

## THE FREE PRESS

VOL. 3, No. 1

1630 S. Hanover St., Baltimore 30, Md.

January 31, 1958

## The Peru Story

BY J. PHILIP CLARK

*Associate General Secretary of The  
Independent Board for Presbyterian  
Foreign Missions*

When I came to Philadelphia in August of 1957 to take this position with The Independent Board, one of the first pieces of correspondence I was given was the letter of resignation from our missionaries in Peru. Individual statements were requested of the missionaries, and these were received in due time. In the last five months a great amount of prayer, thought, and work has been expended because of these resignations. Having come only recently to the executive staff, the situation demanded extensive research through the Board's archives in order to gain the background necessary to help answer the many problems and questions which came to this office. It will be profitable for all of us who have a concern in this situation to consider some facts taken from the records of the Board.

The Rev. Alonzo D. Hitchcock, Jr., and his wife, Bessie, were our first missionaries to Peru. Mr. and Mrs. Hitchcock were appointed and assigned by the Board to Peru in May, 1935. They actually arrived in Peru in December of that year, and settled along the Amazon River at Iquitos. After his having surveyed the country for a year, and having made several recommendations, the Board cabled Mr. Hitchcock in December, 1936, directing him to set up a mission station at Ayacucho. The Independent Board has since that time considered this territory to be its own. Mr. and Mrs. Hitchcock arrived at Ayacucho on February 5, 1937.

The Hitchcocks had actually been invited into this portion of Peru by a Dr. Aldama, then a missionary of the Evangelical Union of South America. Not long after their arrival in Ayacucho there was difficulty with the EUSA, because that missionary organization did not stand behind the invitation of Dr. Aldama. Because of this there was an attempt made by The Independent Board to collaborate with the EUSA and with the National Evangelical Church, with which church the EUSA and the Christian and Missionary Alliance already had a working agreement. Finally, in July, 1937, the Peruvian Evangelical Church, together with the Evangelical Union of South America, conceded the two "Departments" of Ayacucho and Huancavelica, as being the exclusive province of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This agreement was finalized in the summer of 1938, and immediately afterward Mr. Hitchcock wrote to our home office as follows:

"The recent Synodical meetings of the National Church saw another answer to prayer and work which has extended over more than a year, for a plan of collaboration was passed between The Independent

*(Continued on page 2)*

## WHAT HAS HAPPENED AND HOW

BY J. GORDON HOLDCROFT

*President, Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions*

Over two years ago I received what has proved to be a very significant document. It was drawn up by one who had had opportunity to visit many Bible Presbyterian churches throughout the United States and to talk with pastors, elders, and groups of Bible Presbyterians. This person was deeply impressed by what was heard, and, after careful consideration of the situation, drew up the following paper and submitted it to me.

## A FORECAST

## THE OPPOSITION

## THE STRATEGY—NOW

1. Preparation is going on that preparedness may be perfect and complete when the time comes.

2. Organization of a Bible Presbyterian Foreign Missions Committee is probably now being perfected "under cover."

3. The rank and file is receiving partial information, that they too may be prepared when the time comes.

4. A *coup d'etat*. The rank and file will be met by a *fait accompli* overnight.

## THE OBJECTIVE—IMMEDIATE

1. A Bible Presbyterian Foreign Missions Committee

2. "Carl McIntire" to be annihilated from the Bible Presbyterian Church, together with any so foolhardy as to stand with him.

What about the ACCC and its regionals?

What about the ICCC and its regionals?

As for the 20th Century Reformation, is there a Reformation?

THE RESULT—Bible Presbyterian Church, like Orthodox Presbyterian Church, will be a respectable little denomination free from "schism," and cut off from the Twentieth Century Reformation.

I did not at first take the above document very seriously, but as time passed I realized that there were many facts coming to light which corroborated the forecast in that paper and my mind went back to it again and again. That document, of course, was not the first indication I had had of difficulties that were arising, but it was the first impressive statement either written or oral that I had received that definitely and directly indicated that The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions would be drastically involved.

It was not very long before it also became apparent that whatever might be the intention as to the IBPFM, that was but a part

of a much wider campaign that was definitely in mind; not only so, it gradually became clear that "the opposition" was looking for an opportunity to inaugurate their plan.

That they had inaugurated such a campaign soon became startlingly clear. Indeed, even before that document came into my hands there began a serious campaign against the leaders of the American Council of Christian Churches. That campaign began in California. At first it had not seemed to be widespread and it had not seemed to involve much else than the American Council of Christian Churches, but before long it was found that it was also directed against the International Council of Christian Churches. As time passed, Highland College was involved, Shelton College also, Faith Theological Seminary, The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and finally, in recent months, Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference.

## A THREE-PRONGED ATTACK

It is not my purpose to go into all the issues that were involved in each of these institutions, but the campaign or attack had three major prongs. One of these was a determined effort to discredit certain leaders who had been and continued to be prominent in all of the institutions mentioned above. Another "prong" was seen in the determination that soon came to expression, to effect a "tighter" organization in the Bible Presbyterian Church. In this effort the matter of Synod control versus independent agencies loomed large. Third, a definite desire became evident for "a softer approach" to the matter of modernism and to modernists, degenerating to a National Association of Evangelicals' attitude. This desire or attitude has been frequently described as a real "war weariness."

The ultimate object in all of this that has been briefly described was to bring as much as possible into the hands of the "tight control"—"softer approach" party.

As time passed it became clear that any means that furthered that purpose came to be looked upon as legitimate. As illustrative of this attitude one need only refer to the resolution given wide publicity in the Bible Presbyterian *Observer* of December, 1955. That resolution was signed by 25 ministers and elders of the Bible Presbyterian Church. It linked together seven events that had taken place in various institutions and suggested that they together formed "a consistent pattern," and the implication, not to say the direct charge, was that the officers of the various institutions concerned, or the authors of certain efforts in regard to some of these institutions, were all under the dom-

*(Continued on page 4)*

## The Peru Story

(Continued from page 1)

Board and the National Church. Under this plan, The Independent Board missionaries will be co-operating with the Free Church of Scotland, the Evangelical Union of South America and the Christian and Missionary Alliance missionaries in publication work; and will have an active part in the development of the Iglesia Evangelica Peruana, the indigenous national church in Peru. Under the plan *The Independent Board becomes responsible for the evangelization of the two mountain Departments of Ayacucho and Huancavelica*. This means that our 'little parish' covers some 34,000 square miles of broken mountain fastnesses with a population of some 600,000 people, of which 500,000 (est.) are Quechua-speaking Indians, descendants of the tribes which were once subject to the ancient Incas."

From that time, August 10, 1938, this territory described above has been the undisputed "parish" of The Independent Board, that is, until July 27, 1957, when our missionaries resigned. Mr. Hitchcock saw his first convert in this "parish" in November, 1937, in the little town of Huanta, the very town where our Mission is now centered and where our property lies. Mr. and Mrs. Delbert Jorgensen arrived in that "mountain fastness" in the summer of 1938, but for reasons of health they remained with The Independent Board for only a little more than a year.

In all correspondence from the field, and in all writing from this office, the two Departments of Ayacucho and Huancavelica have been accepted as the responsibility of this Board. Mr. Hitchcock wrote a series of articles for *The Independent Board Bulletin*, now *Biblical Missions*, and as an introduction to this series the editor of the magazine in March, 1940, wrote this:

"In the heart of the Andes Mountains in South-Central Peru lie two departmental States which are the responsibility of The Independent Board under present agreements with the Evangelical Union of South America and the Christian and Missionary Alliance. . . . At long intervals in years past this territory has been visited by Protestant missionaries or colporteurs, but it is only in the past three years that it has been occupied by resident missionaries of The Independent Board."

In the first Prayer Calendar ever published by the Board, August-September, 1940, our work and its location were described, and the description was ended with this sentence:

"It is entirely the responsibility of The Independent Board to see that these two Departments (Ayacucho and Huancavelica) are reached with the Gospel."

Has anything happened to end that responsibility?

The first of the missionaries who recently resigned, Mr. and Mrs. Homer Emerson, arrived in Peru during the month of Decem-

ber, 1940. They were appointed by the Board and assigned to Peru. They entered the mountains and did a fine work as ambassadors for Christ, working especially upon a translation of the Bible in the Quechua language. In October, 1943, Mr. and Mrs. George Bragdon received their permits to reside in the country of Peru, and moved in to that "mountain fastness" the following February to settle in the little town of Huanta, where our Board had seen its first fruit in 1937. Mr. and Mrs. Philip Lytle transferred to our Peru Mission from Bolivia in May, 1945, and continued as a part of our Peru Mission until June, 1953.

The two missionary couples who resigned from The Independent Board while still in Peru and who now occupy our property and our territory arrived on the Peruvian scene more recently. Mr. and Mrs. Nickles Cochran were assigned to Peru and reached there in May, 1947, a little more than ten years after The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions entered these "Departments" in the name of Christ, under the authority of the Great Commission. The Board commissioned and sent out Mr. and Mrs. Harry Marshall in the summer of 1953, six years after the Cochrans.

