practices were additions to the biblical model and a sign of growing denominationalism. "For a time, it seemed I was teaching some the truth, enough to cause

---

5. Wallace H. Little, "Philippine Report," *Truth Magazine* 16.45 (September 21, 1972): 11. Little continued on to claim that Agduma "started opposing the institutional apostasy by *himself* when he was a very young preacher."

6. Roy E. Cogdill, "The Battle Against Liberalism in the Philippines," *Gospel Guardian* 22.25 (October 29, 1970): 1; Jady W. Copeland, "Romulo B. Agduma Passes," *Truth Magazine* 24.6 (February 7, 1980): 12, described, "At that time, the institutional issues were being discussed and I subscribed to the *Gospel Guardian* for Brother Agduma and asked him to study the issues. Soon he learned the truth and took a stand against the innovations of the time, which position was instrumental in getting his support cut off from the Harlingen, Texas church."

7. Wallace H. Little, "The News Letter Reports," *Searching the Scriptures* 7.7 (July 1966): 10.

them to want to change," Little described. He was disfellowshipped from the congregation located near the American Air Force base for "anti-ism" (i.e., being an outspoken member of the noninstitutional churches) in the 1960s.[8]

Backlash

The backlash to the efforts of the mainline Churches of Christ missionaries, who had embraced aspects of big religion (described in chapter 3), took three main forms—correspondence, publications, and public debates. In this section I will provide examples of the different forms of the backlash to the missionary efforts of the mainline Churches of Christ in the Philippines. The noninstitutional churches were united in their pushback and their demands for evidence of scriptural support for the methods and beliefs of the mainline churches who supported the use of institutions.

Correspondence

American missionary William Douglass Gunselman received carbon copies of correspondence between Filipino ministers who were debating over institutionalism. Silverio Aniñon, a Churches of Christ minister, wrote Agduma a seven-page letter in which he explained his beliefs concerning the Churches of Christ and institutions. He began the letter with an emphasis on the necessity of unity—that there be no division among the Churches of Christ. According to Aniñon, the debates and division over institutions were unscriptural. He wrote, "Therefore, if the members of the MISSIONARY SOCIETY are from the CHURCH OF CHRIST, then it is not

8. Wallace H. Little, "Modern History of God's People in the Philippines (No. 3)," *Gospel Guardian* 29.20 (October 15, 1977): 11, 14. William Douglass Gunselman to Dudley R. Spears, November 14, 1970, William Douglass & Charline F. Gunselman Papers, 1942–2009, Center for Restoration Studies MS #389, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX (hereafter cited as MS #389), claimed, Wallace Little "proceeded to establish anti-ism in the Philippines."

excluded…nor unscriptural."[9] For Aniñon, as long as the members of an institution were all members of the Churches of Christ, he could not see why the use of institutions in conjunction with the church was problematic.

Aniñon asked Agduma, "SHALL WE USE THE PAPYRUS IN WRITING THESE DAYS? IF WE HAVE NOT PRINTING PRESS because it is excluded or unscriptural, SHALL WE USE THE ANCIENT WAYS OF WRITING AND PRINTING?" This may appear to be humorous, but Aniñon was trying to make a serious point. Was the biblical model of primitive Christianity at stake as churches began to adopt new and modern practices? Aniñon did not think so. He concluded, "Well, I tell you, we have no beautiful feet these days, because we are using costly shoes, and when we go to another place, we are riding on nice cars, if not, ride on bus."[10] Aniñon's play on Romans 10:15 makes it clear that he was not opposed to using new modes of transportation as the means of preaching the gospel. He was pointing out that be believed those who have been swayed by the "anti doctrine" were more interested in avoiding modernization and the use of institutions than they are in preaching the gospel through whatever means necessary.

Agduma did not believe their correspondence was about opposing beliefs. Rather, Agduma believed that Aniñon not pleased with him because he did not help Aniñon acquire American financial support. Agduma asked, "Was it because I did not work out your support that you asked two (2) years ago?" He continued, "It is indeed shameful that

---

9. Silverio Aniñon to Romulo B. Agduma, July 1, 1968, MS #389. I will quote directly from letters to and from Filipinos, leaving grammatical mistakes, use of capitalization, etc., unless otherwise noted. I think this is an important part of providing their voice and perspective in this historical analysis.

10. Silverio Aniñon to Romulo B. Agduma, July 1, 1968, MS #389.

so called 'preachers' like you, after they failed to get favors from those whom they asked go to the extend [*sic*] of hating and opposing them; and worst of all they pass that on to others--perhaps to help justify their cause!" Agduma could see no other reason for why Aniñon supported his work in 1968 but then wrote very critical letters to Agduma in 1970. Agduma believed that Aniñon did the same to Gunselman after Gunselman did not help Aniñon acquire American financial support. In this case, Agduma accused Aniñon of following the money, rather than addressing his claims concerning the institutional debate. He concluded the letter, "your next mail [will] be marked, 'Return to Sender.'"[11] Agduma did not take Aniñon's claims seriously, and apparently cut off correspondence with him. However, this exchange serves as one example of Filipino church leaders engaged in the institutional debate through correspondence.

Filipino church leaders were also engaging American missionaries in this debate. For instance, Agduma wrote to the Gunselmans on this matter. Gunselman wrote an article in the March 1968 edition of the *Philippine Mission News* titled, "Antis." Agduma was upset about this article. He felt that it was a gross misrepresentation of the noninstitutional churches and he demanded that Gunselman prove his claims. Agduma wrote, "Bro. Gunselman, in view of your article against us, in all humility and sincerity, I challenge you to prove in the scriptures; that churches are authorize[d] to work through human organizations or through a sponsor church for the preaching work."[12] Agduma included a list and a cartoon on the final page of his letter to Gunselman—presumably Agduma's interpretation of the March 1968 edition of "The Gunselman Philippine

11. Romulo B. Agduma to Silverio Aniñon, July 2, 1970, MS #389.

12. Romulo B. Agduma to William Douglass Gunselman, April 15, 1968, MS #389.

Mission News."[13] There was series of letters between the two during the following year.

In response to Agduma's continued demands for Gunselman to prove his views scripturally, Gunselman's wife, Charline F. Gunselman wrote to Agduma:

> A few years ago, there were NO Sunday schools, NO Bible camps, NO Bible colleges, NO radio, NO television programs, NO filmstrips, NO records, NO tapes, NO tracts – or other supplementary materials and methods. Our brethren have learned to use these things effectively for CARRYING OUT THE COMMANDS OF THE LORD, and in time these will all be commonly used by those who are attempting to do God's will. A thing is not wrong simply because we are not used to it![14]

This debate was clear for Charline Gunselman. These institutions and newer methods were scripturally sound because they enabled Christians to more effectively carry out God's commands. Agduma continued to argue that the Philippine Bible College of Quezon City was not scripturally sound. However, Gunselman explained, "I do not count new 'preacher colleges' that teach Bible only and are run by congregations. These are not Christian colleges."[15] Because the school only taught Bible and Bible related courses, Gunselman believed it was not unscriptural to use money from the churches to fund the school. He viewed the Philippine Bible College as an extension of the Sunday school. Although it does not appear that either party swayed or convinced the other, they did engage in pointed debate on the matter through correspondence.

Gunselman believed the correspondence between Agduma, Aniñon, and the Gunselmans was not particularly worthwhile. Gunselman explained to Aniñon:

> It is mostly a useless thing to do all the hollering that they are doing! This is especially true here in the Philippines. They are opposing orphans' homes – and

---

13. I have not been able to find an extant copy of this newsletter. However, Agduma included a list of descriptions of the "antis" and a cartoon in Romulo B. Agduma to William Douglass Gunselman, April 15, 1968, MS #389. See Appendix B.

14. Charline F. Gunselman to Romulo B. Agduma, February 21, 1969, MS #389.

15. William Douglass Gunselman to Romulo B. Agduma, March 25, 1969, MS #389.

> we have NO orphan homes. They are opposing Herald of Truth radio and television programs – and we have NO Herald of Truth radio and television programs! They oppose church gymnasiums – and we have NO church gymnasiums! They oppose supporting Christian colleges out of the church treasury – and we have NO Christian colleges! So what it really amounts to is that they are borrowing problems from the United States and building themselves a DENOMINATION on the basis of certain things which they oppose in the UNITED STATES! This is more than just a little bit on the silly side![16]

He believed that the noninstitutional Americans were using differences in belief among American Churches of Christ in order to create their own denomination in the Philippines. Gunselman's argument does not reflect an in-depth understanding of the noninstitutional concern for the use of biblical methods in mission work, but it does demonstrate the ways in which the American contexts of the institutional controversy were imported into the Philippines.

Noninstitutional leaders in the United States also wrote to Gunselman to criticize his methods. Jady W. Copeland received the March 1968 copy of "The Gunselman Philippine Mission News" mentioned above that was critical of the "antis" (i.e., the noninstitutional churches). Copeland agreed with Gunselman that an "un-Christian" spirit is wrong. However, Copeland believed that Gunselman's admittedly negative descriptions of the noninstitutional churches and their leaders only added to the division. Copeland asked, "BUT, PLEASE TELL ME -- WHAT DOES THAT HAVE TO DO WITH WHETHER OR NOT IT IS SCRIPTURAL TO SUPPORT A HUMAN INSTITUTION WITH THE LORD'S MONEY?"[17] He did not support Agduma's alleged

---

16. William Douglass Gunselman to Silverio Aniñon, July 12, 1970, MS #389.

17. Jady W. Copeland to William Douglass Gunselman, March 19, 1969, MS #389. William Douglass Gunselman to Jady W. Copeland, April 2, 1969, MS #389, admitted, "the picture which I painted of what an 'anti' looks like may be overdrawn a bit." Gunselman admitted to Copeland that his written depiction of an 'anti' was exaggerated. The picture in Appendix B is Agduma's artistic interpretation of Gunselman's exaggerated claims.

"un-Christian" attitudes, and he did ask for proof of Agduma's wrongs. However, for Copeland, this issue concerned the scriptural basis for the "new" methods Gunselman used and supported in the Philippines.