Let me go back and clarify one or two points which may later be questioned. In 1938 The Independent Board presented a final plan for collaboration to the Peruvian Evangelical Church. This was rather a formal document and began:

"1. Who we are: (The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions)

- a. We are an independent board without denominational connections.
- b. We are Presbyterian in the doctrinal sense of the word, our doctrinal standards being the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms."

We as a Board continued in co-operation with the Peruvian Evangelical Church, as an independent board with no denominational connections, yet truly Presbyterian, until August, 1944. At that time our close co-operation ended because the National Evangelical Church and one of its co-operating bodies, the field executive of the Evangelical Union of South America, had joined the Evangelical Council of Peru, to which the Methodist Mission also belonged. Because these organizations entered into fellowship with modernists, The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, in the interest of purity, withdrew. The Independent Board, however, continued to occupy the two Departments and has done so ever since, and the indigenous church established is today in the International Council of Christian Churches.

On July 27, 1957, the Peru Mission sent us the following communication signed by Harry G. Marshall, as secretary:

"After much prayer and thoughtful consideration, and believing it to be the will of God, the missionaries of the Peru Mission, namely Homer and Marion

Emerson, George and Mary Bragdon, Nickles and Emily Cochran, and Harry and Florence Marshall, regretfully tender their resignation to The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, to become effective October 31, 1957."

And so The Independent Board was suddenly left without missionaries in its mountain parish, for which it had accepted full responsibility in 1937. Was our responsibility of 20 years' duration suddenly brought to an end in Peru? It was not, but our resigned missionaries thought that it was. The Cochrans, who had been a part of our Mission for only one-half of its history in Peru, wrote the Board in September, 1957, as follows:

"Our vision for the need of these people has not diminished and we do not believe our call to preach the Gospel here has been revoked by the Lord, therefore, we do not feel led to leave. We do not see that our organizational change need affect these people. . . . Therefore, we look forward to some Christian arrangement that will enable us to continue here in Huanta among these people. Is that too much to expect among Christian brethren? . . . Is it possible that suddenly The Independent Board can now staff this whole field and carry on an effective work, including the reading campaign in Quechua? Therefore, any dissension brought into this field, caused by bringing in new missionaries, will rest its responsibility on the IBPFM. We trust therefore that you—with us—will work out some plan so that the Lord's work can continue to go forward, even if it means that the IBPFM has to retire. . . . In view of all the above, we reiterate that we see no need for the work of the Lord on this field to be disturbed. Therefore we look for the full Christian co-operation from you and the IBPFM."

On October 1 of this year the Marshalls, who had been in the Peru Mission for only four years of its 20-year existence, sent out a prayer letter in which they said:

"Our resignation does not mean we shall leave Huanta. By God's grace, our work among the Quechua Indians will continue. He has led us to this field and supplied all our needs, and we are looking to Him regarding the need of a house. . . . Another need we urgently request prayer for is additional missionary help. The Cochrans and ourselves are the only missionaries on the field, and it is impossible for us to carry on a systematic ministry among the thousands of Indians of two large provinces."

On the same day in which Mr. Cochran wrote the above, the executive committee of the Board met in Philadelphia. Not knowing at the time what was the mind of the missionaries who had resigned for the future of the work or the care of the property in a land where possessions must be carefully protected, the Committee passed this resolution:

"WHEREAS, THE INDEPENDENT BOARD FOR PRESBYTERIAN FOREIGN MISSIONS

has, during the past years, established and maintained a Mission for the salvation of souls in the country of Peru, and more specifically in that area known as the Departments of Ayacucho and Huancavelica and in the metropolitan area of Lima; and

"WHEREAS, from time to time various persons have applied as candidates for missionary appointment and have been sent to Peru under this Board; and

"WHEREAS, by these measures a substantial Mission has been established in that area of Peru, with a considerable tract of land and also several buildings provided by the Board; and

"WHEREAS, in addition to the matter of the aforesaid property, our work there has produced a good result of many years of faithful and prayerful work which should not be lost or dissipated; and

"WHEREAS, we have received resignations from the Emersons, the Bragdens, the Cochrans, and the Marshalls, who compose the whole body of our missionaries in Peru; and

"WHEREAS, to accept all these resignations without any arrangement having been made for the care of that work would constitute an abandonment of our whole responsibility in that area, including the Christians already gathered, the people to whom this Board was called to preach the Gospel, the property which God has given us, and, as far as we are concerned, the whole cause of the Gospel in the aforesaid districts; and

"WHEREAS, no adequate reason has been given by said missionaries for their resignations,

"Therefore, Be it resolved, that we cannot accept such resignations until and unless there be first submitted to us a plan acceptable to us for the continuance and maintenance, *under the control and direction of the Board*, of the missionary work in those districts, including the protection and care of said property. On receipt and acceptance by us of such plan, the return journey in the case of missionaries completing a full term of service or more will be the obligation of this Board if such journey begin within one month of their having received notice of such acceptance."

In his reply to this resolution, dated October 23, 1957, Mr. Cochran indicated that the missionaries had sought legal advice and were prepared to take their brethren to law in a Roman Catholic country, employing a Socialistic legislation. The letter reads:

"In reference to the first resolution of the minutes of the executive committee of Sept. 21st we respectfully reply that it would hardly be possible for us to present a plan . . . acceptable to us for the continuance and maintenance, *under the control and direction of the Board*, of the missionary work in those districts, including the protection and care of said property. Had that been possible our resignations would not have been necessary. Since we have found it necessary to resign

we request a settlement agreeable to us as well as to the Board, and one that will not bring disrepute on the Lord's work in this Roman Catholic country.

"The best legal advice available in Lima reveals that the Peruvian laws favor us in this case. According to Peruvian law the Board owes the missionaries of the Peru Mission indemnities amounting to more than the Board's investment in this property. Legal counsel assures us that an embargo for the amount of the indemnization can be put on this property—this in the event the Board attempts to dispossess us. Also said counsel advises us that the Board owes us our passage home irrespective of the date of our travel."

Before this letter was received, the executive committee took action, which action was ratified by the full Board on October 24. A cable was then sent, followed by a letter, accepting the resignations of the missionaries, asking them to transfer all property to our representative, and promising them funds to return to the United States if they were ready to return by December 1, 1957. The missionaries' reply was radioed to the United States on October 30, stating simply that the missionaries found it "impossible to comply."

The dictionary says that dispossess means "to remove from ownership or occupation, especially of land." Judging from the context I assume that Mr. Cochran is claiming that the property in which The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has invested large sums of money is more properly theirs. As far as the travel home is concerned, the Board agreed to pay the passage of both the Marshalls and the Cochrans if they should come home by December 1. The Board did not feel any responsibility for paying the passage after that date when their continuing in the land would be for the purpose of taking the property and the work which rightfully belonged to The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Also, careful investigation by the Board has determined that there is no Peruvian law which gives the Board's missionaries the right to take or to claim property for missionary service in Peru! The laws of the land support the Board's title to its property.

In a letter dated November 4, 1957, and signed by both Nickles Cochran and Harry Marshall, they did express some appreciation for the investment of 20 years on the part of The Independent Board, but that appreciation was couched in these terms:

"We greatly appreciate all that the Board and its praying constituency have done and are sure that the Lord will reward each one for his part, but beside our prayers and gifts to this work we have given over 75 years of our lives and the lives of our children. Regarding personal funds put into the property, we consider all we have as the Lord's. The Lord's money that was put in this property we trust will continue to be uninterruptedly used in the Lord's work."

Another chapter in the "Peru Story" was recently written from another source, World

Presbyterian Missions, Inc., the official denominational Board of The Bible Presbyterian Church (Wilmington Synod). In the second number of that Board's Prayer and Praise Letter, December, 1957, the Board announced:

"World Presbyterian Missions is happy to announce the appointment of several additional missionaries and appointees: Reverend and Mrs. Nickles A. Cochran and Reverend and Mrs. Harry G. Marshall have been appointed to Peru; . . ."

Following receipt of this news letter, there came to our office Vol. 1, No. 44, of the "Bulletin News Supplement" which is published by the Publications Department of the Bible Presbyterian Church at Bible Presbyterian Press, Walker, Iowa. We were surprised to read:

"W.P.M. now has three fields for which it is responsible: evangelistic work in North Chile with a view to establishing New Testament churches and also assisting sound Presbyterian groups in that land as there may be the need; the Quechua Indians of Peru where the missionaries with W.P.M. have already put in a total of approximately 75 years of missionary labor, and where a number of churches and groups of believers are already established. In Korea, W.P.M. will be assisting in the separated Presbyterian work already established there."

I said that we were surprised. That is because we cannot understand men of such missionary experience and reputation as those sitting on the Board of World Presbyterian Missions claiming as their field one that has been faithfully worked for 20 years by The Independent Board. We cannot understand their accepting, as their own, missionaries who are occupying property in Huanta, Peru, which clearly and legally belongs to this Board, missionaries who have evidenced a willingness to use the courts of a Roman Catholic country to apply against us a socialistic legislation in order to claim our property.

World Presbyterian Missions has shown the value it places on its own property. In the Missionary Manual of W.P.M. only recently published, it even demands that personal property be deeded to the Board by resigning missionaries.