Gunselman evaded Copeland's question in his response. He repeated his claims about Agduma's "un-Christian" attitude. Additionally, Gunselman claimed that he was not seeking to divide people into groups, and that he was not an "anti," "anti anti," or a "liberal." Gunselman's focus was on his perception of the attitudes of and the hatred of those he disagreed with in the Philippines. He told Copeland, "Certainly this has nothing to do with whether or not we are to support a human institution with the Lord's money; but that is not the subject that I was talking about."[18] Copeland thought Gunselman was missing the point. He told Gunselman, "If you don't know by now that there is a definite cleavage in the church…there isn't much use of us corresponding, I'm afraid."[19] Noninstitutional leaders in the Philippines and the United States wrote Gunselman, but there did not appear to be a shared understanding of the problems between the two groups.

Publications

Noninstitutional churches also opposed institutional churches in the Philippines through the publication of criticisms and personal attacks in periodicals. Gunselman, received the majority of these published criticisms. Gunselman may have invited the first of his published criticism by writing an article that was rather critical of Filipinos. Gunselman claimed:

---

18. William Douglass Gunselman to Jady W. Copeland, April 2, 1969, MS #389

19. Jady W. Copeland to William Douglass Gunselman, April 10, 1969, MS #389.

> Nearly every Filipino tries to build himself an empire. He wants others around him that he can command. His culture teaches him to "use" people, if he can get by with it. Some go to the [United] States to make contacts to raise money for their empire. Christianity is just the method used. Many fine Christian people have been "taken in" this way. Never send money directly to any Filipino, or any other Oriental. It is a bad mistake.[20]

Gunselman's suggestions, while certainly harsh, racist, and ethnocentric, were not all that different from other recommendations concerning the financial support of native workers at that time.[21] However, these statements made Gunselman an easy target for the noninstitutional leaders in the United States and the Philippines. Gunselman's statements made it easier for noninstitutional leaders to attack not only his theological beliefs, but also his character.

For example, in response to Gunselman's article, Ronnie P. Sadorra asked, "Who is he? A superman with super intelligence? Or an American in a foreign land disguised as a preacher and pretending to be a Christian?" Sadorra was not pleased that Gunselman was focused solely on the conduct of Filipinos. "In many instances, the American brethren who have been among us have erred," Sadorra explained. However, he continued, "the Filipino brethren have always been understanding."[22] This first published

---

20. [William] Douglas[s] Gunselman, "When to Train Preachers—Why?" *Firm Foundation* 82.26 (June 29, 1965): 406.

21. J. C. Bailey, "Can We Evangelize the World?," *Firm Foundation* 82.23 (June 8, 1965): 358, reflected just weeks before Gunselman's article, "Students want to go to America to school. Is this the answer? I have a letter on my desk wanting to know about a certain young man who has attended several years in America. I am trying to find him…. Sending young men to America for some reason has not proved very advantageous to work in foreign countries. There are some notable exceptions. Certainly we shall never get this tremendous job done in this way." Reuel Lemmons, "A Word of Warning," *Firm Foundation* 82.3 (January 19, 1965): 34, cautioned earlier in 1965, "There is a growing practice upon the part of Nationals in foreign lands of securing the names and addresses of brethren appearing in the Firm Foundation and writing them for help of various kinds. Some are operating a racket in this respect." Lemmons's caution is indicative of the practices Gunselman was observing in the Philippines.

22. Ronnie P. Sadorra, "A Review of Gunselman," *Searching the Scriptures* 8.4 (April 1967): 11. Sadorra concluded the article: "Is it adding insult to injury for Gunselman to impute upon the Filipino Christian a low standard of morality to say that we cannot see alike what is staling, lying or

rebuttal of Gunselman was not due to differing claims concerning institutionalism, but about his use of racist rhetoric. Gunselman was heavily criticized for his *Firm Foundation* article, and the noninstitutional leaders used it as one of their arguments against him over five years after it was published.[23]

Noninstitutional leaders in the United States also criticized Gunselman in their periodicals. Roy E. Cogdill published the majority of the articles that criticized Gunselman. Cogdill learned about Gunselman's Philippine efforts during a trip to preach in the Philippines for a couple of weeks in 1970. Following the trip, Cogdill wrote, Gunselman's "invectives and plain falsehoods are calculated to deceive the Philippine brethren so as to keep them under his influence and lead them away from the truth." Concerning the liberal Churches of Christ missionaries, Cogdill explained, "they cannot establish Bible authority for what they are doing, and hence will not come out in the open and meet the challenge to defend their doctrines and practices."[24] He thought Gunselman and the other mainline missionaries had no biblical basis for the introduction of and use of these institutions supported out of the church treasury.

---

misappropriation of funds. Certainly an elementary knowledge of the Bible or even common sense will let us know that what stealing is to an American is also stealing to [a] Filipino. Lying to a white American is also lying to a brown Filipino." William Douglass Gunselman to Ennis N. Franklin, March 16, 1967, MS #389, wrote, "Brother Sadorra has been quite unethical, besides being sponsored by an 'anti' group." Their relationship is not clear, but Gunselman was aware of Sadorra before Sadorra's review was published. Ronnie P. Sadorra to William Douglass Gunselman, October 18, 1967, MS #389, referenced Gunselman's *Firm Foundation* article, writing, "I will be visiting congregations in the US, not to raise funds for *my own domain*, but to inform the brethren of the work here" (emphasis mine).

23. Roy E. Cogdill, "Liberalism in the Philippines," *Truth Magazine* 14.45 (September 24, 1970): 8, referenced Gunselman's June 1965 *Firm Foundation* article in an effort to discredit Gunselman's work and methods. Cogdill questioned Gunselman's character, writing, "With all of the reflection that he has cast on the Philippine people, I am surprised that they do not run him out of their country."

24. Cogdill, "Liberalism in the Philippines," 7, 9.

From Cogdill's perspective, Gunselman believed that the antis quit fellowshipping with the other Churches of Christ. Cogdill believed Gunselman was trying to alter God's plan for the organization of the church by introducing new methods (e.g., the Bible schools) that were not "made plain in the Word of God." Cogdill wrote, "We challenge Gunselman to produce the passages that teaches what he practices. Unless he can, and we will tell you now that he cannot, then he with all the other liberals are exercising the liberty of 'going beyond the doctrine of Christ'—walking after their own wisdom." Cogdill believed that Gunselman's methods were not supported by scripture. If this were not true, Gunselman would be able to provide scripture that validated his methods. Cogdill concluded the article, "He could shut every one of them [i.e., the "antis"] up with just one passage of scripture, if only he could produce it."[25]

Cogdill continued to challenge Gunselman to provide scriptural evidence for his methods. Cogdill cited Acts to argue that the New Testament pattern for the benevolent work of the church was for each congregation to take care of its own needy. Under extreme circumstances, if necessary, churches could send contributions raised by their own members to relieve needy churches. This was based on the examples in 1 Cor 16 and Acts 11. Cogdill wrote about Gunselman:

> He has carried his unscriptural plans and operations into the Philippines and then, in spite of the strongest opposition having already been given his unscriptural plans by the Philippine brethren over a period of several years, he would leave his readers to think that brother Willis and I came over there and introduced the division among the Filippino [*sic*] churches. Brother Gunselman, "Thou art the man!"[26]

---

25. Roy E. Cogdill, "Gunselman's Misrepresentations," *Truth Magazine* 14.46 (October 1, 1970): 7.

26. Roy E. Cogdill, "More of Gunselman's Misrepresentations," *Truth Magazine* 14.47 (October 8, 1970): 6.

Cogdill was convinced that Gunselman was purposefully deceiving Philippine Churches of Christ with unscriptural methods in an effort to discredit Cogdill and Cecil Willis before they arrived in the Philippines on a short-term preaching trip.

Cogdill was frustrated with Gunselman because he believed that Gunselman was being dishonest and insincere. For example, Cogdill asserted:

> Brother Gunselman, if you were honest about the matter…you would know that the ground of our opposition to what you are doing is not the use of "methods" but the forming of human institutions which are unauthorized in the word of God and which, when you build them must "use methods" to do their work. Shall we let the Lord's organizations (the local church) use whatever methods are scriptural and expedient to do its own work, or shall we set up human institutions and organizations to use "methods" to do the work of the church instead?[27]

Cogdill understood Gunselman's insistence of the use of the Bible schools in the Philippines and missionary oversight of funding for Filipino preachers as part of Gunselman's plan to control the Filipinos. Because of this, Cogdill could not understand that Gunselman's methods were an attempt to address the previous problems of financial reliance on U.S. churches—not an attempt to control "his own private diocese."[28]

Gunselman engaged with the noninstitutional leaders more than the other mainline American missionaries in the Philippines. Once Gunselman left the Philippines in 1971, there were far fewer published attacks of mainline church leaders in the Philippines in the pages of noninstitutional periodicals. The absence of published attacks on Gunselman helped alleviate the tension between the two groups, as other mainline missionaries attempted to avoid engaging with the noninstitutional leaders.

---

27. Roy E. Cogdill, "Gunselman's Dilemma about 'Anti-ism,'" *Truth Magazine* 14.48 (October 15, 1970): 8.

28. Cogdill, "Gunselman's Dilemma," 6.

Debates

Noninstitutional Churches of Christ used public debates in their opposition to the institutional Churches of Christ. J. T. Smith was a staff writer for *Searching the Scriptures*, and he was well known among the American noninstitutional churches. In response to Smith's tract, "Institutionalism—Why I Changed," a "liberal" Filipino preacher, Silverio Aniñon, wrote to Smith and attempted to refute his claims. The discussion was then turned over to Eusebio M. Lacuata who wrote Smith and challenged him to a debate.[29] Lacuata attended a Churches of Christ Lectureship out of curiosity when he was forty years old. He was a devout Catholic, but his experience during the open forum following one of the lectures caused him to reevaluate his Catholic beliefs. He then became a member of the Churches of Christ.[30]

The Smith-Lacuata Debate was held at the M'lang Church of Christ (M'lang, Cotabato, Philippines) on May 11–14, 1971.[31] Connie W. Adams, who served as of the moderator for Smith, explained, "Though the issues originated in America, they have not been confined to that country and have spread to the Philippines and other lands by men dedicated to the principle of church supported institutions and sponsoring churchism."[32] Cornelio Alegre, who served as a moderator for Lacuata, observed in his introduction that

---

29. J. T. Smith and Connie W. Adams, "Preaching and Debating in the Philippines," *Searching the Scriptures* 12.3 (March 1971): 9; [J. T. Smith and Connie W. Adams, eds.], *The Smith-Lacuata Debate* (Marion, IN: The Cogdill Foundation, 1972), iv; a later version of Smith's tract was published as J. T. Smith, "Institutionalism—Why I Changed," *Guardian of Truth* 34.15 (August 2, 1990): 465–466.

30. Eusebio M. Lacuata, *We Were Catholics* (Fayetteville, AR: Gospel Tracts International., n.d.), 2.

31. [Smith and Adams, eds.], *The Smith-Lacuata Debate*, v; Connie W. Adams, "The Smith-Lacuata Debate," *Searching the Scriptures* 12.10 (October 1971): 8.

32. [Smith and Adams, eds.], *The Smith-Lacuata Debate*, v–vi.

the debate was unusual for two reasons: (1) it was between an American and a Filipino, and (2) it was between two members of the Churches of Christ.[33]

Over four evenings Smith and Lacuata debated two propositions. The first topic of the debate was whether or not there is scriptural basis for church benevolence from the church treasury to non-church members. Lacuata argued that there is a scriptural basis for doing so, and Smith argued that there is not.[34] The second two evenings of the debate focused on the correct method of U.S. financial support for Philippine churches and Filipino preachers (i.e., direct or indirect support). Lacuata argued that according to scripture, in evangelism and benevolence, a church or multiple churches can send financial support or a preacher's salary through another church. Smith was frustrated because Lacuata did not mention the Philippine Bible College, "a demonstration of the sponsoring church arrangement," but he continued his argument against scriptural support for indirect support.[35] Adams describes that several Filipino preachers who held Lacuata's views changed their positions following the debate.[36]

---

33. [Smith and Adams, eds.], *The Smith-Lacuata Debate*, 1.

34. [Smith and Adams, eds.], *The Smith-Lacuata Debate*, 4–130; Connie W. Adams, "The Smith-Lacuata Debate," *The Gospel Preacher* 1, no. 7 (August-September 1971):1–2, Philippines, World Churches Vertical File, Center for Restoration Studies, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX (hereafter cited as Philippines WCVF).

35. [Smith and Adams, eds.], *The Smith-Lacuata Debate*, 131–252, 145; Adams, "The Smith-Lacuata Debate," 2–3, Philippines WCVF.

36. Connie W. Adams, email message to author, December 4, 2017. Romulo B. Agduma, "Agduma-Lacuata Debate," *The Gospel Preacher* 3.7–9 (July-September 1974): 24, Religious Periodicals, Special Collections, William F. Chatlos Library, Florida College, Temple Terrace, FL (hereafter cited as FCRP), confirmed Adams's account: "I received letters from brethren, after reading the SMITH-LACUATA DEBATE, they walked out from liberalism & started worshipping with the faithful church in their nearest area, or start[ed] a new congregation in their areas." The reason for the changes in position by some of the Filipino preachers remains unclear. The changes in belief may have been due to the fact that the institutional churches were beginning to recommend the reduction of financial support for Filipino preachers. Maybe the Filipinos who changed their position hoped to receive financial support from the

Lacuata and Agduma also engaged in a number of debates concerning the differences in belief between the two groups. Agduma described that they had debated each other concerning church benevolence in February and December 1969. Additionally, they had engaged in debates on the topic through circulated published articles.[37] Agduma and Lacuata agreed to meet three times to debate the sponsoring church system, church benevolence, and the scriptural basis for the Philippine Bible College (PBC) in 1974. Like the Smith-Lacuata debate, Lacuata defended the scriptural basis for indirect financial support of Filipino preachers and for using money from the church treasury to help nonbelievers. The third debate did not take place. Agduma asserted, "Lacuata remain[s] silent – an admittance, he can not really defend PBC whether PBC has the scriptural right to exist."[38] This became a common belief for the noninstitutional churches—the churches and church leaders who supported institutions avoided debate on the matter because they knew they did not have scriptural support for their beliefs.

Another example of debate between the two groups includes the Willis-Buchanan Debate. Bob Buchanan was the president of the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City. Cecil Willis was the editor of *Truth Magazine.* Buchanan objected to a public debate in the Philippines and asked for a written discussion. He told Willis, "We are not interested in United States terminology, or 'imported' propositions. We are not interested in

---

noninstitutional churches. However, their reason for changing positions may be due to the conviction of the error of institutionalism.

37. Agduma, "Agduma-Lacuata Debate," 1, FCRP. Lacuata published and distributed "What Understandest Thou?" and "What Understandest Thou? (No. 2)," and Agduma published and circulated "Bible Refutation of False Doctrine," "Thou Art Without Excuse" and "That the Brethren May Know." See MS #389 for copies of these publications.

38. Agduma, "Agduma-Lacuata Debate," 1, 14, 23, FCRP.

stateside practices."[39] Due to apparent miscommunication(s), Buchanan's return to the United States for further education, and Willis becoming ill during his 1975 trip to the Philippines, this debate was never finished. However, Buchanan distributed the beginning of the debate, which Buchanan and Willis held through written correspondence.[40] Buchanan and Willis debated over whether or not the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City was organized and financed scripturally. Buchanan affirmed that the school was financed in a scriptural way, and held the negative position concerning the proposal that the organization of the school violated scripture. Willis affirmed that the Philippine Bible College violated scripture in the way it was organized, and he held the negative position concerning the scriptural basis for financing the school.

Willis explained that a number of Filipino preachers had opposed the Philippine Bible College during the past decade. Willis described, "From 1968 onward, we have tried to persuade the Americans running the school to debate."[41] Throughout his portion of the debate, Willis challenged the ability for American elders to "oversee" a work in the Philippines, asked Buchanan to provide a verse from the New Testament that justifies cooperative evangelism, and challenged the scriptural basis for indirect financial support of Filipino preachers (i.e., sending the money to Buchanan who then distributed it).[42]

---

39. "Cecil Willis – Bob Buchanan Exchange," *The Gospel Preacher* 4.1 (January 1975): 6, FCRP.

40. [Bob Buchanan, ed.], "Unfinished Discussion Concerning Philippine Bible College Between Cecil Willis and Bob Buchanan," (unpublished manuscript, November 18, 1977), PDF file. Cecil Willis to Luis Calipayan, November 21, 1975, claimed, "I think he [i.e., Buchanan] wants to look like a shining warrior before the Philippine brethren, because they expect him to defend what he practices, but would prefer that it not appear in this country [i.e., the United States], because his American brethren know he cannot defend his practice and would rather he not attempt to do so!" My thanks to Ron Halbrook for bringing both of these documents to my attention, and for sharing copies of the documents with me through email correspondence. Copies of both documents are in my possession.

41. [Buchanan, ed.], "Unfinished Discussion Concerning Philippine Bible College," 1.

42. [Buchanan, ed.], "Unfinished Discussion Concerning Philippine Bible College," 2–12.

Buchanan responded by explaining that the Philippine Bible College was a teaching program of the Inglewood Church of Christ. As a program of the church, it existence was scripturally supported. This is important, because Buchanan believed a Christian College like Abilene Christian College should not be supported by church treasury. Buchanan also asserted that many of the claims Willis made about the school were false.[43]

Leaders of the noninstitutional churches desired to debate institutional leaders more often, but most declined to participate.[44] Little claimed, "The truth is, they well know they have nothing to gain and much to lose by a debate. They are determined not to consent if there is any way around it."[45]As Harrell explained regarding the previous public debates over institutionalism in the United States, "for the most part, they [i.e., the debates] simply demarcated and solidified the two camps."[46] The united opposition of noninstitutional churches to the institutional churches began to atrophy as the institutional Churches of Christ stopped responding to or reacting to the proposals for debate and attacks in periodicals from the noninstitutional Churches of Christ.

The departure of Gunselman from the Philippines in 1971 served as the beginning of this wane in united opposition. The groups held debates during the next few years which may have been strong points in the opposition of the noninstitutional churches to the practices of the "liberal" churches. However, like the third of the scheduled debates between Agduma and Lacuata, the Buchanan-Willis debate fell apart and did not take

---

43. [Buchanan, ed.], "Unfinished Discussion Concerning Philippine Bible College," 13–27.

44. Cecil Willis, "The Desperate Fight of the Philippine Liberals," *Truth Magazine* 16.24 (April 20, 1972): 3–5, criticized the American "liberals" (i.e., the institutional Americans) for refusing to debate.

45. Wallace H. Little, "Philippine Report," *Truth Magazine* 19.20 (March 27, 1975): 6.

46. David Edwin Harrell, Jr., *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century: Homer Hailey's Personal Journey of Faith* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2000), 131.

place in person. This served as another sign of the weakening of the united challenge against the institutional churches. This weakening of the challenge to the institutional churches was not the fault of the noninstitutional leaders—they still desired that the institutional churches provide scriptural evidence for their methods.

The missionaries of the churches that supported the use of institutions may have avoided engaging in these debates because they were in a period of reflecting on their methods of mission work. As described in chapter 2, the mainline missionaries admitted fault in their methods. The missionaries concluded, "termination of [financial] support from America for *local preachers* is a necessity." And they encouraged all of those who financially supported Filipino preachers to institute a three-year plan to terminate financial support.[47] Agduma challenged their conclusions. He recognized that the Churches of Christ grew and developed in the Philippines after WWII and then stagnated after about twenty years. The institutional churches attributed the stagnation of church growth to the reliance of Philippine churches on U.S. financial support. Agduma, however, attributed the stagnation of the growth of the institutional Churches of Christ to "the sponsoring church and church supported human organization system that is wrong and sinful."[48] The noninstitutional churches believed the failure of the mainline churches (i.e., the stagnation of church growth) was due to the use of unbiblical methods, not due to the abuse of American financial support.

---

47. Ray Bryan, Don Huddleston, Robert Buchanan, and Doug LeCroy, "Proposed Plan for Philippine Self-Support," *Firm Foundation* 92.13 (April 1, 1975): 11.

48. Romulo B. Agduma, "The American Liberal Church 'Missionaries' and Their Ugly Tactics," *The Gospel Preacher* 4.5–6 (May–June, 1975): 2, FCRP.