"Property on the field shall be held for the Board by the Mission according to the laws of the country in which the Mission is working. Missionaries may purchase real estate and erect buildings thereon at personal expense only on approval of the Mission and the Board. In doing so, they may not obligate Mission or Board in any way therefor, and they must bear in mind that their own stationing is always a matter for Mission decision. Missionaries may erect buildings at personal expense on Mission property with the approval of the Mission and Board, but in the event that the missionary resigns or is recalled, the building ownership should be deeded to the Board with the proper financial remuneration made to the missionary."—Section 19, page 13.

What it now expects of its own, it should

(Continued on page 4)

## WHAT HAS HAPPENED . . .

(Continued from page 1)

inant control of a certain group of men who were gathering power to themselves, forming a hierarchical quartet or sextet which was determined to impose its will upon all others!

With the publication of that article and the supposedly supporting letters and statements that followed, it was plain that the campaign had come out into the open, although not all of its future ramifications were at that time fully apparent.

### HISTORIC POSITION OF IBPFM

To understand the position of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and the points at which conflict was forced upon it in the pursuit of this "tight control"- "soft approach" effort, it is necessary to understand the basic and historic position of the IBPFM. That is shown in

## The Peru Story

(Continued from page 3)

expect its own to accord this Board, to which they recently belonged.

(More could be said, at another time, about W.P.M. taking over the James Gilchrist's of Chile when these missionaries had spent only eight months on the field under this Board, having gone to the field at a cost of \$2,329. James has refused to make a financial adjustment with us. From the year 1933 to the present The Independent Board has "redeemed" many missionaries from modernistic mission boards. Its willingness to do this helped form its high character.)

From the foregoing perhaps you can see why the president of the Board, Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, felt it necessary to write the lengthy article, which you find in this issue, entitled "What Has Happened and How."

Indeed many, under the hand of God, have invested in the evangelization of these two provinces through The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This investment was made by missionaries from the year 1937, contributors who gave sacrificially, prayer warriors who spent long hours on their knees before the Throne of Grace, Board members who traveled many miles and pored long hours over the problems in order that the work might go forward, executives and secretarial staff who spent many evenings, and more days than five in each week. Someone sitting in my position at present can understand best the tremendous sacrifice and investment made by thousands of people across the country and around the world in each one of our foreign missions. These investments have been entrusted to The Independent Board with the expectation that, under the careful nurturing of this Board, these investments might bring forth much fruit and provide treasures in Heaven. We will do all that we ought, as God enables us, and with the help of our many friends, to protect and make spiritually profitable for God's people their investments in Peru.

that to which Independent Board members and missionaries alike are pledged. All of this can be summed up in five statements. These are basic principles, all very clearly enunciated in the Board's charter.

1. To establish and conduct "truly Biblical missions."

2. To do this by an agency free from ecclesiastical control on the part of any church.

3. To do the same "in clear opposition to all forms of belief or practice which are contrary to the Bible, or are indifferent to the necessity of acceptance of the doctrine that the Bible contains."

4. "To believe, cordially love, propagate and defend the genuine Gospel as set forth in the Confession of Faith and the catechisms of the Presbyterian church."

5. Not "to tolerate in the Board or among its missionaries rejection of or indifference to the importance of the doctrines set forth in the Bible."

These charter purposes, these positions, were all embodied in a succinctly stated pledge, which is also a part of the charter, which every Board member and every missionary is required to sign on election or appointment and to renew at frequent intervals.

That pledge is a solemn vow drafted by men who well knew what kind of struggle lay before them; they knew that they would face determined forces which would be not too much restrained by principles of fairness, for even at that time, 25 years ago, these forces constituted an entrenched modernism which was already showing evidence of extreme antipathy toward any who still held fast to the historic Christian faith.

In the 25 years that have since elapsed, there have been, of course, many important developments which led to certain decisions being made, necessity for which was clearly indicated by the Board's basic principles and by the progress of the struggle between modernism and the historic Christian faith. We mention some of these developments.

1. That none but "separated" Board members, missionaries, or even office workers could be elected or appointed. This was a necessary decision because more and more it became clear that a consistent, militant attack upon modernism could only be conducted by separated groups.

2. That aid should be extended to any organization or individual who was enlisted in a like struggle for the maintenance and defense of the faith; for example, the American Council of Christian Churches, the International Council of Christian Churches, and others in the formation and work of which The Independent Board often took a leading part.

3. That there must be a break with those who refuse, or fail, to go the whole way in the fight, or in separation; for example, there were early Board members who resigned from the Board when they saw what it all entailed. The Board also in two instances had to face the question as to whether it would or would not re-elect some who would not separate. The decision not

to re-elect brought severe criticism upon the Board in both cases on the part of certain ones, but that decision could not be avoided if the Board were to be true to its charter obligations.

4. In the wider sphere also it was seen that there had to be a separation from others after efforts to bring together all evangelicals had failed; for instance, at the time the National Association of Evangelicals was formed. Then also there had to be separation when it was apparent that there were compromises in great evangelistic campaigns. This was evident as early as 1944 and as late as 1957 when it was seen that compromise was the price of co-operation.

By the year 1950 it was thought that these principles and positions were all clearly perceived and approved by all and especially by the whole Bible Presbyterian Church as it then was. However, it was not long after that that it began to be seen that there was serious misunderstanding of what those principles involved and gradually it became clear that there was definite dissent on the part of many from the principles that were so clearly stated, not only in the charter of The Independent Board, but also in the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Synod.

### THE GATHERING STORM SEEN IN SEVEN DECISIVE MEETINGS

To make this clear it is necessary to consider seven decisive gatherings.

1

The effort that was made at the 14th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church (New York, 1951) to change drastically the Bible Presbyterian Church constitution in the interest of a "tighter" church control. Actually, had these "revisionists" succeeded, they would at that time or very shortly thereafter have inaugurated other sections of their plan which in certain minds was already forming, and the Bible Presbyterian Church would have started down the road most Presbyterian churches of America have traveled, by which they have come under a very closely knit control, actually a tyranny such as is shown in a number of the larger denominations and was notably evident in the effort made by the U.S.A. Presbyterian Church during the first three years of The Independent Board's existence to ostracize, or even to annihilate that Board.

Many of the members of the Bible Presbyterian Church did not realize all that was involved in the effort made at the 1951 Synod, and even after many other things had transpired it was not realized by some that this effort in 1951 and the later events had any connection. However, there is good reason to believe that the difficulties the Bible Presbyterian Church finds itself in today began at that time.

2

The second gathering that has proved through the years to have had a great influence in the difficulties that have come upon the Bible Presbyterian Church, upon many affiliated institutions, and now upon the IBPFM was the Convention of the American Council in California in the spring of 1954. That Convention witnessed a

strong effort to stir up dissatisfaction. A number of Bible Presbyterians were deeply involved in that effort. The matters of proxy voting, of ACCC statistics, and a number of other questions were raised in a manner that showed clearly a hostile attitude toward certain of the leaders of the American Council. Even so, the whole matter could and should have been confined to the American Council of Christian Churches alone and a review of the replies made by American Council leaders, men of various denominations, ought to satisfy every impartial mind. The sad fact, however, is that some minds apparently were determined not to be satisfied and wished if possible to hang something on certain leaders of the ACCC.

3

What this involved came out into the open at the meeting of the 17th general assembly of the Bible Presbyterian Synod, later in 1954, when a minority group of ACCC delegates in reporting to the Synod, picked up and passed on questions that had been raised at the ACCC Convention in California. All was summed up in the question, "Do you believe in deliberate deception?" This was in reference to American Council statistics. The very question leveled a grievous charge against the integrity of ACCC leaders, some of whom were members of the Bible Presbyterian Synod. That charge has been proved to be without foundation, and any who had the welfare of the whole cause at heart should have been willing to allow any investigation which they desired to be confined to the ACCC itself before spreading these charges broadcast to member denominations, and, as it soon became evident, to the whole country and eventually the whole world.

The harm done by such irresponsible and hostile charges soon became evident. There was, for instance, a very noticeable boycotting of the Third Plenary Congress of the International Council of Christian Churches on the part of certain Bible Presbyterian pastors; there was a very active campaign of sabotage conducted by one who had been involved both in California and at the 17th Bible Presbyterian Synod, a man who was actually a member of the executive committee of the ICCS and also a missionary of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

4

The next gathering that needs mention was the 18th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church which met June 2-8, 1955. By that time the campaign for change had assumed very large proportions. It is very enlightening to read over again the official Minutes of that Synod. One is amazed at the number of overtures and reports all concerned with difficulties that had emerged into view. Also amazing is the incontinent nature of some of those overtures. I made a note at the time to the effect that the difficulties were largely imaginary and unworthy of so much debate on the part of mature men.

Also, showing very clearly in some of the reports made to that Synod was the growing idea that, once a Synod had spoken,

every member of the denomination was bound to obey the Synod's majority decision. This is evidence of a growing desire for a tight control. It is also evidence that there was coming out into clear perspective a defection from the stand that the Bible Presbyterian Church had taken and expressed in its constitution, namely, that "the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners; that no church court ought to pretend to make laws, to bind the conscience in virtue of its own authority; and that all its decisions should be founded upon the revealed will of God" (*Form of Government*, Chapter 1, Section 7).