Debate Between Noninstitutional Leaders

As described above, the noninstitutional Churches of Christ were initially united in their opposition of the institutional Churches of Christ in the Philippines through three main methods: correspondence, personal attacks in periodicals, and public debates. However, without their common cause against the institutional churches, the noninstitutional churches began to experience internal debate and division. The noninstitutional Churches of Christ began to argue among themselves whether or not it was biblical to financially support Filipino preachers, an argument that the institutional Churches of Christ had been having among themselves for at least fifteen years.[49]

The debate over the use of "scriptural" methods in mission work became an issue among the noninstitutional Churches of Christ within five years of the institutional churches reaching a decision on the matter.[50] Ed Harrell and Tommy Poarch completed a two-month trip during which they visited with members of the noninstitutional churches in nine countries in 1980. Upon their return, they explained that they felt compelled to write a warning about the dangers they believed existed due to the tremendous amount of American money being sent to the Philippines. They sought to clarify that they were not condemning the native preachers or the efforts of missionaries. "What is at stake is not

---

49. Brady Kal Cox, "The Churches of Christ Debate Institutionalism in the Philippines: Its Divisive Effects" (paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Southwest Conference on Asian Studies / Western Conference of Association for Asian Studies Joint Conference, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX, November 17, 2017), explains that Ralph F. Brashears was the first among the institutional Churches of Christ to voice concerns over their methods of financial support of Filipino preachers (c. 1960), but William Douglass Gunselman began to seriously challenge the previous norms of financial support in 1965 in an effort to train financially self-supporting Filipino preachers. It was not until the noninstitutional churches lost their common "enemy" in their attacks on the method of the institutional churches—which had kept them occupied—that they had to confront and attempt to clarify these same issues faced by mainline missionaries since the beginning of their missionary efforts in the Philippines.

50. Bryan, Huddleston, Buchanan, and LeCroy, "Proposed Plan," 7, 11, serves as the decision representative of the institutional churches on the matter in 1975.

simply the possibility that much American money is being wasted, but rather that the cause of Christ in the Philippines is being injured by the support that is being sent," they explained.[51] Harrell and Poarch were concerned that Filipinos might be converting or becoming preachers due to the money they could receive in return.

Harrell and Poarch painted a grim picture of the state of the church in the Philippines. They explained that native preachers had consistently been over-supported financially, and that they had "come to expect and demand such treatment." Harrell and Poarch believed the expectation of great financial support attracted "outright frauds and rascals" and that the only way to address such issues would be for a purification to take place. Why not ask the Filipinos to continue preaching without financial support? This would identify the frauds, they believed. The biggest problem associated with over-support, they argued, is that it "undermines the independence and integrity of the native churches." Harrell and Poarch argued that the Filipino churches could never afford support their preachers at the same rate the American churches were. This system, they claimed, created "a permanent dependence, a paternalistic relationship in which the native churches have little control over their own works…and have little incentive to support themselves."[52]

Harrell and Poarch recommended that no Filipino preacher receive more than $150 a month; support be stopped to those who have previously received excessive salaries; no money be sent to the Philippines unless a church has absolute confidence in

---

51. Ed Harrell and Tommy Poarch, "The Philippines—A Reappraisal and a Warning*," Searching the Scriptures* 21.6 (June 1980): 5; also published as Ed Harrell and Tommy Poarch, "The Philippines – A Reappraisal and a Warning," *Truth Magazine* 24.25 (June 19, 1980): 408–411.

52. Harrell and Poarch, "The Philippines," 7.

the moral integrity of the person (which was not possible); and that American churches initiate a three-year plan for reduction of financial support. They asked, "Are a preacher's 'wages' to include whatever 'assumed' financial responsibilities he decides to undertake?" Because the solicitations for financial support were framed as being for the preacher's family, they believed that money being used on many extended family members was excessive and misleading. Harrell and Poarch concluded by citing a Filipino who believed the best solution was "TO RECOMMEND ABOUT TWO TO THREE AMERICAN FAMILIES TO HELP AND STAY IN THE ISLANDS. To this, a close supervision to teaching and edification can be worked out among Filipino preachers and brethren in the churches."[53]

Connie W. Adams disagreed with the assessment of Harrell and Poarch. Adams claimed there was scriptural support for the methods being used to support Filipino preachers, and he challenged Harrell's and Poarch's opinions about Filipino culture. Adams strongly critiqued their conclusion and recommendation for a more permanent American presence in the Philippines. He asked:

> Why are American workers permanently needed in a country where there are over 600 native preachers? What would be their role? Would they be there to evangelize the country? Native men are already doing that. Many of them are well educated, experienced and frankly, many of them can preach better than some of us can. Would their role be that of supervisors? Is that not the essence of the suggestion? If so, then that is paternalism gone to seed. Is it not good old American arrogance to even suggest it? Is a work not to be counted worthy or valid unless there are Americans on hand to oversee it?[54]

---

53. Harrell and Poarch, "The Philippines," 8.

54. Connie W. Adams, "Appraising 'A Reappraisal and a Warning,'" *Searching the Scriptures* 21.6 (June 1980): 4. This article was also published as Connie W. Adams, "Appraising 'A Reappraisal and a Warning,'" *Truth Magazine* 24.25 (June 19, 1980): 412–413. Adams believed the Filipinos were capable of managing church affairs without American oversight. He was critical of Harrell's (uninformed) recommendation that a more permanent American presence was needed in the Philippines. Bob Buchanon and Ben Shropshire, "A Report on Our Philippine Trip," *Truth Magazine* 24.5 (January 31, 1980): 10, held the same perspective as Adams on this matter: "We share the sentiments of some of the previous American

Adams believed that the recommendation cited by Harrell and Poarch was paternalistic, and that it would undermine the autonomy of the churches—what Harrell and Poarch claimed they wanted to avoid. Adams also questioned setting a fixed amount for support of Filipino preachers, as many of them paid for Bibles, to rent meeting places, to print tracts, and more. He maintained that they needed a "working fund."[55]

Harrell replied to Adams's critiques a few months later. Harrell reaffirmed his support of gradual withdrawal of financial support from Filipino preachers. He explained that their recommendations were not based on hearsay, but on interviews with government officials, professors at Philippine universities, and representatives of Philippine employment agencies.[56] Additionally, Harrell believed his living "for approximately one year in Asia [i.e., India]," briefings from the State Department on Asia, lecturing in Asian universities, and substantial library research on Asian economics and culture qualified him to make the recommendations he made in his previous article. Harrell concluded, "all we are talking about is money. We have not suggested the annihilation of any Filipinos, nor disfellowshipping anyone, nor marking anyone—only that Filipino Christians should learn to live without American money."[57]

Wallace H. Little took issue with their article and he replied to Harrell and Poarch. Little recognized that there were instances of dishonesty and preacher

---

visitors in saying we do not see the need for an American preacher to go there and stay. There are many capable men among the native Filipinos, men well able to teach and train other gospel preachers and capable of defending the truth in honorable debate on any issue."

55. Adams, "Appraising 'A Reappraisal,'" 5.

56. Ed Harrell, "The Philippines—A Warning Repeated," *Searching the Scriptures* 21.9 (September 1980): 5.

57. Harrell, "The Philippines," 6.

misconduct in the Philippines, but that this also occurred in the United States. He asked, "For this dishonesty, do we demand cutting off support of all Americans?" Little then questioned the statistics for financial support that Harrell and Poarch provided, and claimed, "Their 'estimate' would mean there are 1000 supported men in that nation. THERE ARE NOT THAT MANY PREACHERS, TOTAL, PERIOD!"[58] He believed that Harrell and Poarch went to the Philippines in order to confirm their prejudiced beliefs about native preachers in the Philippines. Concerning their recommendation for American supervision, he asked, "But what of the supervision of Filipino preachers by Americans? How much more denominational can we get?"[59]

Harrell answered Little's critiques in the last published article of the exchange between Adams, Harrell, and Little. For Harrell, the most concerning part of Little's claims was "his persistent defense of a one-man benevolent society." Harrell asserted:

> It is clear that Wally [i.e., Little] either does not know or does not care that the New Testament teaches that preachers receive "wages" from churches; that the benevolent needs of saints are not provided by sending money to a caretaker preacher; and that churches do not send money to preachers so that they can provide the things a local church needs for edification and evangelization.[60]

Harrell, too, was concerned about the use of proper biblical methods in the noninstitutional mission efforts. He believed that Little's and Adams's position

---

58. Wallace H. Little, "'The Philippines—A Reappraisal and a Warning'—My Reply," *Searching the Scriptures* 21.9 (September 1980): 7. This article was reprinted as Wallace H. Little, "Ed Harrell's and Tommy Poarch's 'The Philippines – A Reappraisal and a Warning': – My Reply," *Guardian of Truth* 25.6 (February 5, 1981): 8–11.

59. Little, "'The Philippines—A Reappraisal and a Warning,'" 11. The leaders of the noninstitutional churches who had spent the most time in the Philippines come across as more culturally aware, less racist, and/or anti-imperialist. It is not clear whether this rhetoric reflects their cultural convictions, or if it is a rhetorical move used to oppose those who hold positions they disagree with.

60. Ed Harrell, "Brother Wallace H. Little and Support of Filipino Pr[e]achers," *Guardian of Truth* 25.6 (February 5, 1981): 13.

perpetuated a continued reliance on American money, which in Harrell's perspective, was not scriptural.

Little and Adams did not believe that Harrell was qualified to make recommendations on the state of the noninstitutional mission efforts in the Philippines. Harrell claimed the solution to address the abuse of American financial support was to gradually cut the amount of money being sent to Filipino preachers, and/or to place Americans in the Philippines on a more permanent basis in order to recommend who ought to receive financial support. Adams wrote, Harrell's "'serious library research' and 'considerable exposure to Asian culture' do not compensate for the fact that he is totally inexperienced in the work of the gospel in the Philippines."[61]

For Little and Adams, this debate was symptomatic of a larger issue—the use of unbiblical methods in mission work. Like the mainline churches before, they believed Harrell's recommendations lacked biblical support. Adams repeated the scriptural basis for their mission efforts in the Philippines:

> While some brethren may differ as to the best way to establish self-supporting local churches in foreign lands, there are some scriptural truths which should not be overlooked…It is right for brethren to recommend those they know to brethren who do not know them (Acts 9:26-27; 3 Jno. 5-8). It is right for a congregation to support a preacher in another field (Phil. 4:15-16). It is right for more than one congregation to support a preacher in another field (2 Cor. 11:8-9). It is right for a preacher not to accept wages from the church where he labors if he so chooses (Paul at Corinth). It is right for a preacher in his support to sometimes "abound" and be "full" (Phil. 4:11-12), as well as for him to be "abased" and "hungry". We hold these as undeniable truths and stand ready to defend them against any who may wish to gainsay them, including our friend, Ed Harrell.[62]

---

61. Connie W. Adams, "A Warning Assessed—Again," *Searching the Scriptures* 21.9 (September 1980): 3.

62. Adams, "A Warning Assessed," 4.

All three were concerned with following the biblical precedent, but they did not agree on the proper approach. These differing beliefs began to fracture the work of the noninstitutional churches in the Philippines.

There is evidence that Filipino preachers supported Harrell's recommendations for the future of the noninstitutional mission work. Reuben Agduma wrote to Harrell:

> Your articles in fact has changed a NEW DIRECTION to our local 'Church History': It have made the Filipino preachers become aware that American supports should have its condition to end, that is toward the TRANSITION for Filipino churches taking steps on the responsibility over Church work and function -- that someday, somehow, the Filipino churches should have to support their work and local preachers in particular.[63]

Agduma supported the gradual withdrawal of American financial support. However, he asked that American families move to the Philippines during the transition period in order to help train and teach the Filipino preachers and churches how to be financially self-sufficient. Agduma also wrote to Harrell, "To those who knew the 'real problem' well of the Philippine work, they favored brother Harrell for duly exposing the situation of the work; while those who were affected of supports, they disliked the articles of brother Harrell!"[64] Harrell's recommendations, whether or not the other noninstitutional leaders agreed with them, directly influenced the discussion and debate concerning the future of the noninstitutional mission efforts in the Philippines.

---

63. Rueben S. Agduma to David Edwin Harrell, Jr., February 5, 1981, David Edwin Harrell, Jr. Papers, 1923–2017, Center for Restoration Studies MS #467, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX (hereafter cited as MS #467).

64. Reuben S. Agduma to David Edwin Harrell, Jr., November 9, 1981, MS #467.

Conclusion

The noninstitutional churches in the Philippines serve as the backlash to the methods of big religion that were adopted by the mainline Churches of Christ missionaries. Contrary to Elkins's claims, the institutional controversy did take place on the mission field—in the Philippines in this case. Like the outcome of the controversy in the United States, the two sides never understood the beliefs or concerns of the other. Once the noninstitutional churches lost their common cause of confronting the "incorrect" methods of the institutional churches, they noninstitutional churches experienced the same internal debates concerning the proper biblical approach to the Philippine mission work that the institutional churches had already confronted.

The backlash by the noninstitutional churches provides further evidence for Zeller's model of big religion. Zeller explains that critics of big religion sought to create smaller-scale models of the institutions they critiqued. As their smaller-scale models gained in popularity, some of the critics of big religion faced problems which they had previously critiqued in the larger-scale models.[65] This process occurred among the noninstitutional churches. The churches critiqued the problems inherent in the methods of the mainline Churches of Christ (e.g., reliance on American financial support). The noninstitutional churches sought to institute similar methods on a smaller scale in order to "correct" the methods, yet encountered the same problems already faced by the mainline churches.

Would the noninstitutional Churches of Christ introduce "denominational" structures and lose their claim to primitive Christianity? Or would the noninstitutional

65. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion,'" 344.

churches recognize the abuses of American financial support, which the institutional churches had recognized years beforehand, yet continue to support the model of U.S. financial support in hopes of "maintaining" their claim to modeling the New Testament pattern of the church? Ron Halbrook makes no mention of the internal debate among the noninstitutional churches described above, but he explains that noninstitutional American leaders began making periodical preaching trips to the Philippines in the early 1970s. Halbrook also cautions against creating perpetual dependence on U.S. financial support in the Philippines [66] Whether or not the noninstitutional churches have solved their debate concerning the use of nonbiblical methods for mission work falls outside the scope of this work.

66. Ron Halbrook, "The Growth of the Church: The Philippines," in *Can Christianity Survive in America? 2011 Truth Magazine Annual Lectures, June 20–23, 2011*, ed. Mike Willis (Bowling Green, KY: Guardian of Truth Foundation, 2011), 196, 205.

CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this thesis I set out to examine how changes in American postwar religion influenced Churches of Christ missionary efforts using the Philippines as a case study. I described developments in postwar American Christianity using the model of "big religion," and provided historical context for the debate over the use of institutions among Churches of Christ in chapter 2. In chapter 3, I examined how the mainline Churches of Christ missionaries in the Philippines embraced aspects of big religion—institutionalization, professionalization, and centralized knowledge—which influenced their mission efforts. I described the backlash from the noninstitutional churches to the methods of the mainline churches in the Philippines in chapter 4. In conclusion, I now draw several implications from my original research question.

First, I demonstrated that Churches of Christ missionaries introduced institutions unique to their own American religious context. Ralph F. Brashears initiated the American Churches of Christ preaching school model into context of the Churches of Christ in the Philippines. This model created a reliance on American financial aid in order to maintain the missionaries, fund the school, and pay Filipinos to preach. William Douglass Gunselman recognized the problems with this model, and he attempted to adjust the American training of Filipinos for ministry. Gunselman encouraged the students to learn skills that would enable them to support themselves financially. However, Gunselman's model was not popular among the missionaries or the Filipino students, and it was not adopted by the Churches of Christ.

Second, I examined the backlash of the noninstitutional Churches of Christ to the methods used by the mainline Churches of Christ. Theological differences and debates unique to the American religious context were also introduced into the Philippines through the efforts of American Churches of Christ missionaries. I described how both Americans and Filipinos debated one another concerning differing beliefs on the scriptural basis for American oversight of Philippine churches, the use of institutions (e.g., Bible schools), and the funding of native preachers.

This thesis examined a period and a topic in the history of the Churches of Christ that has received little attention elsewhere. While Churches of Christ mission work in the Philippines has been mentioned in works concerning the history of the Stone-Campbell Movement, no one has attempted a substantive study of this history.[1] Additionally, this work considers the history of the noninstitutional Churches of Christ.[2] This thesis project is one of few works that explores the postwar mission work of American Churches of Christ, and, as far as I know, is the first thorough study of postwar mission work in the Philippines and of mission efforts by the noninstitutional churches. My work only focuses on a few small examples in the larger story of the Churches of Christ in the Philippines.

This thesis project raises further questions concerning Churches of Christ mission work. First, I described Gunselman's efforts with the Philippine Bible College of Quezon

---

1. David Filbeck and Robert S. Bates, "Asia, Missions in," in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, ed. Douglas A. Foster et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 32–40; D. Newell Williams, Douglas A. Foster, and Paul M. Blowers, eds., *The Stone-Campbell Movement: A Global History* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2013), 131–133, 275–279.

2. David Edwin Harrell, Jr., "Noninstitutional Movement," in Foster et al., *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 569, observed, "Since the mid-1960s, noninstitutional Churches of Christ have had a more or less separate history." This may account for the lack of academic research concerning this part of the Stone-Campbell tradition.

City as a response to the educational efforts of Churches of Christ missionaries in Baguio City. A study of the Philippine Bible College in Baguio City might provide further insight into the problems associated with institutions introduced by postwar American missionaries. Teofilo G. Alcayde discovered, "The faculty members believed that the curricular offering is not relevant in so far as providing employment to its graduates is concerned."[3] Additionally, in his study of Bible colleges in Baguio City, Ernesto N. Rulloda concluded, "Work privileges should be granted to deserving students where they can earn money while they study so they can pay their school finances."[4]

These observations are interesting to note because Gunselman reached these conclusions years beforehand. Why did it take this group of missionaries in Baguio City more time to come to this conclusion even though they had been in the Philippines longer than Gunselman? These observations also reflect that issues of financial dependence were being experienced by other American denominations present in the Philippines. Denominations that had maintained a stronger presence in the Philippines than the Churches of Christ shared similar problems due to their efforts being tied to American financial support.[5]

---

3. Teofilo G. Alcayde, "The Philippine Bible College in Baguio City: Its Progress and Problems, 1977–1982" (MA thesis, Baguio Central University, 1983), xi, 98. This concern was shared by Catholics as well. For example, Ralphy V. Dawis, "A Comparative Study of the Subject-Offerings in Seminaries Conducted by the Filipino Secular Clergy with the Standards Required by the Catholic Church and the Philippines Educational System" (MA thesis, University of Santo Tomas Graduate School, 1963).

4. Ernesto N. Rulloda, "The Causes of Student Withdrawals from the Bible Colleges and Seminaries in Baguio City and Benguet Province, 1979–1982" (MA thesis, Baguio Central University, 1983), 74.

5. David Lloyd Rambo, "The Christian and Missionary Alliance in the Philippines, 1901–1970" (PhD diss., New York University, 1975), 241–269, discusses the role of American money for the Ebenezer Bible Institute (later Ebenezer Bible College) and the Mt. Apo Alliance Bible School; John Mark Terry, "An Analysis of Growth Among Southern Baptists Churches in Mindanao, Philippines 1951–1985" (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986), 139–179, explains the Baptists' move away from American financial subsidies; and Andrew K. H. Hsiao, "Self-Reliance in Theological Education," in

Second, concerning mainline Churches of Christ, how did American theological developments, changes, and debates influence and/or play out in other foreign missionary efforts? Robert E. Hooper recently finished a work on the history of Churches of Christ mission work in Japan. However, I argue that Hooper glosses over the conflicts caused by differences in opinion among the postwar American missionaries.[6] Benjamin E. Zeller's model of big religion can be used as a lens to examine other postwar Churches of Christ mission efforts.[7] Zeller's historiographic model of big religion can help make sense of the inconsistencies identified by Elkins in thought and practice concerning missionary organization and missionary methods among postwar Churches of Christ—a fruitful field of study.[8]

Third, this thesis highlights the glaring lack of research concerning the history of the noninstitutional Churches of Christ outside of the United States. As far as I can tell, chapter 4 of this work is the first critical study of any missionary efforts by the

---

Theological Education in Today's Asia: Theological Education and Training for Witness and Service held in Manila, Philippines, October 21–24, 1976, ed. K. Rajaratnam and A. A. Sitompul, rev. ed. (Madras, India: The Christian Literature Society, 1978), 45–59, provides example of financial dependence of seminaries in Asia, and suggestions for addressing the problem.

6. Robert E. Hooper, *If Your Enemy Hungers, Feed Him: Church of Christ Missionaries in Japan, 1892-1970* (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2017); Brady Kal Cox, "'The tortuous path of church politics': Transitions in Churches of Christ Leadership in Postwar Japan" (forthcoming presentation at the Christian Scholars' Conference, Lipscomb University, Nashville, TN, June 6–8, 2018).