That same Synod, imbued with these ideas, naturally took long steps toward the *gathering of power to itself*. The work of the committees on Sunday school lessons, publication, children's work, young people's work, were integrated under the Committee on Christian Education; an official Bible Presbyterian magazine was founded, the committee for which was to be directly responsible to Synod, even though a large minority dissented partly on the ground that the establishing of a controlled paper "is a thrust directly at the principle of independent boards and agencies"; and the project of a liberal arts college under the direct supervision and administration of the Bible Presbyterian Church was launched, which soon proved definitely to be determined to create a theological department also.

There was thus, at last, brought out into the open a determined movement to lodge in the Synod very great administrative powers, despite any previous position of the Bible Presbyterian Church, despite any constitutional precautions, and without any constitutional change being first proposed and consummated.

Actually the 18th Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church changed the history of the Church, even as a watershed divides the course of the streams on either side of that mountain crest.

5

The 19th Synod can be summed up in the statement that it completed the work of demolition and change that the 18th Synod so definitely began.

There was, of course, the question of the legality of that Synod. The method of its calling plainly contravened the standing rules which provide that "in case through some unforeseen circumstances, the Synod cannot meet at the time or place appointed," the Committee of Arrangements then "shall have power to appoint such other time or place or both which it believes in its judgment will meet the approval of the General Synod." But beyond all technical rules, if the attitude toward the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church is the criterion by which legality or illegality should be judged, the 19th Synod was plainly illegal, for, as has been said, it completed the work of demolition that the 18th Synod had so definitely begun.

From the very first day it was plain that the "tight church" element was in definite control. It was well organized, had concrete plans in mind, and was so determined

to finish the work that had been begun that opposition was useless.

Some had foreseen both the illegality of the Synod and the quite definite plans that were in the minds of so many, and had therefore absented themselves from attendance. Others, mid-way during the sessions, were convinced that any opposition to predetermined measures was useless.

#### NO INDEPENDENT AGENCY ENDORSED BY BPC

The result was that no independent agency whatever was endorsed and the Synod withdrew its membership from the American Council of Christian Churches, and also from the International Council of Christian Churches; the college, with a theological department added, was approved, and definitely set up; the Synod reached down into the affairs of a Presbytery and of an individual church in ways clearly unconstitutional, and many things were done to emphasize the fact that the Synod was moving fast toward the goal of a tight control of the Church's activities. And repeatedly the phrase was heard, "Let the church be the church." One wonders if those who used that phrase realized that it had been given publicity in the first instance by a noted modernist!

As it concerned the IBPFM, one of the most serious matters was the withdrawal of the 19th Synod from the International Council of Christian Churches. From the first, the IBPFM and its missionaries had, as a part of their defense of the faith, co-operated wholeheartedly with the activities of that Council. Indeed they had been prime movers in its organization. A number of members of even that Synod were not willing to go that far, and when it was indicated that there were individuals and churches that would not be willing to give up their membership in the Councils at the behest of a "fallible" body, even the moderator of Synod acknowledged that that was the right of such individuals and churches—but that opinion did not last long. The total result was that the part of the Bible Presbyterian Church that was dominant in the 19th Synod emerged from its meetings with a tight church complex wholly foreign to what had formerly been the ruling administrative principle of the Church. It was a defeat for freedom under Christ in Bible Presbyterian Church government, even as freedom had previously been defeated in other Presbyterian denominations.

6

The next Synod held by the dominant faction met at Columbus, Ohio, the following autumn. By that time the attitude had considerably hardened toward those who stood for freedom and constitutionality. The latter party even then had not believed that reconciliation and reunion was impossible. It had met at Collingswood, N. J., and had expressed the hope that, when the other group saw how serious might be the result toward which it was driving, it would lead to proposals for informal gatherings free from the limitations of a fixed schedule in order that full and frank facing of all prob-

(Continued on page 6)

## WHAT HAS HAPPENED . . .

(Continued from page 5)

lems might, with the favor of Almighty God, lead to understanding and reunion.

Any such hope, however, was soon shattered, for the Columbus Synod proceeded to advise the presbyteries to take action it well knew would excise from the Bible Presbyterian Church, which their group claimed to be, all those who were not ready to go the whole way with the ideas and measures the St. Louis-Columbus Synods had adopted. In a number of cases already, subservient presbyteries took suggestions which were equivalent to orders and acted upon them. In this manner a considerable number of ministers and elders were forced out of the Church, if they recognized that group to be the Church, without opportunity to state their case, without trial, without observance of the appropriate provisions of the constitution. Actually that procedure was more high-handed than that adopted by the U.S.A. Presbyterian Church in the fight which that Church waged over the formation of IBPFM. That contest had eventuated in the creation of the Bible Presbyterian Church itself and that Church had thought that it had, by constitutional guarantees, fully provided against the very thing to which now it itself was surrendering.

Only one other action of the Columbus Synod needs mention here. That was the action which raised its temporary Committee on Foreign Missions to the status of a permanent committee. Almost immediately that Committee began to interpose itself between The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and its missionaries. For instance, in January, 1957, that Committee informed the IBPFM that the Columbus Synod had given it "new powers of conferring with missionary candidates and of receiving funds from the churches, both within and without the Synod who are no longer ready to entrust their funds directly to The Independent Board of Foreign Missions." This was certainly a long step toward full status as a Board. What was the purpose of conferring with missionary candidates? And if there were difficulties in the case of any church the Independent Board would have much preferred to have, itself, ironed out any possible difficulties with them. The Permanent Committee also told the Independent Board that "our" missionaries had expressed "deep concern over the recent actions of the Board and some expressing distrust of its leadership."

There again. Who prompted these missionaries to write to a different foreign mission organization? If "distrust" there was, why did not the Permanent Committee advise any such persons to take up such questions directly with their Board? And most amazing was the statement, "We consider that the Board should not require our missionaries or candidates to state their *wholehearted* co-operation with the activities of the ICCC, and we ask for assurance in writing that the Board will not discriminate in any way toward these missionaries who con-

scientiously feel that they cannot do so." How and when did the Permanent Committee lay claim to missionaries belonging to the Independent Board? And by what right did any Committee or near Board request the Independent Board to lay aside a policy which it had accepted as an obligation from the Lord in the defense of the faith? Especially, when both Board and missionaries had happily and wholeheartedly co-operated in that effort from the time and even before the time the ICCC was organized? Or did the Permanent Committee consider that something less than wholehearted co-operation in an obligation, which both Board and missionaries had accepted as a solemn commission from the Lord, would suffice?

Furthermore, *an assurance in writing* was asked that the Board "would not discriminate against any of its missionaries"! Could any self-respecting Board give such assurances? Could any self-respecting Board grant a veto power over its actions? What could have been the purpose except to weaken and thwart a defense of the faith on the world level at the behest of a Synod (the 19th) that was missing its opportunity to be great in the sight of the Lord? Was the Columbus Synod and its Committee definitely endeavoring to drive a wedge between the Independent Board and the missionaries it has sent out?

To be sure, the hope was expressed that the Committee wanted "our missionaries" (Bible Presbyterian missionaries) to continue under the Independent Board, but the letter ended by expressing hope "that steps would be taken to regain the confidence which they [Synod and missionaries] formerly had" in the Board.

We will deal further with this particular question after mentioning the last Synod that has met.

### 7

That was the Wilmington Synod (so-called 21st Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church). At that time the Permanent Committee was raised to the full rank of a Board of Foreign Missions with the title "World Presbyterian Missions, Inc."

#### WORLD PRESBYTERIAN MISSIONS ENTERS PICTURE

With the creation of a complete denominational Board, the forecast quoted in the opening paragraphs of this article is proved to have been just about 100 per cent accurate. And with fulfilling of that forecast some other remarkable things have also taken place. They are enlightening.

Even before the personnel of the new Board was known we received a copy of the Rules and Bylaws under which it was to operate. Article IV of those Bylaws states among other things that every member of the Board must "have at heart the objects and interests of this Mission Board." Article VI, speaking of missionaries under that Board says, "Each appointee *must be in wholehearted agreement with the special and distinctive standards and testimony of the Board* [italics ours] and shall subscribe in writing at the beginning of each term of service to its standards and testimony."

That is an entirely right and proper requirement. Every Board worthy of its commission from the Lord has such requirements for both Board members and for missionaries. But what was it that the Permanent Committee, now enlarged to a Board, demanded of the Independent Board? It was that it give assurance in writing that it would not require of its missionaries wholehearted co-operation in the activities of that which had become a distinctive part of its testimony! We submit that such a demand was not only a demand that the Independent Board willingly consent to the introduction of confusion into its solemnly undertaken responsibilities, but also it was, whether knowingly or not, tantamount to an act of robbery, a demand that the Board surrender a part of what it believes it was commissioned of Christ to do which is to conduct a militant defense of the faith on the world level on the most effective basis possible. Is this the "soft approach" that some of the Columbus Synod have advocated?

That World Presbyterian Missions, Inc., began that way cannot be gainsaid. Has it shown any disposition to change? With sorrow of heart, we say that no disposition to change is yet apparent.