7. For example, an in-depth study on the beginnings of Ibaraki Christian College. See the Edward Washington McMillan Papers, 1863–1986, Center for Restoration Studies MS #17, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX, for primary sources regarding the beginning stages of Ibaraki Christian College. Additionally, a new study on the Alpha Bible College and the Mawlai Christian School discussed in Clinton Brazle, "A Church Growth Study of Churches in North East India" (MS thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1977), might be good options for further research.

8. Benjamin E. Zeller, "American Postwar 'Big Religion': Reconceptualizing Twentieth-Century American Religion Using Big Science as a Model," *Church History* 80.2 (2011): 321–351; Phillip Wayne Elkins, *Church-Sponsored Missions: An Evaluation of the Churches of Christ* (Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1974).

noninstitutional churches. Further research might ask, what experience did missionaries from noninstitutional Churches of Christ have in other countries where they have been reported to have had success?[9] Did they engage in similar theological debates with mainline missionaries? Is the story of their missionary efforts similar to that of the missionaries in the Philippines?

Lastly, how did non-American church leaders grapple with changes in American oversight and control of church institutions? For instance, Reuben S. Agduma asked Harrell, "WHY SHOULD AN AMERICAN COME TO THIS NATION TO DEBATE HIS FELLOW AMERICAN OVER AN ISSUE? Is the Philippine[s] a proper setting for a Debate? Can we, Filipinos, do [we] not have the ability and unity to debate these people? What INFLUENCE can an American do? These questions have come into the minds of a few of us.[10] There was concern over who would be making important decisions, such as engaging in public debates, as American Churches of Christ moved away from financial support and oversight of Filipino leaders in the Philippines.

This thesis provides the beginning to further study concerning the missionary efforts of postwar Churches of Christ, the history of the Churches of Christ in the

---

9. For example, see the David Edwin Harrell, Jr. Papers, 1923–2017, Center for Restoration Studies MS #467, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX (hereafter cited as MS #467), for primary source materials concerning the missionary efforts of the noninstitutional churches in India. Additionally, Ferrell Jenkins, "Please Don't Call Us 'Anti' (An Update on the Non-Institutional Churches of Christ)" (presentation at the 55th Annual Pepperdine University Bible Lectures, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, May 1, 1998), explained that the noninstitutional Churches of Christ had successful foreign mission efforts in South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Norway. Cecil Willis, "Foreign Evangelism," *Truth Magazine* 15.34 (July 8, 1971): 4, described, "Reports are coming in from Japan, South America, South Africa, Ireland, Nigeria, Rhodesia, Philippine Islands, Mexico, Norway, Canada, England, Vietnam, India, Australia, Italy, the Bahamas and perhaps other lands that do not readily come to mind." And Ed Harrell and Tommy Poarch, "The Philippines—A Reappraisal and a Warning," *Searching the Scriptures* 21.6 (June 1980): 5, mention learning about the financial support of native preachers in Australia, South Africa, and Italy.

10. Reuben S. Agduma to David Edwin Harrell, Jr., November 9, 1981, MS #467.

Philippines, and the history of the noninstitutional Churches of Christ. The examples that I focus on are only a small sampling of a more detailed history that has yet to be critically explored.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

Archival Materials

45E Faculty & Staff Files. Archives and Special Collections, Olin Library, Rollins College, Winter Park, FL.

Benton Cordell Goodpasture Papers, 1854–1991. Center for Restoration Studies MS #464. Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX.

Edward Washington McMillan Papers, 1863–1986, Center for Restoration Studies MS #17, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX.

David Edwin Harrell, Jr. Papers, 1923–2017. Center for Restoration Studies MS #467. Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX.

Philippines. World Churches Vertical File. Center for Restoration Studies. Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX.

Philippines Folder. Meredith Restoration History Archive, L. M. Graves Memorial Library, Harding School of Theology, Memphis, TN.

Religious Periodicals. Special Collections, William F. Chatlos Library, Florida College, Temple Terrace, FL.

William Douglass & Charline F. Gunselman Papers, 1942–2009. Center for Restoration Studies MS #389. Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX.

Periodicals

Adams, Connie W. “Appraising ‘A Reappraisal and a Warning.’” *Searching the Scriptures* 21.6 (June 1980): 3–5.

———. “The Smith-Lacuata Debate.” *Searching the Scriptures* 12.10 (October 1971): 8.

———. “A Warning Assessed—Again.” *Searching the Scriptures* 21.9 (September 1980): 3–4.

Almonte, Timoteo B. “From the Philippines.” *Firm Foundation* 62.40 (October 2, 1945): 11.

Bailey, J. C. “Can We Evangelize the World?” *Firm Foundation* 82.23 (June 8, 1965): 358.

Benson, George S. “Word from the Philippines.” *Gospel Advocate* 70.39 (September 27, 1928): 927.

———. “Word from the Philippines.” *Gospel Advocate* 70.46 (November 15, 1928): 1094.

Bone, Donald E. “Let’s Trade in the Eye Dropper.” *Firm Foundation* 74.24 (June 11, 1957): 374.

Brashears, Ralph F. “Brashears to the Philippines.” *Firm Foundation* 65.27 (July 6, 1948): 9.

———. “Churches of Christ in the Philippines.” *Firm Foundation* 70.45 (November 10, 1953): 12.

———. “Come to Manila.” *Firm Foundation* 75.20 (May 20, 1958): 315.

———. “A Golden Opportunity in the Philippines.” *Firm Foundation* 65.15 (April 13, 1948): 11.

———. “If Philippine Work Continues, More Land Needs to Be Bought.” *Christian Chronicle* 17.2 (January 5, 1960): 2.

———. “Philippine Help Lacking.” *Firm Foundation* 72.32 (August 9, 1955): 520.

———. “Philippines.” *Firm Foundation* 73.48 (November 27, 1956): 771.

Broaddus, Victor N. “The Indigenous Church.” *Word and Work* 90.6 (June 1996): 168–170.

Bryan, Ray, Don Huddleston, Robert Buchanan, and Doug LeCroy. “Proposed Plan for Philippine Self-Support.” *Firm Foundation* 92.13 (April 1, 1975): 7, 11.

Buchanon, Bob and Ben Shropshire. “A Report on Our Philippine Trip.” *Truth Magazine* 24.5 (January 31, 1980): 6–10.

Carman, M. “Report of Mindanao Mission for June, 1948.” *Firm Foundation* 65.30 (July 27, 1948): 1–2.

Cassell, H. G. “Philippine Evangelism.” *Firm Foundation* 65.7 (February 17, 1948): 7.

Cogdill, Roy E. “The Battle Against Liberalism in the Philippines.” *Gospel Guardian* 22.25 (October 29, 1970): 1–3.

———. “Gunselman’s Dilemma about ‘Anti-ism.’” *Truth Magazine* 14.48 (October 15, 1970): 6–8.

———. “Gunselman’s Misrepresentations.” *Truth Magazine* 14.46 (October 1, 1970): 5–7.

———. “Liberalism in the Philippines.” *Truth Magazine* 14.45 (September 24, 1970): 7–9.

———. “More of Gunselman’s Misrepresentations.” *Truth Magazine* 14.47 (October 8, 1970): 5–7.

Copeland, Jady W. “Romulo B. Agduma Passes.” *Truth Magazine* 24.6 (February 7, 1980): 12.

“E. N. Franklins Arrive For Work in Philippines.” *Christian Chronicle* 17.3 (October 20, 1959): 3.

Enostacion, Wilbert Garingo. “The Gospel in the Philippines.” *Guardian of Truth* 34.7 (April 5, 1990): 198–199.

Evans, Everett W. “A Great Opportunity.” *Firm Foundation* 74.47 (November 19, 1957): 745.

Fanning, Tolbert. “Ministers of Peace in the World’s Conflicts.” *Gospel Advocate* 7.11 (November 1861): 347–348.

Garner, Charlie. “Work in Southern Philippines Will Hurt When Perrys Leave.” *Christian Chronicle* 16.24 (March 24, 1959): 4.

Gunselman, Charline F. “At Rest, Gunselman.” *Gospel Advocate* 114.37 (September 14, 1972): 590–591.

Gunselman, [William] Douglas[s]. “When to Train Preachers—Why?” *Firm Foundation* 82.26 (June 29, 1965): 406, 408.

Goodpasture, B. C. “An Elder Writes.” *Gospel Advocate* 96.46 (November 18, 1954): 906.

———. “They Commend the Elder Who Wrote.” *Gospel Advocate* 96.49 (December 9, 1954): 962.

Hamilton, F. T. “The Seventeenth Street Church of Christ Philippine Mission Fund.” *Firm Foundation* 64.18 (May 6, 1947): 9–10.

Hardcastle, Jack. “Getting Acquainted With Our Preaching Brethren.” *Firm Foundation* 64.24 (June 17, 1947): 5.

Harrell, Ed. “Brother Wallace H. Little and Support of Filipino Pr[e]achers.” *Guardian of Truth* 25.6 (February 5, 1981): 11–13.

———. “The Philippines—A Warning Repeated.” *Searching the Scriptures* 21.9 (September 1980): 5–7.

Harrell, Ed and Tommy Poarch. “The Philippines—A Reappraisal and a Warning.” *Searching the Scriptures* 21.6 (June 1980): 5–8.

Kirby, Jack H. “History of the Cooperation Issue,” *Truth Magazine* 24.36 (September 11, 1980): 585–587.

Lemmons, Reuel. “A Word of Warning.” *Firm Foundation* 82.3 (January 19, 1965): 34.

Lipscomb, David. “I Did Wrong.” *Gospel Advocate* 8.11 (March 13, 1866): 170–171.

Little, Wallace H. “Modern History of God’s People in the Philippines (No. 3).” *Gospel Guardian* 29.20 (October 15, 1977): 11, 14.

———. “The News Letter Reports.” *Searching the Scriptures* 7.7 (July 1966): 10.

———. “Philippine Report.” *Truth Magazine* 16.45 (September 21, 1972): 10–11.

———. “Philippine Report.” *Truth Magazine* 19.20 (March 27, 1975): 6–7.

———. “‘The Philippines—A Reappraisal and a Warning’—My Reply.” *Searching the Scriptures* 21.9 (September 1980): 7–11.