On November 14, 1957, we understand, World Presbyterian Missions met in St. Louis. Following that meeting it announced that among others, four missionaries now on the field in Peru were accepted and appointed as missionaries under World Presbyterian Missions. These were all missionaries who had resigned from the IBPFM. But they were yet living in IBPFM property and they had indicated that they intended to remain in possession of the field which the Independent Board had occupied and worked for 20 years. Indeed, those missionaries had written the Independent Board saying they hoped this Board would take "the Christian attitude" and surrender property and field of work to them.

Does World Presbyterian Missions not know, is it entirely ignorant of the most meager proprieties when one Board takes over missionaries from another Board, especially where there are, as they themselves admit, no doctrinal differences at issue? A developed work which has begun to show great promise, a very considerable financial investment, is not for anyone who wishes it to demand and take over, but for the fulfillment of a God-given responsibility. Is that to be surrendered on demand? Indeed, there are elements in this that again remind one of banditry. One has told the writer that World Presbyterian Missions did not wish to do anything to encourage resigned missionaries before they had made a settlement with the Board they had left. But a pious wish is one thing; moral stamina is another; and the greatest encouragement that could have been given has been given in the appointment of such missionaries before they had made or attempted any settlement, except the stark demand for the surrender of field and property. It is thus, not merely the missionaries who covet this territory and property, World Presbyterian Missions also evidently expects to take it over without even saying, "By your leave"! In December it was announced that World Presbyte-

rian Missions now has three fields for which it is responsible—North Chile, the Quechua Indians of Peru "where the missionaries with WPM have already put in a total of approximately 75 years of missionary labor and where a number of churches and groups of believers are already established." Third, Korea, where it is said that "WPM missionaries will be assisting in the separated Presbyterian work already established there."

These are strange pronouncements from or in regard to any Board that expects to operate on a high plane of inter-Board courtesy, not to say morality.

### ACTIONS IN DEFENSE OF INTEGRITY

We wish now to speak of certain actions by and in the Independent Board during the course of this long difficulty, actions some of which have been much complained of but which were amply justified.

We have already mentioned the Schaeffer case. Dr. and Mrs. Schaeffer were missionaries of the Independent Board for a considerable time. Dr. Schaeffer made the first survey of Europe in anticipation of the formation of a Council such as the ICCC. However, returning from Europe in 1953, it was soon discovered that his mind was full of severe criticism of ICCC men and measures. Long conferences were held with Dr. Schaeffer by individuals and by organizations, seeking to clear away every misunderstanding, but it was useless. When these difficulties touched the IBPFM, the Board attempted to deal with them with patience, until finally, when certain customary statements were requested, resignations were presented instead. We mention this now only because there has been an undercurrent of hostile criticism of the Board in the Schaeffer matter which has continued to the present. It is entirely unjustified.

In the second place, the Board has been greatly criticized because it did not re-elect certain members to the Board when their terms had expired, and did elect other persons. That whole case is summed up in the fact that the Board was under solemn obligation to the Lord to preserve its principles. In the case of the first two men, Dr. Robert G. Rayburn and Dr. Flournoy Shepperson, Sr., Dr. Rayburn had, jointly with others, issued a paper on, "The Ideological Division Within Our Church." In that paper Dr. Rayburn had contended that independently controlled agencies were not truly Presbyterian, but rather Congregational or at best "hybrid," thus reviving the old U.S.A. Presbyterian "mandate" issue of 1934 which had very nearly cost the Independent Board its life at the very beginning of its existence. Dr. Rayburn also charged the Bible Presbyterian Church with being a "hybrid mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism," and said that "our present ideological division became apparent only after men began to recognize the hybrid structure of the Bible Presbyterian Church." That is after men in the B. P. Church "began to recognize the hybrid structure of the B. P. Church." For years Bible Presbyterians had declared they were a true Bible Presbyterian Church, but it is now quite apparent that this revised thinking in the Columbus Synod group of

the B. P. Church actually means that unless administrative control of all church affairs is exercised by the Synod the Church cannot be a true Presbyterian Church.

In taking up this question with Dr. Rayburn he never wholly withdrew his "hybrid" allegations. He could work with the Independent Board, as an independent. But the Board's charter proclaims it to be both Presbyterian and independent of ecclesiastical control! To remain so it must have men on its Board who believe it to be what it declares itself to be.

The very recital of these things now proves that Dr. Rayburn was, even at that time, the head and front of the movement which now openly acknowledges that it seeks a more tightly controlled church.

In the case of Dr. Shepperson, he argued for and widely circulated statements declaring that, in his "sober judgment," not only should his session and church, "if they are to remain true Bible Presbyterians . . . support and abide by the actions of the 18th General Synod, but he also declared that the action taken by his session and church might well serve for all sessions in that decisions once made by Synod were binding upon all except in clear cases where they might have been contrary to the Word of God. However, the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church, as do many others, plainly declares that "although the deliverances, resolutions, overtures and other actions of the General Synod are to be accorded the weight which is proper in view of the character of that body, yet whenever such deliverances, resolutions, overtures and other actions are additional to the specific provisions of the Constitution, they shall not be regarded as binding unless they become amendments to the Constitution."

In this case, then, another Board member was raising again one of the questions that originally nearly cost the very life of the Independent Board. The Board would have been happy to reinstate Dr. Shepperson, had he ever withdrawn such statements. He has not done so. The Board therefore believes that it was justified in both these cases because these men, in different ways, had opened up an attack again upon basic principles of the Board. A further not entirely gracious attitude was stated in the words that it was the *independently* controlled agencies that had "consolidated" the "vested interests" of the Twentieth Century Reformation Movement, which if it means anything must mean that he sought even at that time to take away such control and lodge it elsewhere, probably in the B. P. Synod.

In the case of the Rev. William A. Mahlow, Mr. J. E. Krauss, and others, it must be said that they did not aid in preserving the proper administrative integrity of the Board. The general secretary is employed to aid in carrying out the policies of the Board. The treasurer is in much the same position. In all kindness, however, but in all candor, it is necessary now to state that this was not done. Rather the reverse, for on two major occasions doubts were raised in the minds of missionaries by actions that were altogether out of order, at the time and in the way they were taken.

The president of the Board also is in much the same position administratively as other officers. Certainly all are under mutual obligation for mutual respect; they all are expected to give loyalty to their organization; all are expected to study the peace and welfare of the whole enterprise. But to the president was committed, by formal Board action, the chief executive responsibility of the Board. If then any officer felt that the president overstepped the proper limits of his administrative responsibility, the only right and proper course would be to take the matter directly to the Board, certainly before anything is done to sow doubt and confusion in the minds of missionaries and others far and near. When the Board has decided the appeal, one, anyone, can acquiesce, or if he feels he cannot acquiesce, he could with entire propriety resign. No other method is possible if proper administrative integrity is to be maintained.

In the case of the Independent Board, that course was not followed. On two major occasions grave doubt was raised in the minds of a number of missionaries, first by the general secretary, second by the treasurer and four other members of the Board. No word of regret has ever been spoken by any of them. Final resignations took place on June 24, 1957. The Board bore with that situation long and patiently in an earnest desire to win back those who were turning to other ideas. But it maintained its position because it felt that only so could it be faithful to the vows it had taken in promising allegiance to its charter.

### BOARD-MISSIONARY RELATIONSHIPS INFECTED

There is just one other matter that needs mention. That is the restiveness among a number of the missionaries of the IBPFM. The Independent Board certainly, for at least two years, has not been left to itself to administer the situation that has developed. There has been propaganda against the Board, even by those who were Board officers and members, as noted above. Part of it came from the completely untrue charge of "gathering power." Another part came through what seems to have been an effort by certain members of the Bible Presbyterian Church to bypass the Board entirely and to try to make it appear that missionaries of the Bible Presbyterian Church, under appointment by the Independent Board, were primarily missionaries of the Bible Presbyterian Church, which was only using the Independent Board as a convenient agency for the time being. That idea was diligently presented. Just a few days ago one of our missionaries told how her whole Mission, after the 18th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, received copies of the actions that had been taken by that Synod, long before the Minutes were out generally, in an effort that could not be thought of as anything else but an attempt to stir up dissatisfaction with the Board under which that missionary served.

Again the Board attempted to deal with these various difficulties with patience. It felt that its general secretary would see the situation. It felt for long that its treasurer

(Continued on page 8)

## World Presbyterian Missions, Inc., Takes Independent Board Property, Work, Field

BY CARL McINTIRE

World Presbyterian Missions, Inc., was founded in June, 1956, to be the Foreign Missions Board of the Columbus Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was organized in 1933 and has been the agency which God has used to spearhead the separatist movement in the Presbyterian field, and it has had the endorsement and co-operation of the Bible Presbyterian Church from the founding of that Church in 1938, and since 1956 has had the endorsement of the Collingswood Synod. There is one word that describes what World Presbyterian Missions has done in Peru. It has "stolen" the work of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

Consider the documentation now that supports this fact.

World Presbyterian Missions, Inc., publishes an official "Prayer and Praise Newsletter" and the issue, Volume I, Number 2, December, 1957, has a section, "Quotes From the Field." It reads, "There are eleven organized churches in the Presbytery of Peru, and two more to be added very soon, the two congregations in Lima."

The field thus described is none other than all of the work of the Independent Board in Peru. The Independent Board Mission included work among the Quechua Indians in the Andes, and work in the city of Lima. All of this has now been taken over by World Presbyterian Missions, Inc. It is, however, and remains, the work and the field of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

The Newsletter further gives "news notes" as follows: "Rev. George R. M. Gilchrist is in Peru helping in the work there until that work is reinforced; only two missionary families, with one due for furlough soon, have been carrying on the work that previously three missionary families had difficulty handling." This is and always has been the Independent Board work. World Presbyterian Missions have taken it over and they are talking about reinforcing it. The three previous missionary families to which they refer were all missionaries of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions working under its direction and under its care.

To read this "Newsnote" one would think that World Presbyterian Missions, Inc., had been working there for some time. There is no intimation whatever that the work that they claim previously belonged to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

Also, the "Newsnotes" declared: "World Presbyterian Missions is happy to announce the appointment of several additional missionaries and appointees: Rev. and Mrs. Nickles A. Cochran and Rev. and Mrs. Harry G. Marshall have been appointed to Peru." The Cochrans and the Marshalls have been missionaries under the

Independent Board, but they resigned. They informed the Board that they were remaining in the property that belongs to the Board and that they were going to keep the field. World Presbyterian Missions has taken the field and has proceeded to appoint them to that field for which the Independent Board has been responsible!

This is a clear-cut case of mission robbery, one Board simply going in and taking over another Board's work without saying yea or nay, just taking it—missionaries, property, field, and all the work that has been developed through the years under the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Honorable mission boards just don't do this.

No responsible mission board that has any sense of ethics or integrity would simply unilaterally step in and take over the work of another mission board. It certainly does not show any brotherly consideration or love for another mission or respect for its rights and property.

Further evidence of WPM's ecclesiastical theft or robbery is seen in the December issue of *Bulletin News Supplement*, published "by the Publications Department of the Bible Presbyterian Church at Bible Presbyterian Press, Walker, Iowa." The Rev. Max Belz is the editor. It is said: "WPM now has three fields for which it is responsible: . . . the Quechua Indians of Peru where the missionaries with WPM have already put in a total of approximately 75 years of missionary labor, and where a number of churches and groups of believers are already established." Anyone reading that would not know that it was a field that the mission board had stolen within the last three months from the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. One gets the impression that the missionaries with WPM have been there a long time and that they "have already put in a total of approximately 75 years of missionary labor." All of those 75 years of missionary labor, which they claim for their field, were put in under the direction and the responsibility of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

This quotation further declared that WPM is responsible for the Quechua Indians of Peru. They are not; they never were. The only reason they have any responsibility for them is that they have gone in and taken them away from the Independent Board.

If World Presbyterian Missions desired to do work in Peru, when the missionaries resigned from the Independent Board and left its jurisdiction and responsibility, there are other valleys and many other needy places in Peru where works could be developed and the Gospel preached. But for the WPM simply to take over the Independent Board's work and assume, as these articles indicate, that it is theirs, that their missionaries have developed it, that they are the ones who are reaping the fruit of the 75

missionary years of labor, is a travesty. There is no possible justification for it, or any kind of rationalizing which can possibly justify any such thing. To pirate a whole mission field from a faithful Bible-believing Board does indicate the attitude and spirit of the Columbus Synod in also attempting to change the Bible Presbyterian Church into a different church. The Columbus Synod does not endorse a single one of the historic independent agencies and it has repudiated both the ACCC and the ICCA.

The members of the Board of World Presbyterian Missions are as follows:

Dr. T. Stanley Soltau, Memphis, Tenn., president; Rev. L. LaVerne Donaldson, Chester, Pa., vice-president; Rev. Robert Auffarth, Newark, Del., recording secretary; Mr. J. Emile Krauss, Wilmington, Del., treasurer; Rev. W. M. Alling; Dr. J. O. Buswell, Jr.; Rev. J. W. Buswell; Rev. W. G. Cross; Mr. George R. Johnson; Rev. D. J. MacNair; Rev. N. K. Malkus; Rev. E. T. Noe; Rev. John Palmer; Dr. P. P. Phillips, Jr.; Dr. R. G. Rayburn; Mr. C. E. Secrest; Dr. Flournoy Shepperson, Sr.; Rev. Frank Smick, Jr.

The home staff includes Rev. William A. Mahlow, general secretary. Mr. Mahlow was formerly general secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

There are certain structural, ethical, and fundamental charter considerations which have been violated. A mission board that is worthy of being a board, honoring the Gospel of Jesus Christ, does not go in and pirate or steal the work of another mission board, where that Board had put years of money and work into developing a field.

## WHAT HAS HAPPENED . . .

(Continued from page 7)

might see the situation. It felt for long that various members of the Board, who were all highly esteemed and dearly loved, would come to see the honesty and integrity of the majority whom they had come to oppose. However, they did not, and the whole question then reduced to the simple query, should a Board bend with every wind that blows or should it conscientiously maintain the principles on which it is founded and which it had widely proclaimed, not only to its missionaries and constantly to its Board members, but also in its literature to the whole world. We feel those famous words, "Here we stand. God helping us we can do no other," are appropriate, and we believe the stand of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions in this long-drawn-out difficulty will commend itself to all of those who value consistency and steadfastness in adherence to the great things to which God called the Board and the whole Twentieth Century Reformation.

The resulting situation as it has developed on the fields has been as follows. In Chile, two missionaries were dismissed for what they admitted was sabotage. Six others

(Continued on page 9)

## WHAT SAYS THE CHARTER?

BY J. GORDON HOLDCROFT

The charter of any foreign mission board is usually a very clear and definite document. It states the purposes and objectives of the board; it binds board members and missionaries to those purposes; it also defines the responsibility, rights, and authority of the board. In addition, in the case of The Independent Board, every Board member and every missionary takes a pledge which is incorporated in the charter and is itself a part of that charter. All these things are very important in the difficulties that have arisen between the resigned missionaries of The Independent Board in Peru and the Board.

The Independent Board's pledge reads: "Approving the charter of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, I will faithfully endeavor to carry into effect the articles and provisions of said charter and to promote the great design of the Board." This pledge is taken "in the presence of God and of this Board." It is therefore a very solemn thing.

As to the purposes and designs or objectives of the Board, what are they? Section III states them. "(a) The corporation is formed for the purpose of establishing and conducting truly Biblical Missions among all nations. . . ." In line with the authority granted by that section of the charter, The Independent Board in 1937 established in Peru what was intended to be "a truly Biblical Mission" and the Board has been conducting that Mission ever since; that is, for 21 years. Not one of the missionaries who have recently resigned was a member of the Peru Mission in 1937. They would never have been members of the Mission had not The Independent Board appointed them and sent them to Peru. The Independent Board has maintained them there through all the years of their service. Any attempt,

## WHAT HAS HAPPENED . . .

(Continued from page 8)

have resigned. In Peru, eight missionaries and two appointees resigned. In Palestine, two have resigned. In Japan also two, and two appointees to Korea. Those who resigned in Japan apparently intend to remain independent. Some of the others evidently intend to remain in America, at least for a time. As we have noted above, 15 of these have been appointed by World Presbyterian Missions, expecting to go to Chile, Peru, and Korea. This is a sad situation. It need not have occurred. Had the Independent Board been left to handle the case by itself, it would not have occurred. Very cordial relations had always existed between the officers of this Board and its missionaries. We thought we formed a united missionary family, and, though many of the sad events recorded in this article have passed into history, The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is deeply conscious that it has sought from the first to be true to the obligations which God laid upon it and to the vows which each member of the Board and every missionary so willingly took.

therefore, to divert that Mission, the area in which it works, and its property to another Mission agency could only be described as a direct violation of the solemn pledge that was taken by these missionaries.

Another pertinent section of the charter, Section III (c), reads: "It is to provide a Board under which missionaries who are true to the Bible and to the system of doctrine . . . can serve without compromise with any form of unbelief." Under the authority which that section gives, the Board examines candidates, appoints them as missionaries, commissions them to their field, sets the term of their service, and has general responsibility for their maintenance and their work. In many cases it gives guarantees to the government of the country in question. It has authority to recall missionaries from its field if their work is not satisfactory to the Board.

These provisions have never been challenged. No missionary and no Board member had ever questioned their propriety, but, when the Peru missionaries resigned, the Board on September 21, 1957, stated:

"WHEREAS, to accept all these resignations without any arrangement having been made for the care of that work would constitute an abandonment of our whole responsibility in that area, including the Christians already gathered, the people to whom this Board was called to preach the Gospel, the property which God has given us, and as far as we are concerned, the whole cause of the Gospel in the aforesaid districts; and

"WHEREAS, no adequate reason has been given by the said missionaries for their resignations;

"Therefore, be it resolved, that we cannot accept such resignations until and unless there be first submitted to us a plan acceptable to us for the continuance and maintenance, under the control and direction of the Board, of the missionary work in those districts, including the protection and care of said property. On receipt and acceptance by us of such plan, the return journey in the case of missionaries completing a full term of service or more will be the obligation of this Board if such journey begin within a month of their having received notice of such acceptance."

The Mission in Peru, through its president, the Rev. Nickles A. Cochran, replied in a letter to the Board dated October 23, 1957: "That it would hardly be possible for us to present a plan 'acceptable to us [the Board] for the continuance and maintenance under the control and direction of the Board of the missionary work in those districts, including the protection and care of said property.' Had that been possible our resignations would not have been necessary." And a further paragraph stated: "The best legal advice available in Lima reveals that the Peruvian laws favor us in this case. According to the Peruvian law the Board owes the missionaries of the Peru Mission indemnities amounting to more than the Board's investment in this property. Legal council assures us that an embargo for the amount of the indemnization can be put on this property,

this in the event the Board attempts to dispossess us. Also said counsel advises us that the Board owes us our passage home, irrespective of the date of our travel."

On receipt of that letter this Board naturally sought legal advice and also the advice of the Peruvian authorities in America. It seems evident that these missionaries in Peru have been given completely erroneous advice. It has been found that there is a Peruvian law which applies to persons employed in Peru under contract or agreement registered with the Labor Department of the Government. The Board's *Manual*, of course, expressly states that our missionaries are not our employees in that sense. They do not have any contract which they have registered with the authorities, and Peruvian lawyers in America tell us that our missionaries have been completely misinformed. It is a marvel that anyone competent to be a missionary, whose chief purpose is to present and to explain the Gospel to natives of Peru, should so completely misunderstand their relations with The Independent Board and the conditions under which they are operating.

As mentioned above, The Independent Board has consulted legal authorities, both Peruvian and American. They all agree that this correspondence from Peru contains direct threats against The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and its rights to the Mission property. A further letter was written on January 8, 1958. In that letter Mr. Cochran states that they sought legal advice "in the event the Board attempts to dispossess us." Then he asks further down, "Why should we start any legal procedures? There is no reason for us to start procedures against The Independent Board because we have possession of the property. [Italics ours.] So if any legal procedures are taken they will have to start with The Independent Board and not with us." This amounts to saying, We are in possession of the property, we will not surrender it unless we are legally dispossessed; and all the way there runs the plea that, in spite of their holding the property and refusing to surrender it to the Board, "our differences will not be publicized and used by the Roman Catholics against the evangelical work in Peru." We do not like to use harsh terms, but sometimes they are necessary.

It seems to us that the course pursued by these missionaries is rebellion, seizure of property, and defiance, coupled with the statement that if anything is done about it the onus and the disrepute which they think it will bring upon the evangelical cause in Peru must rest upon The Independent Board and not upon them.

In regard to the funds which the Board receives and administers there are two sections of the charter which are in point: Section III (b) says: "It is to act as an agency to receive and disburse funds to be used for foreign missions work . . ." In discharging that responsibility the Board receives and considers appeals from each field for funds for all phases of the work, including property expenditures. Only with Board approval can a Mission proceed with

(Continued on page 10)

## Foreign Missions Suffer

Some 20 elders and deacons of the Columbus Synod have addressed an urgent and crisis letter to the officers of the churches recognizing the Columbus Synod. It said that present commitments at Covenant College, Seminary, and the National Missions Board are running behind at the rate of \$5,215 per month. In the appeal it is said:

"No matter how worthy appeals from without our denomination are, it is apparent that we are too few to do more than meet our own obligations."

"The St. Louis men have called for first emphasis on the needs of Covenant College and Seminary, and National Missions."

This indicates:

(1) That the very foreign missionary emphasis which has blessed the movement of the Bible Presbyterian Church is slipping back into some subordinate place. This is what we said would happen. It has been the emphasis of the movement upon the testimony of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, its first and pioneering independent agency, that God has used to bless the movement abundantly. The turning away of the Columbus Synod from the Independent Board and its distinctive witness in battling for the faith has contributed definitely to that Synod's present condition.

(2) The little Columbus Synod, with its central powers, is going to go around and around in circles, appealing to its own people, urging them to leave off outside interests, and thus the independent agencies are com-

pletely cut out. This movement, ingrown, will follow the example of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

How different this all is from the free, larger circle of operation which has characterized the Bible Presbyterian movement from the beginning. As people on the outside have rejoiced in the movement itself, they have helped form churches, and have come in, and the whole movement has rejoiced in the independent agencies, the denomination, the councils, and the various institutions of which God has led Bible Presbyterian men to be a part in these latter days.

It is our conviction that only in this free, broader outlook can the true interests of the Bible Presbyterian Church historically be maintained and promoted. The Columbus Synod group has turned aside and they have now found themselves in such difficulties that they are building up the psychology that, if you are going to be loyal, you must support only the institutions which they have established and controlled. This is similar to the cry that the U.S.A. Presbyterian Church used for its agencies when the Independent Board was first formed. — C.M.

## A Matter of Statistics

A responsible spokesman in the Columbus Synod gave information to Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia. Page 41 of the *New Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia Year Book 1956* carries the following statement:

"BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, THE. Organized in 1937, in Philadelphia, Pa. Statistics (1955): 8,670 members, 199 ministers, 95 churches. At the 19th Gen-

eral Synod meeting held in April, the Bible Presbyterian Church withdrew from the American and International Councils of Christian Churches. At the 20th General Synod in Columbus, Ohio, Nov. 28-30, 1956, the names of about 30 ministers who participated in a Synod called in Collingswood, N. J., were dropped from the rolls."

Here is a good example of the way in which statistics are misrepresented by a group that was very sensitive on the matter of statistics of the American Council of Christian Churches. The information given to Funk and Wagnalls was after the 20th General Synod in Columbus was held. The two different synods were in existence at the time, but the statistics reported are of 1955, before there was any division in the synod or among the churches recognizing the different synods in the Church; and, with the information that "about 30 ministers who participated in a Synod called in Collingswood, N. J., were dropped from the rolls," one gets the impression that there are around 169 ministers in the Columbus Synod and that the churches continued the same in number.

The giving of such information, particularly the reporting against the ACCC and ICC, indicates the misrepresentation which the spokesmen for the Columbus Synod have been making in attempting to promote their cause. To use the statistics of 1955 to support the Columbus Synod as of November, 1956, gives an entirely wrong impression to the public.

Also, the Bible Presbyterian Church was organized and its first Synod held in Collingswood in 1938 — C.M.

## WHAT SAYS . . .

(Continued from page 9)

purchases or any project that involves expenditures of any but minor amounts. When a project is approved, each field may appeal for funds, so also does the Board, but the Board receives and disburses the funds, or, should they be sent to the Mission direct, the Mission reports them to the Board and all such receipts are counted as part of the authorized amount. The Board has been a good and faithful steward of all the funds committed to it by the donors through the years. These funds have gone into the Mission properties, homes, and schools, all that the Board has built up, including the property owned in Peru

Section IX of the charter also declares in this respect: "Any property, real or personal, which may at any time be bequeathed, devised, conveyed, or transferred to, and accepted by the Corporation shall be received, held, and used by it in furtherance of the purposes expressed in Article III of these Articles and not otherwise. . . ." In view therefore of these articles and the pledge the missionaries themselves have taken, for them now to argue that gifts given to the Board for the work in their particular fields are actually gifts given to them personally and therefore that the Board has no interest

in, or responsibility for, them and that they therefore can take to themselves this money which has been invested in their fields is a specific and express violation of the pledge which was taken by them as required by the charter when they were appointed as missionaries.

Section X of the charter grants the Board other powers also. Among these is the power "(2) to establish, maintain, support, and otherwise encourage such schools in foreign countries as may be necessary or essential to effect the purpose or purposes for which the Corporation is organized." Under these provisions The Independent Board has established and conducts the supervision and direction of its Missions and missionaries on the fields, various schools, including Bible institutes and theological seminaries. The attempt, therefore, of the missionaries in Peru to take the Bible Institute which The Independent Board has established is in express violation of the pledge they made to the Board that they would "faithfully endeavor to carry into effect the articles and provisions of said charter and to promote the great design of the Board." It was never envisioned in the "great design of the Board" that its property, its work, its field should be taken by its missionaries or former missionaries and diverted to the control and supervision of a denominational mission board or any other board. Any attempt to do this

could only be thought of as a form of pious banditry unworthy of any Christian missionaries, and especially unworthy of any who have taken vows such as all missionaries of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions have taken.

These provisions from the charter of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions should settle for all Bible Presbyterians the moral and ethical questions involved in the attempt of missionaries in Peru, or elsewhere, to take from the Board its property and work and to operate it independently or turn it over to another mission board.

THE HEADQUARTERS AND OFFICE OF  
THE INDEPENDENT BOARD  
FOR PRESBYTERIAN FOREIGN  
MISSIONS

246 W. WALNUT LANE  
PHILADELPHIA 44, PA.

(Photographed from a folder published by The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions)

THE purpose of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions may be described as four-fold. It recognizes the Great Commission of Christ to take the Gospel to the "uttermost" part of the earth as binding upon all Christians. The atoning work of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, His virgin birth and His physical resurrection are central to that Gospel message. Secondly, the Independent Board was brought into being to be a sterling testimony to the veracity and finality of the Holy Scriptures, as constituting God's Word to man. No missionary is sent out who has doubts concerning the inerrancy and full truthfulness of the Bible. Thirdly, we are living in a day when whole Mission agencies and denominations have come under the domination of apostasy and unbelief. The Independent Board has purposed in the face of this flood of the enemy firmly to oppose error and maintain a testimony separated unto Christ and His truth. Finally, the Board upholds truly Biblical methods and principles of missionary work. We believe these methods and principles have been well summarized from a doctrinal viewpoint in the Westminster Standards of the Presbyterian Churches and from a practical viewpoint by the Nevius methods of missionary work, often called the indigenous system, emphasizing self-support, self-education, self-extension and self-government on the part of the churches it establishes.

The need for the Independent Board is great. As yet approximately one thousand tribes have no portion of the Bible in their own language, and over one half of the people of the earth have never once intelligently heard the Gospel of Christ. Yet two thousand years ago our Lord said, "teach all nations." So there is a tremendous task of evangelism before us and in this great program the Independent Board is playing its part. But more than that, recent decades have brought much confusion to the mission fields of the world. Modernists, liberals and Barthians are being sent out and many mission institutions on the foreign field have been taken over by those who teach and preach "another" gospel. Nationals are confused by the change in message and principles on the part of the missionaries. Thus, there is a vital place to be held by Missions like the Independent Board which maintain a testimony which is completely separated unto Christ and His truth and in no wise entangled with the things of the world. Constantly calls come to the Board to extend this sterling testimony into other parts of the globe. But the need is also great here at home for the Independent Board. Both donors and missionary candidates are looking for a Board they can fully trust as to message and methods, and many are finding one they can trust in The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

The history of the Independent Board is as follows: The Board was organized in 1933 and chartered in 1934, being dedicated to the task of establishing and maintaining "truly Biblical Missions among all nations." In pursuance of this high calling, and working on the basis of the above mentioned principles, the Board at first carried on its work within the bounds of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. However, the Board was not tolerated by a denomination so rapidly

descending into unbelief and soon found itself faced with a "mandate" from the U.S.A. Presbyterian General Assembly which sought to compel the Board to dissolve. The men who had begun the work however stood fast, knowing it was better to obey God rather than to obey man. As a result the Board's members were suspended from their office as ministers. This led to an exodus from the Church to which most had belonged and resulted in the formation of new Churches dedicated to the purity of the faith. Meanwhile the Independent Board has steadily grown. Now, June, 1957, there are established Missions in Japan, Korea, India, Arabia, The Holy Land, Europe, Kenya Colony East Africa, Peru, Chile, Brazil and Formosa. Independent Board missionaries have also served in Bolivia, the Philippines and Mexico. The Board is ready to re-enter these countries and enter others as the Lord provides.

The Board works in close fellowship with--

BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES

FAITH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HIGHLAND COLLEGE

SHELTON COLLEGE

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

THE ASSOCIATED MISSIONS OF THE I.C.C.C.

HARVEY CEDARS BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CONFERENCE

THE SUMMER BIBLE SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

ALL WHO STAND UNCOMPROMISINGLY FOR THE FAITH ONCE  
DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS

The support for the work of the Board does not come from the budget of one denomination. The Board goes forward in dependence on the faithfulness of God. Much of the support comes from local churches and individuals in denominations which are true to God's Word. On the other hand members of other groups who feel they need a Board such as the Independent Board to represent them in the regions beyond send in their gifts. The books and financial records are always open for responsible inspection and are audited annually by certified public accountants.

Missionary Candidates are required to meet high standards spiritually and personally. The Board regards the sending out of a missionary a solemn responsibility before God and makes the sending of each candidate a matter of much prayer and full investigation.

All who are troubled in heart as to where they can find a Foreign Board, loyal to the Scriptures and to the Great Commission, are invited to investigate The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions; and, when convinced that this Board is such and that it is conducting its work in loyalty and in love, all such are invited to share in its work by prayer, by gift, by life, or in whatever way God may direct in order that in just as many areas in the world as possible such a testimony may be established, maintained and enlarged "until He come."

## Harvey Cedars Conference Stymied

### By Controversy: Future in Doubt

BY CARL McINTIRE

Not a single independent agency that God has raised up in the last 25 years in the separatist movement as it relates to the Bible Presbyterians has escaped grief and loss as a result of the attacks made upon their position by the Columbus Synod and those supporting it.

The Columbus Synod at the start withheld its endorsement of Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference and all the independent agencies. Though some men affiliated with the Columbus group and advocates of its cause continued their membership on the Board of Harvey Cedars, the support of the Conference financially, numerically, and every other way came mainly from the Collingswood Synod, not the Columbus Synod. In fact, most of the financial support through the years, so far as the Church itself was concerned, came from Collingswood people and the Collingswood church itself.

Jack Murray and Carl McIntire are the only two Board members remaining of the original Board which founded the Conference in 1941. They wrote into the charter of incorporation that it was to function according to "the doctrines and tenets of the Bible Presbyterian denomination." The Bible Presbyterian denomination as of that time corresponded to what is now represented in the Collingswood Synod and the churches which recognize it—the support and the recognition of the independent agencies, association and affiliation with the Councils which have been established. Harvey Cedars was made an independent agency and was not placed under the control of any synod or presbytery. Very few will question this!

However, the 21st General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Collingswood Synod, meeting in the Collingswood church, unanimously withdrew its endorsement from Harvey Cedars and set up a five-man committee to give its endorsement if the situation were corrected. This followed an appearance before the Synod of the Rev. Albert Oldham, director, who informed the brethren that he believed that "Ichabod" had been written over both synods. Mr. Oldham did admit, however, that it is the Collingswood Synod group which has supported the Conference and that this is the group that should have the Conference.

This situation was precipitated in the annual meeting of the Conference Board when a majority, controlled by men affiliated with the Columbus Synod, took action which supported the interests of that party.

Carl McIntire, a member of the Board, had requested that Bill Mahlow step aside.

He had been elected to the Board while general secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. He had since resigned and had become the general secretary of a Synod-controlled denominational board, World Presbyterian Missions, Inc. Carl McIntire pointed out that Bill Mahlow would never have been elected to the Harvey Cedars Board of Directors while he held his position as general secretary promoting the interests of a Synod-controlled denominational Presbyterian agency, and which Synod had taken positions against the independent agencies and against the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. By majority vote of the Board, Mr. Mahlow was retained. Among those voting to retain him on the Board were the treasurer of World Presbyterian Missions, Inc., John Krauss; a member of World Presbyterian Missions, Inc., John Buswell; and John Sanderson, a professor at Covenant College and Theological Seminary and visiting professor in Westminster Theological Seminary. During the discussion McIntire pointed out that Sanderson, teaching in Westminster Theological Seminary, would never have been elected to the Board of control of Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference while holding such positions.

There are 12 members of the Board. Six of these members are ministers or members of churches which recognize the Columbus Synod. Six of them are ministers or members of churches which are recognizing the Collingswood Synod.

Murray and McIntire maintain that the Conference was being diverted, and that men, Mahlow and others, being retained on the Harvey Cedars Board, were promoting a different concept of boards and the church.

Whereupon the Collingswood session declined to contribute any further of its benevolence funds. Three thousand dollars have been in the budget annually for Harvey Cedars from Collingswood. The Presbytery of New Jersey, Collingswood Synod, called upon John Sanderson and Bill Mahlow honestly to recognize the shift which they had taken in their position and to step off the Board of Harvey Cedars and permit it to go on in peace and maintain the charter of the Board as understood by its history and founders.

With the Collingswood Synod withdrawing its endorsement, Dr. Robert T. Ketcham and others affiliated with the American Council of Christian Churches have declined to accept invitations to speak on the platform of Harvey Cedars. A stalemate has been created. In the recent weeks Mr.

Oldham has made it known that three members of the Board affiliated with the Columbus Synod have indicated to him that they would withdraw and resign if he requested it. They have not resigned. If this were to occur, the present stalemate would be resolved and Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference would continue as in the past with its same backing and support.

The Columbus Synod group is so involved financially in the support of their own new Synod-controlled agencies that there is little prospect of substantial financial help coming to Harvey Cedars, and those associated with the Collingswood Synod are not going to invest their money or help contribute toward the building up of a work which the Columbus Synod may take over, and, according to the prevailing thought of that Synod, eventually incorporate under the control of the Synod itself, as are now all the agencies that the Columbus Synod endorses.

According to McIntire and Murray, Harvey Cedars was never started to build or promote a synod-controlled, tightly run denomination that has repudiated the American Council and the International Council of Christian Churches. Harvey Cedars Conference has been a loyal supporter of the Councils from the beginning of both of them, and it has helped contribute to the support and development of Shelton College, Faith Theological Seminary, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and Al Oldham himself is a member of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions. The Columbus Synod group is not supporting these historic agencies.

McIntire and Murray both have announced that they have no intention of resigning from the Board of control of Harvey Cedars, that they have been on it from the beginning, and that they intend to stay and try to save the Conference for its original purposes. It is their firm belief that the Conference should continue in accordance with its charter and not be directed to help build a synod-controlled, anti-ACCC movement, or help the WPM undercut the Independent Board and other independent agencies.

The property and money invested in Harvey Cedars was placed there that it might help develop a movement such as has been represented in the Bible Presbyterian Church through its 19 years before the change came in the Columbus Synod.

Published by Committee on  
True Presbyterianism.

All communications and requests for extra copies of The Free Press may be addressed to the secretary-treasurer of the Committee, the Rev. Arthur G. Slaght, 1630 S. Hanover St., Baltimore 30, Md.