McDonald, Jim. “The Work of Our Lord in the Philippine Islands.” *Truth Magazine* 45.4 (February 15, 2001): 14–16.

“Philippine Progress.” *Firm Foundation* 67.29 (July 18, 1950): 14.

Reedy, W. P. “H. G. Cassell Going to the Philippines.” *Gospel Advocate* 70.46 (November 15, 1928): 1094–1095.

Ruby, Wade. “A Fruitful Field.” *Firm Foundation* 67.6 (February 7, 1950): 6.

Sadorra, Ronnie [P]. “Cotabato -- The Neglected Province.” *Christian Chronicle* 17.36 (June 14, 1960): 2.

———. “A Review of Gunselman.” *Searching the Scriptures* 8.4 (April 1967): 11.

Smith, J. T. “Institutionalism—Why I Changed.” *Guardian of Truth* 34.15 (August 2, 1990): 465–466.

Smith, J. T. and Connie W. Adams. “Preaching and Debating in the Philippines.” *Searching the Scriptures* 12.3 (March 1971): 9.

Smythe, James E. “Southwest Congregation in Los Angeles Sponsors Franklins in Philippines.” *Firm Foundation* 76.19 (May 12, 1959): 297.

Srygley, F. B. “Brother Daniel Sommer’s Visit to Nashville.” *Gospel Advocate* 75.10 (March 9, 1933): 228–229.

———. “Brother Sommer’s Visit to Nashville.” *Gospel Advocate* 75.15 (April 13, 1933): 348–349.

Utley, Orrin W. “Philippine Work.” *Firm Foundation* 70.16 (April 21, 1953): 5.

Wallace, Cled E. “That Rock Fight in Italy.” *Gospel Guardian* 36.1 (January 19, 1950): 1, 5.

Wallace, William E. “Onward Processes of the Movement (I).” *Vanguard* 10.6 (June 1984): 20–21.

———. “Rock Fight in Italy.” *Vanguard* 9.7 (July 1983): 12–13.

Willis, Cecil. “The Desperate Fight of the Philippine Liberals.” *Truth Magazine* 16.24 (April 20, 1972): 3–5.

———. “Foreign Evangelism.” *Truth Magazine* 15.34 (July 8, 1971): 3–5.

Unpublished Materials

Alcayde, Teofilo G. “The Church of Christ in the Philippines: Its Involvement in Community Development, 1990–1991.” EdD diss., Baguio Central University, 1992.

———. “The Philippine Bible College in Baguio City: Its Progress and Problems, 1977–1982.” MA thesis, Baguio Central University, 1983.

Batalla, Elpidio S. "A History of Davao Bible Seminary: Its Role in Church Growth of the Churches of Christ in Mindanao, Philippines." MA thesis, Emmanuel School of Religion, 1981.

Bohannan, Ray. "The School of Preaching: A New Concept of Teaching in the Churches of Christ." MA thesis, San Diego State College, 1970.

Brazle, Clinton. "A Church Growth Study of Churches in North East India." MS thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1977.

[Buchanan, Bob, ed]. "Unfinished Discussion Concerning Philippine Bible College Between Cecil Willis and Bob Buchanan." November 18, 1977. Manuscript in author's possession.

Chimhungwe, Paul Shupikai. "A Descriptive Chronicle of Transition from Mission to Indigenous Leadership in Two Churches of Christ Institutions (Zimbabwe 1976–1986)." MA thesis, McMaster Divinity College, 2012.

———. "The Indigene's Undocumented Contribution to the Growth of the Two Branches of the Stone-Campbell Movement in Southern Rhodesia 1897–1949: A Historical Analysis." PhD diss., McMaster Divinity College, 2016.

Corpuz, Leonardo Baylon. "History of Christianity in the Philippines." MA thesis, Pepperdine University, 1973.

Curry, Michael Weldon. "Mission Institutions of the Churches of Christ in Southern Tanzania." MA thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1972.

Daggett, Shawn Z. "The Lord Will Provide: James A. Harding, J. M. McCaleb, William J. Bishop, and the Emergence of Faith Missions in the Churches of Christ, 1892–1923." PhD diss., Boston University School of Theology, 2007.

Dawis, Ralphy V. "A Comparative Study of the Subject-Offerings in Seminaries Conducted by the Filipino Secular Clergy with the Standards Required by the Catholic Church and the Philippines Educational System." MA thesis, University of Santo Tomas Graduate School, 1963.

Fountain, Russell S. "Captive of 'God's Blueprint'--Fanning Yater Tant and the Development of Non-Institutional Churches of Christ." MA thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1990.

Gunselman, William Douglass. "Status of the Ten Evangelical Bible Colleges in the Philippines with a Proposed Program for Their Improvement." EdD diss., Manuel L. Quezon University, 1971.

Hegi, Jeremy P. “Don Carlos Janes: One-Man Missionary Society.” MA thesis, Abilene Christian University, 2012.

Holland, Ron. “The Church in the Philippines.” Term paper, Sunset School of Missions, 1982.

Hutcheson, Robert Sherwood. “The Philosophy of Christian Education as Evidenced by the Colleges Established by the Brethren of the Restoration Movement.” MS thesis, Abilene Christian College, 1973.

Ngaya-an, Ben B. “Mission Policies of the Episcopal Church in the Philippines (ECP), 1901–1980: Their Contribution to the Regional Character of the Church.” PhD diss., Middlesex University, 2015

Obata, Yukikazu. “Against the Odds: J. M. McCaleb’s Missionary Vision of Universality in the Context of Imperial Japan, 1892–1945.” PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2016.

Pante, Michael D. “Conjuring a Capital City: The Spatial Evolution of Quezon City, 1939–1986.” PhD diss., Kyoto University, 2017.

Parrish, Claud. “A Historical Study of Sunset Church of Christ School of Preaching.” MS thesis, Abilene Christian College, 1965.

Rambo, David Lloyd. “The Christian and Missionary Alliance in the Philippines, 1901–1970.” PhD diss., New York University, 1975.

Roper, Coy Dee. “A Study of the Training of National Preachers on the Mission Field.” MS thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1977.

Rulloda, Ernesto N. “The Causes of Student Withdrawals from the Bible Colleges and Seminaries in Baguio City and Benguet Province, 1979–1982.” MA thesis, Baguio Central University, 1983.

Tanicala, Eusebio A. “Church History – Philippines (Brief Outline).” Manuscript in author’s possession.

Terry, John Mark. “An Analysis of Growth Among Southern Baptists Churches in Mindanao, Philippines 1951–1985.” PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986.

Wissman, Ross B. “A Lone Wolfe: In the Pearl of the Orient.” MDiv thesis, Emmanuel School of Religion, 1998.

Email Correspondence

Adams, Connie W. Email message to author, December 4, 2017.

Gunselman, Charles. Email message to author, February 27, 2017.

———. Email message to author, October 5, 2016.

———. Email message to author, October 10, 2016.

———. Email message to author, October 11, 2016.

Gunselman, Kenneth D. Email message to author, October 6, 2016.

Morgan, Janine Paden. Email message to author, February 8, 2018.

Secondary Sources

Books

Allitt, Patrick. *Religion in America Since 1945: A History*. Columbia Histories of Modern Life. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Almonte, Timoteo B., and Frank Trayler. "Mission Work in the Philippines." Pages 227–241 in *The Harvest Field.* Edited by Howard L. Schug and Jesse P. Sewell. Athens, AL: Bible School Bookstore, 1947.

Altschuler, Glenn C., and Stuart M. Blumin. *The GI Bill: A New Deal for Veterans*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Anderson, Gerald H., ed. *Studies in Philippine Church History.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Baxter, Batsell Barrett and M. Norvel Young, eds. *Preachers of Today: A Book of Brief Biographical Sketches And Pictures of Living Gospel Preachers.* Vol. 2. Nashville: Gospel Advocate Press, 1959.

Bebbington, David W. *Baptists Through the Centuries: A History of a Global People*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010.

Brashears, Ralph F. "The Church in the Philippines." Pages 231–243 in *The Harvest Field.* Edited by Howard L. Schug, J. W. Treat and Robert L. Johnston, Jr. Athens, AL: The C. E. I. Publishing Co., 1958.

Burton, Antoinette. "Introduction: Archive Fever, Archive Stories." Pages 1–24 in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*. Edited by Antoinette Burton. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.

Casey, Michael W. “Pacifism.” Pages 586–588 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*. Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Choate, J. C. *Missionary Problems.* Winona, MS: J. C. Choate Publications, 1971.

Elkins, Phillip Wayne. *Church-Sponsored Missions: An Evaluation of Churches of Christ.* Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1974.

Ellwood, Robert S. *The Fifties Spiritual Marketplace: American Religion in a Decade of Conflict.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997.

Elwood, Douglas J. “Varieties of Christianity in the Philippines.” Pages 366–386 in *Studies in Philippine Church History*. Edited by Gerald H. Anderson. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Filbeck, David and Robert S. Bates. “Asia, Missions in.” Pages 32–40 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*. Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Gorman, James L. *Among the Early Evangelicals: The Transatlantic Origins of the Stone-Campbell Movement.* Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2017.

Grem, Darren E. *The Blessings of Business: How Corporations Shaped Conservative Christianity.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Halbrook, Ron. “The Growth of the Church: The Philippines.” Pages 187–208 in *Can Christianity Survive in America? 2011 Truth Magazine Annual Lectures, June 20–23, 2011*. Edited by Mike Willis. Bowling Green, KY: Guardian of Truth Foundation, 2011.

Hardin, John C. “Rock Fights, Quarantines, and Confessionals: B. C. Goodpasture, the *Gospel Advocate* and Keeping Order in Churches of Christ.” Pages 60–83 in *Recovering the Margins of American Religious History: The Legacy of David Edwin Harrell Jr.* Edited by B. Dwain Waldrep and Scott C. Billingsley. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2012.

Harrell, David Edwin, Jr. *The Churches of Christ in the Twentieth Century: Homer Hailey’s Personal Journey of Faith.* Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2000.

———. “Civil War, The.” Pages 221–225 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*. Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

———. “Noninstitutional Movement.” Pages 567–569 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*. Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Harvey, Paul. “The Bible in the Civil War.” Pages 358–369 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in America*. Edited by Paul C. Gutjahr. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Hooper, Robert E. *If Your Enemy Hungers, Feed Him: Church of Christ Missionaries in Japan, 1892–1970*. Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2017.

Howell, Bernard. *Missions: Progress, Stalemate, or Regression?* Concord, CA: Pacific Publishing House, 1971.

Hsiao, Andrew K. H. “Self-Reliance in Theological Education.” Pages 45–59 in *Theological Education in Today’s Asia: Theological Education and Training for Witness and Service held in Manila, Philippines, October 21–24, 1976.* Edited by K. Rajaratnam and A. A. Sitompul. Rev. ed. Madras, India: The Christian Literature Society, 1978.

Hudnut-Beumler, James. *Looking for God in the Suburbs: The Religion of the American Dream and Its Critics, 1945–1965*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994.

———. *In Pursuit of the Almighty’s Dollar: A History of Money and American Protestantism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Hughes, Richard T. “David Edwin Harrell Jr. and the History of the Stone-Campbell Movement.” Pages 24–32 in *Recovering the Margins of American Religious History: The Legacy of David Edwin Harrell Jr.* Edited by. B. Dwain Waldrep and Scott Billingsley. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2003.

———. *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America.* Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2008.

———. “Why Restorationists Don’t Fit the Evangelical Mold; Why Churches of Christ Increasingly Do.” Pages 194–213 *in Re-Forming the Center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present.* Edited by Douglas Jacobsen and William Vance Trollinger, Jr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Kleinman, Daniel Lee. *Politics on the Endless Frontier: Postwar Research Policy in the United States.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995.

Lacuata, Eusebio M. *We Were Catholics*. Fayetteville, AR: Gospel Tracts International, no date.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. *The Rise of Professionalization: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Mathis, James R. *The Making of the Primitive Baptists: A Cultural and Intellectual History of the Antimission Movement, 1800–1840.* Studies in American Popular History and Culture. New York: Routledge, 2004.

McCaleb, J. M. *On the Trail of the Missionaries*. Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1930.

North, James B. "Bible College Movement," Pages 92–94 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement.* Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Oakley, J. Ronald. *God's Country: America in the Fifties*. New York: Dembner Books, 1989.

Olbricht, Thomas H. "Churches of Christ." Pages 212–220 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement.* Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

———. "Congregational Life." Pages 231–233 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement.* Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

O'Neal, L. E. "Working for Christ in the Philippine Islands." Pages 53–61 in *Abilene Christian College Bible Lectures 1953*. Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1953.

Osburn, Wade E. "Children's Homes and Orphanages, 2. Churches of Christ." Page 172 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement.* Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Oyco-Bunyi, Joy. *Beyond Accreditation: Value Commitments and Asian Seminaries.* Bangalore, India: Theological Book Trust, 2001.

Phillips, Woodrow. "Introduction: Missions in the Restoration Movement." Pages 1–18 in *Unto the Uttermost: Missions in the Christian Churches / Churches of Christ*. Edited by Doug Priest, Jr. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1984.

Powell, James Marvin, and M. Norvel Young. *The Church is Building*. Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1956.

Priest, Doug. "Missionary Societies, Controversy over." Pages 534–536 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement.* Edited by Douglas A. Foster,

Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Reed, J. C. "Mission Work in the Philippines." Pages 49–53 in *The Harvest Field: An Account of Evangelistic Work of Churches of Christ Throughout the World by a Group of Students of Abilene Christian College.* Edited by Howard L. Schug and Don H. Morris. Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian College Press, 1942.

Rice, Ira Y., Jr. *We Can Evangelize the World*. Second Edition. Nashville: Williams Printing Company, 1966.

Ruble, Sarah E. *The Gospel of Freedom and Power: Protestant Missionaries in American Culture After World War II*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Schneider, Robert A. "Voice of Many Waters: Church Federation in the Twentieth Century." Pages 95–121 in *Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900–1960*. Edited by William R. Hutchison. Cambridge Studies in Religion and American Public Life. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Sensing, Tim. "Herald of Truth." Pages 383–384 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement.* Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

[Smith, J. T. and Connie W. Adams, eds]. *The Smith-Lacuata Debate*. Marion, IN: The Cogdill Foundation, 1972.

Williams, D. Newell, Douglas A. Foster, and Paul M. Blowers, eds. *The Stone-Campbell Movement: A Global History.* St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2013.

Williams, Paul Allen. "Missions, Missiology." Pages 537–542 in *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*. Edited by Douglas A. Foster, Paul M. Blowers, Anthony L. Dunnavant, and D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since WWII.* Studies in Church and State. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Young, M. Norvel, ed. *The Lubbock Lectures on Mission Work*. Lubbock, TX: Broadway Church of Christ, 1946.

Journal Articles

Cox, Brady Kal and McGarvey Ice. "A Descriptive Guide to Missions-Related Archival Collections in the Center for Restoration Studies." *Missio Dei: A Journal of*

Missional Theology and Praxis 8.1 (2017), http://missiodeijournal.com/issues/md-8-1/authors/md-8-1-cox-ice.

Domenico, Roy Palmer. "'For The Cause of Christ Here in Italy': America's Protestant Challenge in Italy and the Cultural Ambiguity of the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* 29.4 (September 2005): 625–654.

Foster, Douglas A. "The Effect of the Civil War on the Stone-Campbell Movement." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 20.1 (2017): 5–16.

Gilpin, W. Clark. Review of *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America*, by Richard T. Hughes. *The Journal of American History* 83.4 (March 1997): 1400–1401.

Gorman, James L. "European Roots of Thomas Campbell's Declaration and Address: The Evangelical Society of Ulster." *Restoration Quarterly* 51.3 (2009): 129–37.

———. "The Omission of Missions: Transatlantic Evangelical Missions Culture and the Historiography of the Campbell Movement's Origins." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 21.1 (2018): 5–27.

Hegi, Jeremy. "One-Man Missionary Society: The Indefatigable Work of Don Carlos Janes." *Restoration Quarterly* 58.4 (2016): 211–227.

Heitzenrater, Richard P. "Inventing Church History." *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 80.4 (December 2011): 737–748.

Humble, B. J. "The Influence of the Civil War." *Restoration Quarterly* 8.4 (1965): 233–247.

Jacobsen, Douglas and William Vance Trollinger, Jr. "Historiography of American Protestantism: The Two-Party Paradigm, and Beyond." *Fides et Historia* 25.3 (September 1993): 4–15.

Larkin, John A. "The Place of Local History in Philippine Historiography." *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 8.2 (1967): 306–317.

Miller-Davenport, Sarah. "'Their blood shall not be shed in vain': American Evangelical Missionaries and the Search for God and Country in Post-World War II Asia." *The Journal of American History* 99.4 (March 2013): 1109–1132.

Rhodes, Roy. "Germany for Christ: The Churches of Christ and East Germany, 1945–1989." *Restoration Quarterly* 57.3 (2015): 159–172.

Straker, Jonathan. "Clara Bishop and the Transfer of Oversight of the Koishikawa, Japan, Work in 1913." *Restoration Quarterly* 54.2 (2012): 91–104

Zeller, Benjamin E. “American Postwar ‘Big Religion’: Reconceptualizing Twentieth-Century American Religion Using Big Science as a Model.” *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 80.2 (June 2011): 321–351.

Presentations

Cox, Brady Kal. “The Churches of Christ Debate Institutionalism in the Philippines: Its Divisive Effects.” Paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Southwest Conference on Asian Studies / Western Conference of Association for Asian Studies Joint Conference, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX, November 17, 2017.

———. “‘The tortuous path of church politics’: Transitions in Churches of Christ Leadership in Postwar Japan.” Forthcoming presentation at the Christian Scholars’ Conference, Lipscomb University, Nashville, TN, June 8, 2018.

Harrell, David Edwin, Jr. “What Shall We Do With History?” Presentation at the Florida College Lectures, Florida College, Temple Terrace, FL, February 5, 2018.

Jenkins, Ferrell. “Please Don’t Call Us ‘Anti’ (An Update on the Non-Institutional Churches of Christ).” Presentation at the 55th Annual Pepperdine University Bible Lectures, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, May 1, 1998.

APPENDIX A

Institutional Review Board Approval Letter

ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
Educating Students for Christian Service and Leadership Throughout the World

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
320 Hardin Administration Building, ACU Box 29103, Abilene, Texas 79699-9103
325-674-2885

8/23/2017

Brady Cox
Graduate School of Theology
ACU Box # 29429
Abilene Christian University

Dear Mr. Cox,

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board, I am pleased to inform you that your project titled

(IRB# 17-053)is exempt from review under Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects as:

- ☑ Non-research (45 CFR 46.102(d))
- ☐ Non-human research (45 CFR 46.102(f)

Based on:

If at any time the details of this project change, please resubmit to the IRB so the committee can determine whether or not the exempt status is still applicable.

I wish you well with your work.

Sincerely,

Megan Roth

Megan Roth, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Sponsored Programs

APPENDIX B

Agduma's Description of Gunselman's Article on the Antis in the March 1968 Philippine Mission News[1]

THE "ANTI" --

as being pictured by his brethren, the "Anti-antis".

DESCRIPTIONS:

1. "They are of the Devil"--by Douglas Gunselman
2. They taught the "teachings of the Devil"--Al Horne
3. They oppose church cooperation.
4. They do not help a needy congregation.
5. They do not want to help the needy outsiders.
6. They do not help the needy orphans and widows.
7. They oppose mission work, radio preaching, etc.
8. They are not cooperative.
9. They have a "bad and don't care attitudes."
10. They are"unfriendly."
11. They are "church splitters!"
12. They are "careless of the Truth."
13. They are often"disagreeable."
14. They are "troublemakers."
15. They "force their own way" to others.
16. They have "ugly heads in the Philippines."
17. Their doctrines are now "dying."
18. They are foolish. ("We must not be fooled by them.")
19. "They have just one point." (I know he has two--one is wrong)
20. "Watch out they are dangerous," said the "anti-anti" preachers.

This descriptions can be read in the 1968 March edition of "The Gunselman Philippine Mission News" under the heading "Antis," written by Bro. Douglas Gunselman, A.A., B.A., M.A., Bible Professor and Director of the Philippine Bible College at 3-C Gilmore, Quezon City.

R. B. Agduma
M'lang, Cotabato

1. Romulo B. Agduma to William Douglass Gunselman, April 15, 1968, William Douglass & Charline F. Gunselman Papers, 1942–2009, Center for Restoration Studies MS #389, Callie Faye Milliken Special Collections, Margaret and Herman Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX.