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Chapter 1

Renewing the Vision—Mission Organizations in a Changing World

Throughout the history of the Christian church men and women have been set apart as missionaries for the task of presenting the gospel cross-culturally and living out its implications. In more recent history mission organizations were created, liberating missionaries’ time by providing them a structure through which supporters give financially and missionary effort can be made more effective.

Approximately 80 years ago Latin America Mission (LAM) came into being through the work of its founders, Harry and Susan Strachan. Over the ensuing decades this mission has given faithful witness to God and has assisted the emerging Protestant Latin church to take its place in the global community of churches. LAM’s current mission statement reads,

The Latin America Mission is an international community of men and women who, motivated by their love for the Lord Jesus Christ and in obedience to His commands, encourage, assist and participate with the Latin Church in the task of building the Church of Jesus Christ in the Latin world and beyond. (LAM 2000a)

Like many aging mission agencies LAM faces an uncertain future. As will become obvious in this study, neither Latin America nor the mission organization itself escaped the changing times. Yet, change is nothing new for an organization experienced in past paradigm shifts. This study revisits this important mission’s past in order to inform its future and hopefully that of other similar agencies.

Paul McKaughan, president of the mission conglomerate Evangelical Fellowship of Mission Agencies (EFMA), notes that there are few longitudinal studies dealing with mission organizations at the structural level (McKaughan 2001). While some studies have been conducted on the topics of missionary care/attrition (Bennett 1998; Dooley
1998; Taylor 1997; Toews 1996; T. Nelson 1985), asset management (Accornero 1998; Engel 1996), missiological trends (McKaughan, O’Brien & O’Brien 1998) or individual mission agencies, this study not only documents LAM history, but also interfaces secular organizational theories (Denison 1997; Schein 1992; Greiner 1978) with a Christian mission organization. Organizational theorists have consistently demonstrated that organizational vision, organizational identity and organizational leadership are key to organizational effectiveness and health (McGregor 1960; Likert 1961; Drucker 1974; Peters and Waterman 1982; Schein 1992; Kouzes and Posner 1995; Denison 1997).

*Organizational vision* or mission is the shared “definition of the function and purpose of the organization,” which then provides organizational purpose, meaning, and direction (Denison 1997:13). *Organizational identity* is the self-perception of the group’s members as displayed in their degree of involvement and ownership in the organization, and in the consistency produced by a strong organizational culture (Denison 1997:7-9). *Organizational leadership* concerns the ability of leaders to create, manage, and work within a given organization’s culture (Schein 1992:5).

The ideal mission organization would have a strategic organizational vision consistent with God’s love for the world and plan for humankind as demonstrated in Jesus Christ and his church, and appropriate to the needs of the particular context. It would have a healthy organizational identity, reflecting appropriate commitment to the organization as a part of the body of Christ in mission and to the care of individual missionaries as a reflection of Christ’s love for people. The mission organization’s leadership would continually affirm the best in the organization’s culture while still directing and refining the agency toward greater effectiveness in carrying out its
mandates in the contemporary context for the glory of God. Under-girding these organizational principles would be theological commitments to God, the Bible, the church, and the Savior’s mission.

With this in mind, this study documents LAM history from an organizational perspective focusing primarily on organizational culture as seen in organizational vision, organizational identity, and organizational leadership.

**Historical Synopsis**

LAM was founded in 1921 by Harry and Susan Strachan. While Harry focused on continent-wide evangelistic campaigns, Susan developed a seminary, church, hospital and more in the mission’s home base country of Costa Rica. Between the two of them, the mission maintained a balanced approach to evangelism. Upon their deaths, leadership passed on to their son, Kenneth Strachan, whose best known contribution was *Evangelism In Depth*. The mission was strengthened and grew under his direction.

Since Kenneth Strachan’s death in 1965, the mission has been governed in turn by Horace Fenton, Mike Berg, Paul Landrey, David Howard, and since 1999, by David Befus. In the 1970s the mission latinized its ministries and became, essentially, a seconding agency. In the 1980s it initiated *Christ for the City*, a direct ministry of the mission, but this too was spun off in the 1990s an independent ministry.

The mission currently has approximately 200 missionaries serving in a variety of contexts (See Appendix A). About one half of the field missionaries are seconded to ministries in Costa Rica, with the balance serving in Mexico, Colombia and several other countries. Costa Rica accounts for one third of all LAM missionaries, followed closely
by LAM headquarters (Miami Springs, Florida) with over one fourth (LAM 1999). LAM missionaries serve in a variety of ministries including evangelism and outreach, church planting, street children, theological education, short term teams, micro-enterprise, health, women at risk, pastoral training, university ministries, video, networking, strategic events, Christian camps, literature, leadership training, economic development, assisting the Latin missions movement, institutional strengthening, broadcasting, and prison outreach (LAM 2000a).

As suggested in this brief synopsis, LAM has characteristically been in the forefront in terms of innovative evangelistic and social service ministries, elevation of nationals to equal partner status, church networking, and willingness to make major organizational changes. For these reasons, and others that will become obvious in the following chapters, LAM has been missiologically a significant mission agency.

**Task Force 2**

On August 27-30, 1997, 15 men and women gathered in Miami, Florida to discuss the LAM’s future. This group, Task Force 2 (TF2), was the second of two task forces charged with discerning the status and future of the mission. TF2 was the more expansive of the two task forces, composed of the LAM interim president, a member of the Board of Trustees, a representative from a local USA church mission board, a general council member, the facilitator, and both field and support missionaries (including Latino missionaries). This author was a member of this task force, representing younger field missionaries.
TF2’s defined purpose was “to study the future of the LAM in light of the rapid changes taking place in the world of missions and with special focus on the need for developing younger leadership in LAM” (Howard 1997b). Interim LAM president David Howard made clear in the letters of invitation that participants were not chosen as representatives of specific entities of service or countries. Instead, TF2 members were chosen on the basis of their ability to help “analyze and work through where the LAM should be going as we enter the 21st century” (Howard 1997b). TF2’s agenda soon expanded to include practically every facet of the organization.

Many TF2 participants agreed that LAM should address both its organizational problems (raising up younger leadership) and its visional crisis (recapturing or redefining its purpose in Latin America). A pending leadership crisis was being precipitated by the impending retirement of many of LAM’s oldest and best missionaries and leaders. In their absence a generational leadership void would be apparent. At that time David Howard, who was himself contemplating retirement, noted that while LAM was “blessed with the ‘gray hair of experience’” from its “post-World War II generation of missionaries,” their day of leadership was “nearly past” (Howard 1997a:3). By 1998 twelve of these veteran missionaries, six couples, had retired with a combined missionary service log of 500 years among them (LAE 1998(1):20). With them an understanding of LAM’s early organizational vision and motivation is also passing.

TF2 was convened to deal with LAM’s impending crises. Anderson noted that just as “IBM has had to transform itself to survive in a business environment that had changed dramatically,” so also LAM needed to face “issues crucial to [its] future as a mission” (Anderson 1997). The organizational vision crisis was in part attributable to
LAM’s 1971 decision to nationalize all its ministries. The mission now had to decide, “Was LAM content to rest on its laurels and simply supply missionaries to its partner entities as it had been doing for the past few decades, or would it reinvent itself?” In other words, “Where was LAM heading?” LAM needed to decide between a strategic vision and maintaining the status quo.

LAM also faced an organizational identity crisis. This might be framed, “What was LAM in an era of nationalized ministries?” Or from an insider’s perspective, “What are we as an organization?” “What does it mean to be a LAM missionary?” “What kind of pastoral or professional care should we expect from LAM?” Some LAM missionaries realized that fundamental changes had occurred in LAM’s organizational culture. It was less personal, less collegial, and less familial (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:69). On the other hand, many LAM missionaries were seemingly unconcerned about these broader, organizational issues. They appeared content to be seconded to partner ministries and to simply let LAM be a conduit for support. LAM faced the choice between being a people in missional movement as they had been at times in the past or an atomized collection of individuals who simply worked under the same organizational umbrella.

The leadership crisis could be phrased in the following questions: “Where will the new leaders for LAM come from?” “Was there a place in LAM for younger missionaries to exercise leadership?” “How would this be accomplished?” “Who was willing to do administrative work at headquarters where many felt disconnected from the excitement of being a field missionary?” In other words, if LAM were to address its organizational issues, it would need quality leaders to guide and inspire the organization. Without responding adequately to the need for developing younger leaders, organizations
stagnate and eventually lose the ability to function. LAM was faced with a choice between focusing on managers to maintain the organization or leaders who would create fundamental change.

Although TF2 confirmed the challenges LAM faced, it did not solve them. When TF2 was over, no one went away satisfied. A start had been made but nothing was resolved. Much time, prayer, talk, and effort still remained before a complete turnaround could be accomplished. While some favorable changes have occurred in the intervening years, much remains to be done. For its part, TF2 recommended action steps in four areas impacting the Board of Trustees, the administration, the formation of Latin leaders in Latin America, and the care of existing missionaries (See Chapter 6). These action steps remain challenges for LAM and will be incorporated into several proposals (See Chapter 8). TF2 became a significant personal impetus for the author’s missiological studies and provided the focus for this dissertation.

In light of contemporary challenges, LAM should look back to understand its history, strengths, weaknesses, vision, theology, core values, identity, culture, and leadership, in order to inform effectual ministry in the future. What has LAM gone through and why? What has it learned and where is it heading? What did LAM leave undone? What were the implied theories of evangelism and leadership behind the major movements and organizational phases? What theological assumptions can be seen in the way ministry was carried out? What changes could be made to facilitate continued productivity? What insights could such a process of historical organizational analysis yield for other mission agencies? These are the types of questions that led to this study’s research questions to be delineated below.
Statement of the Problem

As this study demonstrates, LAM is missiologically important. The lack of a critical, comprehensive history of LAM written primarily from an organizational perspective was a significant gap in mission history. Without such a study it is difficult for younger LAM leaders to fully understand the lessons of the organization’s past history and what these might teach for LAM’s future effectiveness.

Viewing history from an organizational perspective focuses primarily on the organization’s culture as seen in its primary leaders, its activities, and its average workers. Such a cultural analysis illuminates: (1) how “subcultural dynamics” work within the organization; (2) how new technology might influence the organization; (3) how to manage “across national and ethnic boundaries;” and (4) how organizations learn, develop, and plan change in the face of an organizational culture that resists change (Schein 1992:xii-xiv). An organizational perspective reveals organizational culture insights in: “(1) visible artifacts; (2) espoused values, rules, and behavioral norms; and (3) tacit, basic underlying assumptions” (Schein 1992:47).

Broadly stated, the problem this study addresses is how to use organizational history to inform and direct the organizational future of a mission agency as it responds to changes in the external operating environment. Specifically, this study is focused on the problems of organizational vision, identity, leadership, and, to a lesser degree, theology, while documenting LAM’s history primarily from an organizational perspective. This historical documentation looks at LAM’s organizational culture and processes, LAM’s major leaders, a sampling of stories about ordinary LAM missionaries,
major events, obvious theological assumptions, and significant missiological contributions. Following the process of historical documentation and analysis, and based in part on insights gained from the study, a series of proposals are set forth designed to guide LAM and mission organization’s like LAM into effective ministry in the coming decades.

**Research Questions**

As the organizational history was documented, three key research questions encompassing organizational vision, organizational identity and organizational leadership, and related sub-questions, guided the study and filtered the data in anticipation of the proposals developed at the conclusion. These three categories were derived from authoritative organizational theorists, i.e. McGregor 1960, Likert 1961, Drucker 1974, Greiner 1978, Peters and Waterman 1982, Schein 1992, Kouzes and Posner 1995, and Denison 1997, who have demonstrated their importance for organizational effectiveness. A fourth subordinate research question, theology, was also considered in a limited manner, particularly as it related to organizational motivation.

First, “How does the data illuminate LAM’s need for a guiding organizational vision that facilitates effective ministry in the coming decades?” The following sub-questions were also helpful: “What have been LAM’s ‘visions’ in the past?” “In light of LAM’s history, what strengths and weaknesses does LAM bring into the coming decades?” “Based on LAM’s past, what might be an appropriate vision and set of core values capable of pointing it into the future?” “How does a seconding organization like LAM maintain the balance between its organizational needs and those of its partner
agencies, particularly in terms of vision, personnel and strategic initiatives?” “How should a mission organization like LAM function in today’s Latin America?”

Second, “How does the data address the need for a clear, healthy, workable and satisfying organizational identity?” The following sub-questions also proved to be insightful: “How have LAM missionaries perceived themselves in the past?” “How would LAM missionaries have described the LAM culture when they entered the organization?” “How would they describe it now?” “What are the needs of newer, younger missionaries which the mission must address?”

The third key research question was, “How does the data address the need for continually raising up, training, and utilizing new leaders capable of leading the organization into effective ministry in the coming decades?” Related questions were: “How has LAM raised up leaders in the past and what could be done today to train younger missiologically and organizationally informed leaders?” “How does mission leadership and oversight relate to the needs of younger missionaries and the reduction of missionary attrition?” “What kind of leadership does LAM need today?” “Does the practice of seconding missionaries discourage quality leaders from applying to or continuing with LAM?”

While the first three research questions form the bulk of this study, a fourth was considered in a subordinated fashion, “What theological beliefs were organizationally motivating?” Associated questions were, “What were LAM’s theological beliefs as taught or preached?” “How did these beliefs impact programs and strategies?” “Have theological emphases changed over time?” “How has LAM responded to theological
currents and debates?” “In what way does theology relate to effectiveness in a mission agency?”

These questions were used to highlight how LAM dealt with these issues in the past. Based in part on these insights, proposals have been generated for the future.

Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the body of missiological knowledge in three areas. First, it contributes to the general historical body of knowledge by documenting the history of this missiologically significant organization in a critical and comprehensive manner. There are few texts available which tell any part of the LAM story and none that treat it critically and comprehensively over this length of time or from a predominantly organizational perspective. Second, this study demonstrates a generalizable analytical process that can be applied to other mission agencies needing to understand their past in order to guide their future. Third, the series of proposals described in chapter eight may enable mission agencies like LAM to respond proactively in their contemporary context to changes in the external environment.

Delimitations

This study is focused primarily on the history and ministry of LAM. As such, the claims made herein are not necessarily applicable to every other mission agency. Nevertheless, this study illustrates a process for doing historical organizational analysis that can contribute to the informed organizational rethinking of mission agencies in general.
This study does not endeavor to give an exhaustive history of LAM. It is comprehensive, however, in the sense that it noted critical organizational issues such as vision, identity, leadership, and, in a limited manner, theology throughout LAM’s history. This is accomplished by highlighting LAM’s major leaders, its organizational culture and processes, and presenting a sampling of stories about ordinary LAM missionaries, major events, noteworthy driving theological convictions or vision, and significant missiological contributions. This study reviews the years from LAM’s founding in 1921 to 1998, when the current LAM president assumed his post. A contemporary picture of LAM is also presented without a full organizational analysis (See Chapter 7).

This research does not depend on whether LAM actually implements the proposals. Again, part of the intention was to display a process by which a mission agency could be analyzed. Then, based on this analysis, a series of proposals are presented as possible appropriate responses to the given contemporary and anticipated ministry environment.

**Audience**

Although the primary audience is LAM stakeholders, it is assumed that the mission history, the process of analysis, and the insights generated herein, can be helpful to students of mission, mission executives, and leaders of other visional movements who need to understand their own past in order to refocus for effective ministry in the coming decades.
Data Collection

In order to address the problems of vision, identity, leadership, and theology, this study utilized a qualitative approach. “Qualitative implies that the data are in the form of words as opposed to numbers” (Rudestam & Newton 1992:31). Information in the form of verbal or written accounts, reviews, reports, testimonies, stories, etc., were collected from a number of sources described below. The data was then presented in the form of “words/descriptions that are intended to accurately reflect the situation under study” (Leedy 1997:105).

The qualitative research design yields an interpretive narrative striving to “capture the complexity of the phenomenon under study” (Leedy 1997:108). Accordingly, this study documented LAM’s history primarily from an organizational perspective by telling its story in narrative form highlighting the major periods of its approximately 80 years of existence. Particular weight was given to those parts of its history illuminating the four key research areas of vision, identity, leadership, and theology.

In order to access the necessary information, data was collected from three sources. First, relevant information was gathered from library and archival research. The LAM archives held in the Billy Graham Center, Wheaton, Illinois were made available to the author. Data related to the primary research questions were documented and analyzed throughout the study (Booth, Colomb & Williams 1995:158).

Second, interviews and surveys were conducted with selected missionaries and former leaders (See Appendix B and C). As with all interviews, the interviewer attempted a critical analysis of the accuracy and genuineness of the testimony being
given (Barzun & Graff 1992:157). At times verification was achieved through multiple subject interviews and the use of multiple data sources.

Third, participant observation was utilized based upon the author’s own experiences with LAM and ethnographic observations made at LAM’s most recent ten year “all mission” gathering called FamilyFest (See Chapter 7). Ethnographic insights are generated as the participant observer “moves back and forth between specific events recounted in [the] fieldnotes and more general concepts of interest to [the] discipline” under consideration (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw 1995:169).

Besides documenting LAM’s history, this study analyzes data pertinent to emerging cultural and missiological trends affecting the mission’s vision, identity, leadership and theology. The result is focused on LAM’s constituency and the contemporary needs of its host countries, particularly Costa Rica. The information was distilled from pertinent books, studies and articles. Additional data was also collected from the job descriptions of Latin ministries requesting LAM missionaries.

Theoretical Framework Used to Interpret the Data

The general theoretical framework is based on: 1) Edgar H. Schein’s (1992) work concerning organizational culture and leadership, 2) Daniel R. Denison’s (1997) composite model of corporate culture and organizational effectiveness, and 3) Larry E. Greiner’s (1972) work on profiling an organization’s past to yield clues for its future. These theoretical frameworks provide a consistent tool for understanding the processes involved in profiling an organization historically and then creating a strategy of transformation. This study uses these models at various stages in LAM’s history as a
means of evaluating the data in light of other organizational studies. Particular attention is given to LAM’s vision, identity, leadership, and, to a lesser degree, theology during various time periods. These models are used both individually and in a composite manner.

Organizational Culture and Effectiveness

Denison’s study confirmed several existing theories on organizational effectiveness set forth by such theorists as Likert (1961), McGregor (1960), Peters and Waterman (1982), Deal and Kennedy (1982), Katz and Kahn’s (1978), Locke (1968), and Weick (1979). Denison conducted both quantitative and qualitative research through a study that brought together both the case method and the comparative method (Denison 1997:3). He gathered behavioral and “financial performance data from 34 large corporations in an attempt to predict future performance,” and did in-depth case studies on five of them (Denison 1997:20). His findings validated theories on organizational effectiveness in the four broad areas of mission (vision in this study), involvement and consistency (taken together as identity in this study), and adaptability (sometimes referred to as innovation in this study). Dennison’s composite model of these theories is used as an overall filter through which to process the historical and contemporary data collected (See Figure 1-1 and Figure 1-2). Additionally, Denison (1997:6) and Schein (1992:89) both affirmed the importance of underlying beliefs, referred to as theology in this study.

First, based on the research of such authors as Likert (1961) and McGregor (1960) (See Chapter 2), Denison considered the level of involvement an organization achieved among its members in such areas as organizational values, practices and goals. He correlated member involvement in the organization, which created a “sense of ownership
and responsibility” (Denison 1997:7), with the competitiveness and effectiveness a company could likely achieve.
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**Figure 1-1 Past, Present, and Future**

This study’s *identity* category correlates Denison’s *involvement* component with what others refer to as organizational culture (Schein 1992), identity, and values (See Figure 1-1). As the LAM history was documented, particular attention was given to the relative levels of involvement, enthusiasm, commitment, organizational culture, and sense of “family” evidenced by LAM missionaries.

Second, drawing upon Peters and Waterman (1982) (See Chapter 2), and Deal and Kennedy (1982), Denison’s *consistency* component assessed the degree to which an organization’s core values permeate its inner workings and direct its activities. “A shared
system of beliefs, values, and symbols, widely understood by an organization’s members, has a positive impact on their ability to reach consensus and carry out coordinated actions” (Denison 1997:8).
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**Figure 1-2  Culture and Effectiveness Model**

In this study *consistency* correlates roughly to *theology*, with its focus on organizational beliefs, as well as overlapping with this study’s *identity* rubric. Agreement on organizational values and beliefs is

the most mystical explanation of why an organization’s culture should affect its performance. Nonetheless, strongly held beliefs, a sense of mission, or the consistency that comes from a set of shared values and beliefs do provide a fundamental basis for coordinated action within an organizations. (Denison 1997:5-6)

While such core beliefs may be stated as *ideology* in a secular setting, in a religious context they may become *theology* (Schein 1992:89). In a Christian mission organization
theology reinforces “what is considered heroic and desirable . . . thus creating an ideology that unites into a coherent whole the various assumptions about the nature of human nature, the nature of relationships, and the nature of society itself” (Schein 1992:89).

Close attention is paid to the consistency between what LAM claimed its values, theology, and purposes were at various stages, as compared to the actual events, energy, time, money and personnel devoted to those ends. At times this category even overlaps with leadership theories which critiqued the consistency of the organization’s leaders in enacting the organization’s stated values, beliefs, policies, and practices.

Third, as in Katz and Kahn’s (1978) (See Chapter 2) work, Denison’s adaptability component measured the ability of the company to respond to new demands and opportunities. This category considered an organization’s capacity for change in the face of a changing environment. While not treated as a separate category, this study does document those times when LAM clearly innovated or adapted in the face of new opportunities, and also those times when it resisted adaptation. These responses impacted both LAM’s vision and leadership.

Fourth, Denison’s mission component, which was alluded to by Locke (1968), Drucker (1974), Weick (1979), Kouzes and Posner (1995), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Collins and Porras (1994) (See Chapter 2), spoke not only to the existence of a strategic plan, but to the ability of leadership to communicate that vision. Having a plan was insufficient if leaders were unable to cast it in a manner others could understand and embrace (Denison 1997:195-196).
For the study at hand, mission theories are treated under the more contemporary word vision so as to reserve the use of the word mission for the mission organization itself. Evidence of LAM’s ability to generate and communicate a compelling vision to its constituency is documented at various historical stages.

Below this overall level of abstraction based on Denison’s composite Organizational Culture and Effectiveness Model, this study relies on Schein’s insights and structure for profiling organizations. Schein wrote that organizational culture concerns “shared basic assumptions that the group learned” in the past as it solved problems and that were considered valid enough “to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (1992:12). These are the core values and nonnegotiables organizations believe are necessary for survival. While this culture often exists just below the observable surface, it is the guiding force determining overall organizational effectiveness. In large measure this is true because “cultural assumptions evolve around all aspects of a group’s relationship to its external environment” (Schein 1992:68).

Historical Context

Schein believed that one must understand the culture of an organization thoroughly before an appropriate intervention can be designed. His overall approach was to “identify the issues that any group faces from the moment of its origin through to its state of maturity and decline” in an evolutionary manner (Schein 1992:51). In order to discover a group’s cultural assumptions, Schein looked at historical roots (Schein 1992:48). The motivation for this historical study, however, was done out of a contemporary need to respond to changes in the operating environment (Schein 1992:48,
Likewise, this study, motivated by LAM’s contemporary need to respond to a changing environment, evaluates LAM history utilizing Schein’s evolutionary paradigm, which will be spelled out below.

Schein noted that ”organizations do not form accidentally or spontaneously” (1992:212). Rather they are created by individuals with a specific goal in mind that requires the “coordinated and concerted action of a number of people” working to “accomplish something that individual action cannot” (Schein 1992:212). The “founders usually have a major impact on how the group initially defines and solves its external adaptation and internal integration problems” (Schein 1992:212). In fact, “one could argue that the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture and that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to understand and work with culture” (Schein 1992:5). In order to truly understand an organization one must pay particular attention to the role of the primary leaders in the formation of the agency and in its ensuing development. Thus, in this study organizational leadership is one of the three primary research areas that is traced and analyzed.

Since leaders are so important, it is vital to understand some of the story surrounding the creation of the mission agency under consideration—in this case, LAM. This study, therefore, places special emphasis on LAM’s most significant leaders, since they played the greatest part in either creating or managing LAM’s culture.

Crisis events and how leaders respond to them are another significant window into an organization’s past (Schein 1992:237). During such times of heightened emotional involvement, group learning occurs and culture is created (Schein 1992:237). In light of
this, the historical documentation focuses on what appeared to be the mission agency’s most significant events and ministries.

In reconstructing the history of an organization one must also be aware of the various stages that many organizations traverse. As time passes, the interplay between the external culture and the dominant organizational culture impact the life and effectiveness of the organization. Given an extended length of time, most organizations pass through the growth stages of founding and early growth, midlife, and maturity and decline (Schein 1992:304) (See Figure 1-3). At each of these stages the culture and issues dealt with will vary.
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Figure 1-3 Organizational Growth Stages

For LAM the founding and early growth stage includes the period from its beginning in 1921 to 1945, when co-founder Harry Strachan died. 1946 to 1965 was
LAM’s *early* to *midlife* period when R. K. Strachan led, and Evangelism in Depth (EID) was launched. LAM’s *midlife* to *maturity and decline*, 1966 to present, included LAM’s latinization effort (CLAME) in 1971, and its post-latinization direct ministry effort, Christ For the City (CFC) (1984 to 1995). Each of these major stages in LAM history are described and evaluated in terms of the key research topics.

Expanding on Schein’s growth stages, during the *founding and early growth* of an organization, “the main cultural thrust comes from the founders and their assumptions” (Schein 1992:303). For LAM this means understanding the roles of its founders, Harry and Susan Strachan, and the values they embedded in the mission.

During this early period one of the most significant crises is the transition from founder to a second-generation chief executive officer. Even if that person is the founder’s son, daughter, or some other trusted family member, it is in the nature of founder entrepreneurs to have difficulty giving up what they have created. (Schein 1992:310)

For LAM, this transition occurred after the death of Harry Strachan (1945), during which time Susan Strachan and their son R. Kenneth Strachan shared power. After his mother’s death (1950), R. Kenneth Strachan became the agency’s sole director.

The occasion of the transition from a family-controlled organization to one in which others lead, signals the entrance into *midlife* (Schein 1992:313). At this point the organizational culture is often taken for granted (Schein 1992:314), and, in fact, multiple subcultures may have developed. Deciding what to change and what to maintain in order to accomplish organizational goals becomes the primary strategic decision leaders face during this phase (Schein 1992:332). For LAM, this leadership transition from the Strachan family to a trusted insider occurred when Horace “Dit” Fenton became General Director of the mission in 1965, upon Kenneth Strachan’s death.
In time, organizations can stagnate or decline, thus entering the *maturity and potential decline* period (Schein 1992:321). This appears to be the phase in which many mission agencies of the same approximate age as LAM currently find themselves. Despite historic successes, the inability or unwillingness to deal with culture assumptions and changes in the environment can sidetrack an organization (Schein 1992:321). Often what worked so well for the organization in the past hampers it from embracing the future. The company needs to reacquire the *fire* or vision that once made it relevant but has been allowed to slip into obscurity. Schein suggests that rapid cultural transformation, or even cultural destruction followed by cultural reorganization, may be necessary (Schein 1992:322; Wallace 1956). The responsible choice for the mature mission organization is to proactively embrace organizational transformation.
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*Figure 1-4 Phases of Organizational Growth and Crises*
The third model used in this study is Greiner’s theory of organizational
development for profiling organizations (Greiner 1972) (See Figure 1-4). He approached
organizational history from a slightly different perspective than either Denison or Schein.
According to Greiner, an organization’s history shapes its future growth (Greiner
1972:38). The choices it makes at one stage of development will become both its current
solution and its future problem (Greiner 1972:40).

Greiner built his model around five dimensions that help determine the phase of
development in which an organization is situated. He measured (1) the age of the
organization, (2) its size, (3) the stages of evolution that connotated times of relative
stability where things were progressing smoothly in an evolutionary fashion, (4) the
stages of revolution that identified times of traumatic and revolutionary upheaval in the
organization, and (5) the growth rate of the industry (Greiner 1972:38-39).

Based on these five dimensions Greiner described a series of five organizational
phases that could be passed through, and the attendant management styles and
organizational structures for each one. These phases include (1) growth through
creativity, which is interrupted by a crisis of leadership, (2) growth through direction,
which results in a crisis of autonomy, (3) growth through delegation, which precipitates a
crisis of control, (4) growth through coordination, which leads to a crisis of red tape, and
(5) growth through collaboration, which could lead to an unknown crisis (Greiner
1972:41). At each stage of documentation in this study, Greiner’s model is overlaid on
LAM’s historical development, eliciting insights on the mission’s growth and crises.
Contemporary Cultural Context

Both Denison and Schein’s methodology looked not only at the organization under study from a historical perspective, but also evaluated its current ability to interact effectively with its environment. In LAM’s case the contemporary cultural analysis overlaps with the mature growth stage described above.

Schein suggested that clues to the organization’s current status could be gained through interviews that would focus on surprises, hunches, joint explanations, and systemic searches for corroborating evidence (Schein 1992:171-175). In addition to interviews and other forms of research, Schein would look for clues in the organization’s structural choices (Schein 1992:180), and its “myths, legends, stories, and charters” (Schein 1992:182).

After documenting LAM historically, this study considers contemporary data from three general sources in order to understand LAM’s current status and challenges. First, insights gleaned from interviews and surveys with several key LAM leaders and typical LAM missionaries (See Appendix B and C), articles, emails and books related to LAM are synthesized, producing a composite profile of LAM in recent years. Second, expert analysis concerning trends affecting mission agencies’ current and future constituents, including mobilization patterns and missionary attrition, are incorporated. Special consideration is given to a World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF) study (Taylor 1997) on missionary attrition and generational attitude shifts occurring among younger missionaries. Third, data is distilled from articles and books about the Latin American context, focusing on pertinent contemporary trends impacting mission organizations. More weight is given to the country of Costa Rica, since it hosts roughly half of LAM’s
mission force. Guided by the four key research categories of vision, identity, leadership, and theology, this information is correlated with LAM’s ability to minister effectively as a mission organization.

Organizational Transformation

After relating and analyzing LAM’s history on the basis of the methodology and models described above, this study elaborates a series of proposals applying them specifically to LAM. These proposals address needs which this study identifies for organizational transformation in the areas of vision, identity, leadership, and, to a minor degree, theology. The theoretical basis for developing these proposals relies heavily on the work of Denison (1997), Schein (1992), Greiner (1972), as noted above, and Pansegrouw (1996).

“Culture and leadership are two sides of the same coin,” wrote Schein (1992:15). Although leaders “first create culture” when they form groups, culture, when it has formed, will “determine the criteria for leadership and thus determine who will or will not be a leader” (Schein 1992:15). Hence, the proposals deal specifically with existing cultural assumptions as well as the type of leadership needed.

Change becomes necessary when an organization’s assumptions and operations are no longer effective in accomplishing its goals or vision, either internally—in terms of its members, or externally—in terms of the environment. The role of leadership is to “perceive the functional and dysfunctional elements of the existing culture and to manage cultural evolution and change in such a way that the group can survive in a changing environment” (Schein 1992:15). Leadership sees the needs of the agency—both its strengths and weaknesses—and has a vision of where it could or should be.
Expanding on the idea of transformational leadership, Pansegrouw (1996:521-524) identified seven basic tasks of leaders, which shed light on the leadership research question. First they must be personally committed to the process of transformation. Second, leaders must communicate the “impossibility of maintaining the status quo” (Pansegrouw 1996:523). Third, the leader must create an alternative vision of what the group could become. Fourth, a critical mass of support must be garnered. Fifth, resistance to the proposed changes must be dealt with honestly. Sixth, an organization capable of implementing the vision being espoused must be defined and set up. Seventh,
as the new paradigm is embraced, information about progress should be communicated, and those who are accomplishing the transition ought to be recognized and rewarded (See Chapter 8 for a fuller treatment of Pansegrouw’s analysis.)

Pansegrouw’s model demonstrates that superficial solutions are inadequate for organizational crises occurring at the organizational culture level. LAM needs to rethink its vision, identity, leadership, and in some cases its theology. Proactively embracing change by implementing a process such as Pansegrouw describes requires not only a paradigm shift, but paradigm shifters as well. Thus, leadership is critical to successfully transition an organization into a new paradigm.

In addition to the theory of transformational leadership, Pansegrouw provides a “Situational Leadership for Transformation Model” (See Figure 1-5). Based on Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership model, Pansegrouw indicates not only the type of leadership needed, but also takes into account the current attitudinal status of the organization itself (Pansegrouw 1996:532). He suggests this model should “be used to determine the appropriate transformational leadership strategy in terms of the mix of structuring and inspiring actions for the diagnosed level of organizational readiness” (Pansegrouw 1996:532). In other words, attention must be given to the type of leadership needed, the status of the mission itself, and the new direction in which the agency should be going. In a mission agency’s case it affects its mission (what it is and what it does), its mobilization (the way in which it achieves its goals through human resources, including leaders, structure, and systems), and its ministry (the specific activities in which its members engage).
Finally, insights based on Greiner’s model of organizational development are considered. Based on his study of the growth phases through which organizations pass, he noted that organizations desiring to move ahead “must consciously introduce planned structures that not only are solutions to a current crisis but also are fitted to the next phase of growth” (Greiner 1972:45). Thus, the proposals incorporate suggestions for moving LAM to Greiner’s next developmental phase.

Summary

In summary, this study relies heavily on models from Denison (1997) and Schein (1992) for understanding organizational culture and leadership as it interprets the data collected. Theories from Schein (1992) and Greiner (1972) are used to evaluate and analyze LAM’s historical periods and its current organizational context. The proposals for a refocused mission agency look not only to these models, but also to Pansegrouw’s theoretical model (1996).

Missiological Assumptions

The following missiological assumptions inform this study’s research.

Missionaries as Sent Ones

This study makes the theological assumption that God is a missionary God and his church is a missionary church (Allen 1962:97; Bosch 1991:372). The Bible affirms that God the Father sent Jesus Christ the Son into the world to bring eternal life to those who would believe (John 3:16). Likewise, the Holy Spirit has been sent in the Son’s name to the church (John 14:26) in order to empower and guide believers in effective witness that bears fruit (John 15:16). Jesus specifically commissioned his disciples to
spread the good news throughout all the world (Matthew 28:18-20). Thus, “as God sent Jesus Christ into the world, so the church, the body of Christ, is sent into the world to continue Christ’s mission” (Snyder 1997a:646).

While the task of sharing the gospel belongs to every believer, some have been set apart by God and his church to do this in a more deliberate, focused and strategic manner in cross-cultural settings. What are today called *missionaries* are vocational messengers “with a message from God, sent forth by divine authority for the definite purpose of evangelism, church-founding and church edification” (Peters 1972:248). Although some missionaries might work alone, the biblical pattern would seem to indicate that groups of believers functioned together as a sort of missionary band. For instance, the Apostle Paul’s missionary team was sent out from the local church in Antioch (Acts 13:2-3), to which they latter returned (Acts 14:26-27). This example indicates the intimate connection that should exist between sending congregations and the missionaries sent out from them. Additionally, it is important to recognize that these missionary bands existed and functioned as specialized organizations in order to spread the gospel.

**Sodality and Modality**

Based on the theology described above, this study assumes there is a proper role for mission agencies in the economy of God and the ministry of the local church. Ralph Winter has suggested that throughout history there have always been some kind of *modality*, “a structured fellowship in which there is no distinction of sex or age,” and also some kind of a *sodality*, “a structured fellowship in which membership involves an adult second decision beyond modality membership” (Winter 1999:224). This second commitment beyond the commitment to a local fellowship is typically accompanied by
some sort of advanced competency. It involves participation with other “similarly-committed Christian brothers and sisters” (Mellis 1976:6). Snyder states, “Parachurch organizations are a type of voluntary society” that can “help the church fulfill its mission in the world, whether in evangelism, compassionate service or social justice” (Snyder 1997c:726-727).

Under this paradigm a denomination or local congregation would be seen as a modality, while a mission agency is a sodality. Mission-focused groups or movements often flow out of denominations and local congregations, and while being distinct from them, nevertheless are still a sort of organized composite of many local congregations and individuals united in outreach. “The modality/sodality approach may be seen as a systematization or elaboration of the ecclesiola in ecclesia pattern”—a little church within the larger church (Snyder 1997b:53). In this sense, they are indeed part of the church. Thus, there is both sameness and distinctness between the contemporary mission agency and its local counterpart, the congregation.

Excellence and Effectiveness

Excellence and effectiveness are measures of the ability of an organization to fulfill its mission. Peters and Waterman viewed organizational excellence in terms of companies continually innovating in response to changing environments (Peters & Waterman 1982:12-13). Denison saw organizational effectiveness as “a function of the interrelation of core values and beliefs, organizational policies and practices, and the business environment of the organization” (Denison 1990:6). In order to proactively maintain this responsive posture, Gouillart and Kelly maintained that organizations must
intentionally transform themselves and thus continue “to achieve a common set of goals” (Gouillart & Kelly 1995:25).

This study assumes that organizational effectiveness is desirable for at least two reasons: first, for the benefit of the recipients who will be touched by God through his servants and the good works performed, and second, for the health and well being of missionaries themselves. The gospel is worthy of one’s best effort. The model for a missionary organization should be Jesus Christ, who not only accomplished his task, but also treated both insiders and outsiders with respect. The missionary organization should demonstrate elements of both excellence and effectiveness.

**Organizational Behavior**

This study assumes that Christian mission agencies can learn from secular organizational behavior studies. In making this assumption, it is recognized that some Christian colleagues may have legitimate concerns. George Hunter notes that “some church leaders resist insights from the literatures of leadership, management, and organization effectiveness,” since in many ways the church is a distinct type of organization (Hunter 2000:21). Although written primarily concerning local church pastors, his remarks are equally applicable to their mission agency counterparts (McKaughin 2001).

Though the church is indeed a unique type of organization, resistance to learning from others is unfortunate for two reasons. First, it ignores the fact that the majority of Christians work in the so-called secular realm and are not clergy. It should be remembered that most Christians [stay] in their own towns and neighborhoods, raising their families and living ‘peaceful and quiet lives in all godliness and holiness’ (1 Tim
2:2), witnessing to Christ by their deeds and lives. They [become] the spiritual and material support base for those whom God commissioned to carry the good news to other people. This [is] their mission, and it [is] a key part of the broader missionary outreach of the Christian community. (Snyder 1997d:651)

Their vocation, and the insights generated therein, can be helpful to those who work in Christian organizations.

Second, negative perceptions about learning from the \textit{secular} world demonstrate a lack of understanding about how organizations function. Congregations and mission societies are gatherings of people who have a common vision and purpose. Unless a person is content to work alone and thus accomplish little in life, things will be done by groups. “Christian leaders must aspire to multiply and maximize the results of their service by accomplishing more through leading others than they could ever accomplish by themselves” (Galloway 1999:56). Organizations allow people to get more done.

The church, and her related ministries, is a community of people doing ministry together. These committed Christian communities (Mellis 1976:6) form their own group identity and culture. This process is basically the same in the religious realm as it is in the corporate world. While there are important distinctions and motivations to be maintained, there is nonetheless nothing to fear. Lessons, filtered through a framework of Christian values, can be gleaned from those who have studied the phenomena of leaders and those they lead.

\textbf{Summary}

Together, these missiological assumptions provide an underlying framework for this study’s analysis and proposals. At heart, what is assumed is that mission agencies are a part of the plan of God for reaching the world with the message of Jesus Christ. As people working together toward common goals, mission organizations can glean insights
from corporate entities on how best to excel at attaining the purposes for which they were created.

**Definitions**

1. **Mission, Mission Agencies, Mission Organizations**

   These terms refer to any Christian organization engaged in cross-cultural service and witness. Nowadays, these sending groups can be found in many countries that until recently only received missionaries.

2. **Missionaries**

   *Missionaries* in this study refers to those people working in cross-cultural ministry. While recognizing there are missionaries who work independently, this study focuses on those who have aligned themselves with a mission organization.

3. **Organizational Perspective**

   This study normally describes and analyzes history from an organizational perspective. This means that the primary focus is on organizational culture, organizational vision, organizational identity, organizational leadership, and organizational theology as seen in its primary leaders, major organizational activities, and lives of average workers. An organizational perspective reveals organizational culture insights in: “(1) visible artifacts; (2) espoused values, rules, and behavioral norms; and (3) tacit, basic underlying assumptions” (Schein 1992:47).

4. **Organizational Culture**

   Schein defines culture as those patterns of basic assumptions that have been created or discovered by an organization as it copes with its problems and that are
deemed valid enough “to be taught to new members as the correct way” to behave (Schein 1992:12). These assumptions form the values that “are the basic concepts and beliefs of an organization” (Deal & Kennedy 1982:14), i.e. the way things are done around here. A strong organizational culture would be one in which this system of informal rules and values “spells out how people are to behave most of the time” (Deal & Kennedy 1982:15).

5. Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational effectiveness is the extent to which the action and activities of an organization achieves its stated objectives, purposes, and goals (French & Saward 1975:137).

6. Organizational Vision

Organizational vision is the shared “definition of the function and purpose of the organization,” which then provides organizational purpose, meaning, and direction (Denison 1997:13).

7. Organizational Identity

Organizational identity is the self-perception of the group’s members as displayed in their degree of involvement and ownership in the organization, and in the consistency produced by a strong organizational culture (Denison 1997:7-9).

8. Organizational Leadership

Organizational leadership concerns the ability of leaders to create, manage, and work within a given organization’s culture (Schein 1992:5). Leaders direct and influence others to work toward accomplishing organizational goals.
9. Organizational Theology

In this study organizational theology will refer to those doctrines and beliefs that were explicitly or implicitly used to motivate the organization or which represent underlying theological assumptions that the organization made in its various programs (Denison 1997:5; Schein 1992:89).

10. Organizational Transformation

Organizational transformation is a term referring to major revitalization attempts, typically for the purpose of becoming organizationally effective once again. As opposed to the incremental change process that characterizes daily organizational life, organizational transformation often involves a profound rediscovery of an organization’s core values and passion. This rekindled vision impacts “the organization itself, its parts, and their relationships” to one another (Beckhard & Pritchard 1992:3).

11. Seconding

Seconding refers to the practice of some mission organizations whereby various personnel are temporarily loaned (“seconded”) to other ministries or agencies for a period of time. This creates a situation wherein the missionary is theoretically accountable to both organizations.

12. Mission’s Constituency

A mission’s constituency are those people who are either currently involved with the mission in some capacity, such as missionaries and their families, supporters and friends, administrators, board members, former missionaries, and those future
stakeholders who could become involved should they so choose, i.e. potential missionaries and supporters.

13. LAM

LAM is the acronym for Latin America Mission, an agency formed in 1921 for continent wide evangelization and for encouraging the Latin American church and its ministries.

14. TF2

TF2 is the abbreviation for Task Force 2, a strategic meeting convened in August 1997 for the purpose of discussing the future of LAM and the need to involve younger leadership in the mission. Much of the personal motivation for doing this study arose as a result of being a member of this task force.

15. EID

EID stands for Evangelism In Depth. This was developed by R. Kenneth Strachan, and it became LAM’s best-known attempt at countrywide evangelistic work. EID, which began in the late 1950s, was based upon Strachan’s famous dictum, “The expansion of any movement is in direct proportion to its success in mobilizing its total membership in continuous propagation of its beliefs” (R. Strachan 1968:108). EID networked and trained people in the local church, and then brought all of the participants together for mass evangelistic campaigns and public parades (See Chapter 4).

16. CLAME

CLAME stands for Comunidad Latinoamericana de Ministerios Evangélicos (Community of Evangelical Ministries in Latin America). CLAME was a Latin organization formed in LAM’s deliberate attempt in 1971 to transform itself from a
traditional mission into a partner agency. LAM divested itself of all direct ministries, turning them over entirely to national leaders. Under the CLAME structure, LAM was simply one of several participating ministries. Although the community existed for mutual cooperation, membership was voluntary and each ministry retained its autonomy (See Chapter 5).

17. CFC, CFCI

Christ for the City (CFC), later known as Christ for the City International (CFCI), was the name of a LAM-sponsored direct ministry involved in urban evangelism and church planting through existing national church entities (See Chapter 6). In 1995 CFCI became an autonomous mission agency, a “sister” organization to LAM.

18. LAE

The Latin America Evangelist (LAE) is LAM’s principle communication device. Begun in 1921 by Harry and Susan Strachan, the LAE has been published for 80 years and is a primary source for LAM history.
Chapter 2

Perspectives on People—Getting Things Done Through Organizations

This study draws primarily upon literature from two fields. First, relevant literature on LAM’s history was analyzed and a comprehensive history written from an organizational perspective. Second, relevant literature on leadership and organizational studies was considered as the framework through which LAM history was analyzed and written, and the proposals generated (See Chapter 8). These sources were mined for insights on the key research areas.

Selected Literature on the Latin America Mission

This section reviews the materials available for reconstructing LAM’s history from an organizational perspective. It should be noted that prior to this study there was no comprehensive history of LAM written from an organizational perspective. The few books that have been written dealt only with particular segments of LAM’s history or work. Hence, there was a need for this study. The following is a description of sources that are available.

Written Documents

The LAM archives, located at the Billy Graham Center, Wheaton, Illinois, are one resource available for reconstructing LAM’s past (Latin America Mission, Collection 236). These archived documents cover the period 1920-1973 and include assorted internal documents, letters, memos, personal correspondence, budgets, minutes, advertisements, and other items related to LAM itself or to one of the ministries that it
began. Documents since 1973 are in the process of being archived, but have not as yet been cataloged. Thus, these are not readily available for analysis.

One of the most vital written records for understanding LAM is the *Latin America Evangelist* (LAE) magazine. LAM founders Harry and Susan Strachan began this periodical in 1921, the same year they began the mission, and it has been published continually to the present day (LAE 1921-2001). Of course, one must read all such magazines with an eye toward their dual purpose of internal communication and external public opinion building. These magazines were reviewed for clues that addressed the key research questions of organizational vision, identity, leadership, and theology. The entire collection of LAE was available for research.

LAM’s handbook for new missionary candidates contains a number of helpful papers (LAM 1993; LAM 2000). It covers the basic principles and government of the mission, the mission’s projected plans, and historical and general background papers related to LAM and its work in Latin America.

W. Dayton Roberts, son-in-law of LAM’s founders, has done the most extensive writing on the Strachan family. His book, *One Step Ahead*, gives the most complete published biographic record of the founders, Harry and Susan Strachan, available (Roberts 1996). It covers not only their lives with respect to LAM, but also their early years as missionaries serving in Argentina with the “Regions Beyond Missionary Union,” prior to forming LAM (Roberts 1996:8). Roberts has also written unpublished manuscripts on both Harry and Susan Strachan (Roberts 1992; Roberts 1993a). Additionally he wrote vignettes of the Strachans for the *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions* (Roberts 1998a; Roberts 1998b) and the *International Bulletin of*
Missionary Research (Roberts 1998d). Ruth Tucker also gave a brief glimpse into the contributions of Harry and Susan Strachan (Tucker 1983:290). These sources were used to help reconstruct LAM’s early days as a mission.

R. Kenneth Strachan, son of Harry and Susan Strachan, became the successor to LAM leadership upon the passing of his father and later, his mother. Kenneth Strachan is by far the best-known and most far-reaching figure in LAM history. His Evangelism In Depth (EID) program, with its famous dictum, “The expansion of any movement is in direct proportion to its success in mobilizing its total membership in continuous propagation of its beliefs” (R. K. Strachan 1968:108), was a significant rediscovery for the missiologists of that day. As such, he is the single most important individual in understanding LAM’s past.

The official biography of Kenneth Strachan was written by Elisabeth Elliot, author and sister of David M. Howard, who was a LAM contemporary of Strachan (Elliot 1968). Her work gave further insights into Harry and Susan Strachan’s family life with their children, and Ken’s inner turmoil as he grew and assumed leadership of LAM.

W. Dayton Roberts wrote on Kenneth Strachan, but focused more upon his intellectual development and the ramifications that this had on his missiological strategies (Roberts 1971). For her part, Ruth Tucker included a lengthy section on Kenneth Strachan in her chapter on new methods and strategies for reaching the world (Tucker 1983:462-467). Finally, current LAM missionary Paul Luciani wrote a Master of Arts thesis on the development of R. K. Strachan into a leader (Luciani 1990). Together, these sources aided this study’s profile of Kenneth Strachan’s life.
Kenneth Strachan’s book, *The Inescapable Calling* (1968), was published posthumously following his untimely death due to Hodgkin’s Disease. Based on a series of lectures given at Fuller Theological Seminary, this book articulated the ideas that had led Strachan to create Evangelism in Depth. Also of interest is Strachan’s defense of the need for active Christian witness in a famous debate with Victor E. W. Hayward (R. K. Strachan 1964a; R. K. Strachan 1964b; Hayward 1964).

In terms of mission strategies, nothing in the LAM’s history has garnered as much attention as Kenneth Strachan’s EID and its subsequent manifestations. In 1961, LAM missionaries told about the early stages of the EID story from their own perspective in *Evangelism-in-Depth* (LAM 1961). This was followed in 1967 by W. Dayton Roberts’ work which gave a more thorough look at EID’s progress over the intervening years (Roberts 1967). Over 20 years later Pretiz and Roberts revisited EID in a book entitled, ‘Like A Mighty Army’: *R. Kenneth Strachan and the Global March of Evangelism-in-Depth*, which not only described the early EID history, but also its subsequent evolution as a worldwide phenomenon (Pretiz & Roberts 1998).

LAM missionary and early EID pioneer Juan Isáis contributed to understanding EID from an insider’s perspective in his book, *The Other Evangelism* (J. Isáis 1989). Isáis went on to work with *Misión Latinoamericana de México* (MILAMEX) (Latin America Mission-Mexico). Additionally, *Goal-Oriented Evangelism-In-Depth* was the title of a short booklet that informed local USA churches how they could apply the EID principles in their settings (IDEA 1973).

In addition to the LAM missionaries who participated in EID, other authors have contributed to its analysis. Writing his Th.M. thesis in 1966, Ray Rosales described and
evaluated EID (Rosales 1968). This work was followed in 1969 by Malcolm Bradshaw’s investigation on the church growth that resulted from EID. More recently, Willys Braun, former EID director for Africa, attempted to trace the roots of the AD 2000 movement, at least in part, to EID (Braun 1993).

Further critique was provided in 1970 by George W. Peters who analyzed available church records and conversion rates from EID campaigns in an attempt to verify its affect on the number of converts. He concluded that most of the professions of faith would have occurred without EID’s efforts (Peters 1970:73). For his part, C. Peter Wagner participated in EID in 1965 while serving as a missionary in Bolivia. He too studied EID’s affect on church growth (Wagner 1971:142, 144) and found fault with EID’s implication that unity was essential to the task of evangelism, even claiming that too much cooperation led to less occurrence of evangelism (Wagner 1979:285). He concluded that EID did not greatly affect church growth.

Since EID cast such a long shadow across LAM’s history, this study devotes careful attention to its analysis. Drawing upon these various sources, it considers the missiological and organizational contributions of EID, as well as any hints that EID may provide for directing LAM’s future plans.

Although Costa Rica is LAM’s primary field, LAM has had a significant presence in Colombia. Of particular importance in understanding LAM’s history is the period of violence, 1948-1958, and the subsequent charismatic outpouring that occurred in Colombia in the middle of the 20th century (U. Padilla 1995:52). Former LAM missionary to Colombia, David Howard, wrote about the struggles of the Colombian evangelicals at that time in his book, *Hammered as Gold* (Howard 1969). This work was
later followed up by an in-depth biography of Victor Landero, one of the principal
Colombian believers involved in the charismatic movement (Owen & Howard 1979). As
a result of his experience with the outpouring, David Howard also wrote a book on the
person of the Holy Spirit in which more of the Colombian story was spelled out (Howard
1973). This topic and other facets of the LAM history in the founding of a Colombian
denomination were also dealt with by author Ubaldo Padilla from a Colombian
perspective (U. Padilla 1995).

The desire for the mission to become more responsive to Latino input could be
seen in a 1954 article by Kenneth Strachan where he wrote, “it would seem that some
way must be found to bring the national church and its leaders into partnership and the
planning and execution of all missionary—not merely church endeavour [sic] in each
respective field” (1954:6). LAM missionary Juan Isáis wrote, in story form, from the
Latino side of the church/mission equation in *The Other Side of the Coin* (Isáis 1966).
Several years after Ken’s death (1965), *Comunidad Latinoamericana de Ministerios
Evangélicos* (CLAME) (Community of Evangelical Ministries in Latin America) was
created. CLAME was the product of LAM’s 1971 attempt to latinize all of its ministries.
As Dayton Roberts noted, CLAME sought to deal with the problem of structuring “a
missionary bridge over the gap between Old World resources and Third World
opportunities” (Roberts 1973:345). At that stage LAM basically became a seconding
mission agency and ceased most of its direct initiatives. Although CLAME’s members
dissolved this Latino organization in 1984, its impact can still be seen in the mentality
and strategies of LAM USA. Pretiz and Roberts provided the most complete record of
this period, along with their subsequent analysis, in *Uncharted Waters* (1997).
Two other LAM ministries warrant mention because of their continuing missiological impact. First is LAM’s summer to two-year intensive missionary exposure program Spearhead, hosted by pastors in Mexico City. Steve Downey shared the story of his experience with Spearhead in the book, *More Than I Imagined* (1987). Second, Christ for the City (CFC) was LAM’s post-CLAME attempt to create a ministry that incorporated the concepts of Evangelism In Depth and a more holistic, local church networked approach to urban evangelism and church planting. There is as yet no single definitive work on this ministry, but it is discussed in Berg and Pretiz (1992:153; 1996a:258-259), Pretiz and Roberts (1998:120-121), and Roberts (1992:193-208; 1993b:15-16). CFC has now separated from LAM to become a sister mission agency, called Christ For the City International (CFCI).

As LAM approached the end of the millennium it faced a crisis. This crisis could be seen in the necessity for a clear-cut vision capable of uniting the LAM and carrying it into the future, and the need for younger leaders (Task Force II 1997). To begin addressing these concerns LAM convened two task forces to discuss these issues. Based on the findings of Task Force I and II, a Strategy Planning Committee convened in 1999 developing “short- and long-range plans for the mission” (Pretiz & Roberts 1999:155).

A final source available for study is Christina Acconero’s dissertation written for Fuller Theological Seminary entitled, “A Mission Organization as Steward: Facing the Tensions Between People and Product.” Her work examined USA mission structures and the problems existing between missionaries doing their work and the impact the structure had on them on a day-to-day basis (Accornero 1998:2). Accornero used LAM as her case
study and set forth the concept of a biblical stewardship of human resources as a possible framework for dealing with the tensions between “people, product, and process of mission” in a mission structure (1998:4). She concluded,

The first responsibility of mission managers is to be stewards of God’s love within the mission organization as choices are made on how to distribute resources, develop personnel, create opportunities for service, and set goals for a particular calling. (Accornero 1998:182)

Her dissertation integrated both biblical theology and organizational theory as a means of addressing the management of human resources.

While the current study also considers implications of “member care,” it primarily focuses on it as related to the larger issues of organizational vision, identity, leadership, and theology. Accornero’s study was helpful in seeing the process by which she wove a brief case study of LAM history together with organizational theories and theological concepts in order to produce her recommendations on managing human resources.

This review of written sources on LAM shows that most of the material focuses on a few key personalities and programs and their evangelistic witness and effectiveness. As this study recounts these people and events, the sources mentioned above have been invaluable. No one, however, had written a careful and comprehensive history of LAM from the perspective of organizational effectiveness highlighting vision, identity, leadership, and theological challenges. This historical study draws not only on these personalities and programs, but other significant LAM leaders, events, missionaries, missiological contributions, and insights derived from the overall LAM organizational culture. Hence, there was a need for this study.
Oral History

Beyond accessible written data, interviews and modified questionnaires were utilized (See Appendix B and C). A number of older missionaries supplied invaluable oral histories about LAM. Several younger missionaries shared their experiences as well. In addition to their insights about LAM’s leaders and major events, their own stories form part of the LAM story and culture. These interviews were conducted by phone, in person, by mail, by email, or a combination of these media (See Appendix B and C).

LAM has had seven presidents, or general directors, over its approximately 80 years of history. The founders, Harry and Susan Strachan, the first directors, as well as their son, R. Kenneth Strachan, the second director, have all passed away. The third director, Horace “Dit” Fenton, is currently alive, but is in very poor health and was unavailable for interviewing. The fourth president, Mike Berg, was resistant to being interviewed in an in-depth manner, supplying only basic data. The fifth president, Paul Landrey, is working with another organization, but he did give his responses to several key questions. The sixth president, David Howard (a LAM contemporary of Kenneth Strachan), was interviewed on multiple occasions. The current president, David Befus, just assumed his post in 1999 and while he did respond to several important questions, a critical evaluation of his tenure fell outside of the historical scope of this study.

During the directorship of R. Kenneth Strachan, a second layer of leadership was created whose leaders have impacted the LAM greatly. In addition to Strachan, the three other associates were David Howard, Paul Pretiz and W. Dayton Roberts, all of whom responded eagerly in supplying insights and recollections for this study.
Concerning more recent history, John Huffman and Chip Anderson were interviewed. They were largely responsible for the success of LAM’s Christ for the City (CFC) program that became autonomous as a sister mission in 1995. CFC was the most progressive ministry LAM had produced since the days of Evangelism in Depth and CLAME, the LAM-initiated nationalization effort.

In addition to these primary leaders, others missionaries were sought out (See Appendix B). Their perspectives were woven into the LAM story and organizational analysis.

Summary

This study draws upon both written and oral sources in documenting LAM’s history from an organizational perspective. In addition to recounting the LAM story, analysis was provided for each of the major historical periods.

Selected Literature in the Field of Leadership and Organizational Studies

Central to this study were the theories and insights of those authors who have written in the field of leadership, organizations, organizational effectiveness and organizational change. Many insights were gleaned from their work that applied in a general manner to the key research questions concerning organizational vision, identity, leadership, and theology. Particularly significant for this study were those authors who focused on human motivation and the creation of a corporate culture capable of satisfying both organizational and personal objectives. Their work over the past decades provided a basis on which to view organizational history and to generate the series of proposals in
chapter eight. Although most studies in these fields have been done in the secular realm, there are many parallels to mission agencies in their function as organizations.

This section reviews the most significant literature on leadership and organizations by grouping them under three of the four research areas: vision, identity and leadership. There is some carryover from one category to the next since vision, identity and leadership do not operate in a vacuum within organizations. Thus, for instance, some authors mentioned under the vision rubric may just as well have been cited under leadership. With the centralizing of the various literature sources under these three umbrella topics, the reader will more readily discern the connection between the sources cited and the study at hand. In this manner one can see the roots of contemporary strategies for accomplishing organizational goals (mission) through human resources (mobilization) to do effective work (ministry).

Organizational Identity

At its core, identity means an organization’s view of itself. Identity is a reflection of the members’ own values and beliefs and those of the organization with which they work. Identity is closely tied to organizational culture and can be seen in the level of involvement workers have in an organization, and in the relative consistency between stated organizational purposes and actual practices.

Kurt Lewin. One of the earliest and most influential theorists of modern times was Kurt Lewin (1947). Lewin was a pioneer in attempting to bring the social sciences to higher levels of theory and concepts, and thus of usefulness to society (Lewin 1947:5). He is particularly remembered for two related contributions. In his studies on group dynamics he analyzed the existence of force fields. Lewin wrote that “production levels
are quasi-stationary equilibria which can be changed either by adding forces in the desired direction or by diminishing opposing forces” (Lewin 1947:26). Thus, for an organization to experience change, the existing force fields—people’s attitudes, opinions, and ethos—need to be addressed. Only then can changes can be expected. These insights bear directly on organizational identity.

Related to his discussion of force fields is the second contribution. In examining how planned group changes occur, he theorized that “an additional force [seemed] to be required, a force sufficient to ‘break the habit,’ to ‘unfreeze’ the custom” (Lewin 1947:32). From this theoretical insight on “unfreezing,” “moving,” and then “refreezing,” has come a series of strategies for organizational transformation. Thus, in order for organizational change to occur, the existing identity must, at times, be challenged and then reshaped.


Theory X assumed that humans dislike work and avoid it if possible (McGregor 1960:33). Since they dislike it they must be manipulated and “threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives” (McGregor 1960:34). This view assumed that people wanted to be told what to do and preferred not to be given any responsibilities, so long as they felt personally secure (McGregor 1960:34).
On the other hand, Theory Y saw work “as natural as play or rest” and believed that people would motivate themselves toward goals to which they were committed (McGregor 1960:47). Likewise, it assumed that most people were creative and imaginative, and eager for responsibility (McGregor 1960:48).

Depending on the assumptions organizations make about human nature, management and their employees will both behave in a particular manner. Changing views could dramatically affect the way people feel about their work and perform it. This study attempts to discern the ways LAM functioned in terms of identity at various historical stages.

Edgar Schein—Social Psychology. While psychology is often thought of as it applies to individuals, Edgar Schein wrote from the field of social psychology as applied to organizations (Schein 1965). He conceived of organizations as open systems constantly interacting with their environment as they went about the task of producing their products (Schein 1980:228). In this dynamic view of organizations, he felt “the agents of planned change [would] necessarily be key managerial personnel, and these individuals [would] be required to take a systems view of organizations” (Schein 1980:35).

Employees are one of the most dynamic subsystems in organizations. Schein notes that the goal of management is to harness individual motivation and direct it toward organizational goals (Schein 1980:69). Leaders need to recognize that what drives an individual might vary over time. Thus, Schein took a developmental perspective that provided a key to understanding the issues involved in changing psychological contracts between the employer and the employee (Schein 1980:23). This insight proved helpful in
designing a mechanism to help missionaries track career needs over time (See Chapter 8). It is hoped that this will help reduce unnecessary missionary attrition.

Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman. Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman considered companies as a whole in their attempt to understand the forces at work in organizational effectiveness (Peters & Waterman 1982). They studied the interrelationships between “structure, strategy, people, management style, systems and procedures, guiding concepts and shared values (i.e., culture), and the present and hoped-for corporate strengths or skills” (1982:9). As a result of their research the authors distilled eight commonalities that characterized excellent companies.

The first of these was that excellent companies had “a bias for action” (Peters & Waterman 1982:119). They were not content to simply sit around thinking and planning. Rather, they converted desire into action. Second, they were “close to the customer” (1982:156), which meant they were obsessed with customer service, quality products and listening to the customer. Third, as opposed to being dictatorial, these companies encouraged “autonomy and entrepreneurship” among their employees (1982:200). Fourth, they believed in people’s inherent ability to do good work and thus emphasized “productivity through people” (1982:235). Fifth, management stayed deeply and personally involved in the work and the lives of their people in a “hands-on, value-driven” manner (1982:279). Sixth, rather than being widely focused like a shotgun, they “stick to the knitting” by keeping their business activities related to their central mission (1982:292). Seventh, as opposed to getting bogged down with a complex organizational structure, they attempted to maintain a “simple form” and a “lean staff” (1982:306).
Eighth, they had “simultaneous loose-tight properties” as they sought to balance “firm central direction and maximum individual autonomy” (1982:318).

Organizational identity must be realigned around deeply held motivating core values. Some of Peters and Waterman’s insights were incorporated into chapter eight’s proposals.

**Daniel Denison.** Writing in 1990, Daniel Denison broadened the theory and data on the relationship between corporate culture and organizational effectiveness (Denison 1990). His study led him to the conclusion that “effectiveness (or lack of it) is a function of the values and beliefs held by the members of an organization” (Denison 1997:5). The organization’s culture was thus seen “as a code, a logic, and a system of structured behaviors and meaning that [had] stood the test of time and [served] as a collective guide to future adaptation and survival” (Denison 1997:175). Like others before him, Denison discerned the importance of the role of leaders in creating appropriate corporate cultures (Denison 1997:194).

Denison generated a model that integrated four branches of organizational theory as a means of determining an organization’s culture and effectiveness. The *involvement hypothesis* argued “that high levels of involvement and participation create a sense of ownership and responsibility” (Denison 1997:7). The *consistency hypothesis* emphasized “the positive impact that a ‘strong culture’ can have on effectiveness” and on the ability of members “to reach consensus and carry out coordinated actions” (Denison 1997:8). The *adaptability hypothesis* spoke to the ability of the organization to respond appropriately to a changing environment by maintaining an attitude of learning (Denison 1997:196). The *mission hypothesis* stated the importance of groups having “a strategic
plan and a clear direction” that could be expressed in a manner meaningful to its members (Denison 1997:196). The theories represented by these four hypotheses were used in this study to aid in interpreting the data collected in terms of LAM’s organizational vision, identity, leadership, theology, and capacity for effectiveness.

**Gary McIntosh.** McIntosh studied the effects of generational changes on local churches and missions outreach (1995). Although the WWII *Builder* generation was deeply invested in the ministries of local churches and mission agencies, they are retiring (McIntosh 1995:14). The Vietnam *Boomer* generation following them was never committed as deeply to church and mission institutions, creating a dearth of fresh missionaries (McIntosh 1995:19). The modern *Buster* generation has yet to show their inclinations, but they represent the future hope for staffing mission organizations (McIntosh 1995:15). While generation gaps may have been minimal in the past, rapid societal changes in recent decades makes this a serious challenge to organizational identity (McIntosh 1995:179).

**Organizational Vision**

Organizational vision guides the priorities and activities of an organization. Yet, as was alluded to above, it is inextricably bound up with a group’s self-perception and its ability to impact the external environment. Vision must be coupled with effective leadership capable of inspiring and directing people if corporate goals are to be accomplished.

**Everett Rogers.** As was mentioned earlier, one of Denison’s four components for predicting future organizational effectiveness is the company’s ability to adapt (Denison 1998). This is a key component in maintaining a viable organizational vision. Given the
importance of the topic, Everett Rogers’ work (E. Rogers 1962) on the manner in which innovations diffuse through societal groupings is particularly relevant. He described diffusion as “the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system” (E. Rogers 1995:35). His categories and characteristics of adopters were: “Innovators—venturesome; early adopters—respect; early majority—deliberate; late majority—skeptical; and laggards—traditional” (1995:279).

Beyond applications that can be made to individuals, Rogers’ studies are significant for those leaders and organizations interested in facilitating the process of planned change through the diffusion of new organizational goals. He identified five stages in the innovation process for organizations: agenda setting, matching, redefining/restructuring, clarifying, and routinizing (E. Rogers 1995:403). This, then, would form the typical process by which a mission agency or any other organization could transform and renew its organizational vision.

Joel Arthur Barker. Futurist Joel Arthur Barker frames organizational vision and change in terms of paradigms.

A paradigm is a set of rules and regulations (written or unwritten) that does two things: (1) it establishes or defines boundaries; and (2) it tells you how to behave inside the boundaries in order to be successful…. A paradigm shift, then, is a change to a new game, a new set of rules. (Barker 1992:32, 37)

Changes occur in every organizational setting. Neither internal nor external environments remain static. Appropriating the future through proactive organizational revisioning maintains maximum effectiveness and relevance. This is no less true for mission agencies operating in changing ministry environments.
Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn. Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn espoused the open systems theory (Katz & Kahn 1966). They saw organizations as a type of open system with “repeated cycles of input, transformation, output and renewed input” (Katz & Kahn 1966:28). Through the process of feedback, organizations were able to respond to deficiencies and changes in the outward environment, thus maintaining their organizational objectives (Katz & Kahn 1966:28).

Individual workers under this theory could impact the system as their needs changed over time. These changes represented “a kind of extraorganizational source of demand” that was difficult to anticipate (Katz & Kahn 1966:307).

The effective organization would be one that understood the process of importation of energy, throughput, and output (Katz & Kahn 1966:20). This systems view could then be utilized for systemic change that was seen as being the “most powerful approach to changing human organizations” because it required “the direct manipulation of organizational variables” (Katz & Kahn 1966:451).

Mission agencies do not operate in a vacuum. Like their corporate counterparts, their organizational vision and strategies are impacted by changes in the external environment. By proactively embracing a systems view, mission organizations can maintain control of the vision, rather than allowing external forces alone to dictate organizational priorities. There is a balance between the need for changes and the right kind of changes.

Larry Greiner. Writing from the perspective of organizational development, Larry Greiner contributed a model for approximating the phase in which an organization found itself (Greiner 1972). Greiner drew upon the observations of European
psychologists whose thesis was that “individual behavior is determined primarily by
previous events and experiences, not by what lies ahead” (Greiner 1972:38). Likewise he
theorized that an organization’s past would largely determine its response to the future.

Greiner’s model considered the factors of organizational age, size, stages of
evolution, stages of revolution, and growth rate of the industry as he postulated five
organizational phases (Greiner 1972:38-39). These phases (creativity, direction,
delegation, coordination, and collaboration) each had their own appropriate managerial
style, organizational structure and control system (Greiner 1972:41-45). His theory gives
organizations a helpful macro-level view encompassing not only their past, but also hints
of their probable future depending on the trajectory embraced. As stated earlier, this
model helped interpret this study’s data and in approximating LAM’s organizational
phases at various historical periods.

James Collins and Jerry Porras. James Collins and Jerry Porras studied
companies who had shown themselves to be truly visionary by the longevity of their
success in making an impact on the world around them (Collins & Porras 1994:1). One
of their most useful exhortations was to “shift from seeing the company as a vehicle for
the products to seeing the products as a vehicle for the company” (Collins & Porras
1994:28). In other words, they exhorted the reader to “shift to seeing the company itself
as the ultimate creation” (Collins & Porras 1994:30). Thus, rather than viewing
effectiveness solely in terms of the founder, a particular leader, an employee, a current
product line, etc., the organization became the life-giving organism capable of
metamorphous when the need should arise. This insight is particularly relevant since
LAM has passed the founder phase and is well into institutional maturity.
Collins and Porras noted several paradoxes characterizing the visionary companies studied. These companies had both a deep purpose and the ability to make a profit. They had solid core beliefs, yet were capable of responding to changes. Such organizations had a clear sense of direction, but were not above searching for alternate routes (Collins & Porras 1994:44).

Two final insights from the study on visionary companies warrant highlighting. First, the authors believed that the core ideology, consisting of the core values, was not created, but rather was discovered by an inward analysis of the organization (Collins & Porras 1994:220). It was a deep culture-like phenomenon not easily manipulated. Second, while the authors agreed that such core values could normally be traced to specific leaders, what was most crucial was how those values were institutionalized into the life of the company (Collins & Porras 1994:86). Thus, what became most important were not individual leaders, but rather the continuity of quality homegrown leadership that preserved the core (Collins & Porras 1994:173). This concern for leadership continuity is set forth in the proposals in chapter eight.

Paul McKaughan, Dellana O’Brien and William O’Brien. Paul McKaughan, Dellana O’Brien and William O’Brien gathered and analyzed the insights of a number of mission executives and pastors in their book, Choosing a Future for U.S. Missions. They identified two major factors impacting mission agencies today. First, there is a shift away from the agency to the local church as the primary support structure for missionaries (McKaughan, O’Brien & O’Brien 1998:3). Second, people’s attitudes and feelings toward missions are changing as a result of their own ability to travel and communicate globally (McKaughan, O’Brien & O’Brien 1998:3). The authors contend that despite the
revolution occurring, many missions are in “denial about the kinds of changes that will be demanded of organizations over the next few years” (1998:2). Putting it bluntly, they concluded that the recycling of past visions in order to ensure institutional survival was no longer adequate. “Past its prime, the U.S. missions community stands in need of total reconceptualization” (McKaughan 1998:16). Paul Mckaughan, president of the Evangelical Fellowship of Mission Agencies (EFMA) mission conglomerate, notes that while the old mission paradigm appears ragged, there is no clear consensus on the new paradigm (McKaughan 2001).

Organizational Leadership

Ultimately organizations need people who will lead by affirming and shaping organizational culture and identity, and who will direct people toward the accomplishment of the organization’s vision. Such people inspire and coordinate groups of people working toward goals they could never accomplish alone. Leaders arouse and articulate the best which organizations have to offer.

Peter Drucker. Peter Drucker has contributed immeasurably to understanding how leaders and organizations should function. Writing in 1954 he noted that managers have two tasks. First, they were to create a “true whole” that was “larger than the sum of its parts” and that produced more than the “sum of resources put into it” (Drucker 1954:341). In today’s language, one might say they were responsible for the overall vision and direction of the company. Second, managers ensured that each decision and action worked toward immediate as well as long-term organizational goals (Drucker 1954:342). They maintained both the vision and the effectiveness of the company.
Drucker noted that effective organizations had better people because they had taken the time to implement systems for focused self-development and training for its members. This led to effective executives (Drucker 1967:170). Effective leaders and managers were key components in the overall organizational mix.

Drucker identified five characteristics of effective executives. First, they were able to account for their time (Drucker 1967:23). They refused to fritter it away. Second, they focused on results rather than the work or techniques required to achieve those results (Drucker 1967:24). Third, they capitalized on their strengths and the strengths of others, rather than beginning with their weaknesses (Drucker 1967:71). Fourth, effective executives were intent on doing the most important and strategic things first (Drucker 1967:100). They knew that without this level of commitment their energies would be consumed in doing many good things, but not necessarily the things that they should be doing. Fifth, they made effective decisions based on a rational course of action (Drucker 1967:169). Effective executives did not shy away from making a decision, but rather accepted this as one of their tasks. The modern mission executive must likewise possess these qualities.

Writing in 1968, Drucker identified three characteristics of organizations. First, it does not exist for itself. Rather, organizations were created for a specific purpose. Ideally, organizational goals benefited both individuals and society (Drucker 1968:189-190). Second, while each organization would have different goals, they all had to manage the human resources at their disposal. This involved balancing the needs of the individual worker and the goals of the company (Drucker 1968:195). Third, organizations needed individuals who were personally effective in order to attain
organizational effectiveness. Organizations accomplished nothing without clear
direction and competence from their managers and other knowledge workers (Drucker

In 1973 Drucker presented a comprehensive work on management, focusing on its
tasks, responsibilities, and practices (Drucker 1973). Drucker traced the roots of the
modern management boom to the efforts of the Marshall Plan to “mobilize management
for economic and social reconstruction” (1974:13). He went on to state that the goals of
management were to “organize work for productivity . . . to lead the worker toward
productivity” and achievement (Drucker 1974:13).

Drucker saw five basic operations in managerial work: (1) setting objectives, (2)
organizing, (3) motivating and communicating, (4) measuring, and (5) developing people
and themselves (Drucker 1974:400). He felt that one of the most common mistakes made
in designing managerial jobs was making the job so small that a person couldn’t grow in
it (1974:405). Work needed to be engaging and challenging.

At the executive level, Drucker saw risk as inherent to business. Avoiding risk
was useless. In his view “the main goal of a management science must be to enable
business to take the right risk” (Drucker 1974:512). Managers were to systematically
slough off obsolete tasks, responsibilities, and practices so they could free up human
resources in order to respond to new strategic initiatives (Drucker 1974:791). In 1980, he
wrote that this policy of “systematic abandonment” was particularly important “in times
of turbulence” (Drucker 1980:43). Certainly mission organizations exist in turbulent
times and must determine what to maintain and what to jettison. Non-profit
organizations must be fiscally frugal and strategic in deploying limited resources.
Drucker wrote that service institutions, like the church, have a particularly difficult time being entrepreneurial (1985:179). He suggested four policies to help them become more innovative. First, they needed a clear definition of their mission. Second, they had to state their goals realistically. Third, if their objectives were not reached, they were to consider the possibility that they had the wrong objectives. Fourth, they must purposefully and constantly be open to innovative opportunities (Drucker 1985:183). These insights are particularly important for a mission like LAM, one which has a history of being entrepreneurial, but which may be growing more institutionally conservative.

In Managing the Nonprofit Organization, Peter Drucker offered more management insights applicable to church and mission work (Drucker 1990). He noted that the first task of leadership was to ensure that everyone saw, heard and lived the organizational mission since “non-profit institutions exist for the sake of their mission” (1990:45). Having clearly defined the mission as the organization’s first priority, the leader then would turn to strategy. “Strategy [committed] the non-profit executive and the organization to action” (Drucker 1990:102). After devising its strategy, leadership was responsible for seeing that the organization performed its goals of changing people and society. It was not enough to simply have good intentions, results were demanded (Drucker 1990:139).

Two additional leadership duties were mentioned. First, leaders managed relationships with both volunteers and employed staff (Drucker 1990:182). Nonprofit organizations were ultimately about people. Second, leaders develop themselves. Drucker claimed this process “begins by serving, by striving toward an idea outside of
yourself—not leading. Leaders are not born, nor are they made—they are self-made” (1990:222). It was up to leaders to take responsibility for their own improvement.

Rensis Likert. Rensis Likert built on the knowledge of research conducted by social scientists in the corporate realm and articulated a specific system for managing human resources for organizational productivity (Likert 1967:1). In a manner reminiscent of McGregor, Likert described four types of organizational systems: exploitive authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and participative group (1967:14). The last, System 4, was seen as the most viable choice for those interested in maximum performance.

System 4 contained three primary characteristics. First, leadership worked with employees through the medium of “supportive relationships” (Likert 1967:47). Second, “group decision-making and group methods of supervision” were emphasized (Likert 1967:47). Third, high performance goals were set for the organization (Likert 1967:47). In this way Likert integrated current theories on human nature and motivation into an organizational systems model for achieving corporate goals.

Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard. Situational Leadership as a formalized model was the contribution of Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (Hersey & Blanchard 1969). According to this theory there is “no one best way to influence people,” rather the method used is to be determined by the needs of the employees at the time (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson 1996:190).

This approach integrated three realities present in the work environment. First, it factored in the leader’s task behavior that was defined “as the extent to which the leader engages in spelling out the duties and responsibilities of an individual or group” (Hersey,

Second, the leader’s *relationship behavior* was established. This relational dimension was seen as “the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multiway communication” (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson 1996:191). This could vary between being high and low in terms of relational content.

Third, the *readiness level* of the worker or group determined both the leader’s *task* and *behavior*. Readiness was explained as “the extent to which a follower demonstrates the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task” (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson 1996:193).

Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson defined “management as the process of working with and through individuals and groups and other resources (such as equipment, capital, and technology) to accomplish organizational goals” (1996:7). Since managers and leaders work with people it is vital that they learn to respond appropriately in a given situation.

Mission administrators face no less a monumental task than their corporate counterparts in dealing with their human resources both ethically and productively. They, too, are responsible for accomplishing the mission’s goals through the missionaries they coordinate.

**Edgar Schein—Organizational Culture and Leadership.** Culture has long fallen under the social science domain of anthropology. Felix M. Kessing wrote that culture was “the totality of learned, socially transmitted behavior, or ‘custom’” (Kessing 1958:16). It included the shared “actions, ideas, and artifacts” of a particular people
group and could be “studied as a historical phenomenon” as one traced the origins of its elements through the process of innovation and diffusion (Kessing 1958:25). Gary Ferraro added to this understanding by stating that culture was “everything that people have, think, and do as members of a society” (Ferraro 1998:18). In light of such a broad and powerful definition, it is not surprising the concept of culture is utilized by organizational theorists.

Writing on the topic of organizational culture and leadership, Edgar Schein looked at culture as the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs shared by members of a group that determine both how they view themselves and their external environment (Schein 1992:12). He believed organizational culture was in part created by leaders and its management was their primary task (Schein 1992:5). As such, it became vital to understand an organization’s history and the culture that developed in order to intelligently advocate changes for the future. In many ways this is parallel to the indigenizing activities engaged in by anthropologically informed missionaries who desire their message and ministry to be well received.

Schein saw the interrelationship of organizational culture and leadership as of major importance in organizations. In fact, he went so far as to claim “that the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture and that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to work with culture” (Schein 1992:5). If this statement is true, then it becomes important not only to understand the culture as the founder created it, but also to note the ways in which subsequent leaders created, altered, and managed the cultural environment of the organization. Based on that information an organizational planner could then formulate a hypothesis as to the likely trajectory of the company given
its current ethos and suggest possible cultural refinements leading to alternative futures. The proposals generated in this study made use of Schein’s theories on organizational analysis.

Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus. Effectiveness is a vital topic for the modern organization. All of the most effective organizational leaders surveyed by Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus (1985) made a “sharp distinction between leadership and management.” Those polled saw leaders as those who concerned “themselves with the organization’s basic purposes, why it exists, its general direction and value system” (Bennis & Nanus 1997:218). “Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing” (Bennis & Nanus 1997:20).

Given their understanding of the relationship between organizational effectiveness and effective leaders, Bennis and Nanus uncovered four “areas of competency” or strategies, held in common by the effective leaders surveyed (Bennis & Nanus 1997:25). In the first strategy leaders gained “attention through vision” by focusing on getting results (1997:26). They distilled a compelling vision from the alternatives available and interpreted it in a manner that gave others ownership (1997:93). Strategy two achieved “meaning through communication” (1997:102). Using the tools of a social architect (1997:102), the leader helped people commit to the vision (1997:131). Third, leadership made changes based on “trust through positioning” (1997:141). People need confidence in leaders and their competencies. Additionally, leaders must position themselves in appropriate niches enabling them to accomplish the vision (1997:43). The fourth strategy was the deployment of self (1997:175). Ultimately, leadership is based on human
relations and interactions. Self-aware leaders were confident in themselves and affirming of the strengths in others in a motivating manner.

**James Kouzes and Barry Posner.** While effectiveness is a whole-company effort, the importance of leadership cannot be over-emphasized. Drawing upon their experience in the field of learning and organizational behavior, James Kouzes and Barry Posner published their revised study on exemplary leadership in 1995 (Kouzes & Posner 1995). Like other modern commentators on leadership, they approached leadership holistically, recognizing the current “renewed search for meaning” in such things as “spirituality, civility, and community” (Kouzes & Posner 1995:xix).

Kouzes and Posner identified five practices and ten sub-commitments of the best leaders. First, they *challenge the process* by searching out new challenges and being willing to take risks (Kouzes & Posner 1995:18). Second, leaders *inspire a shared vision* by envisioning “an uplifting and ennobling future” and enlisting others in it (1995:18). Third, they *enable others to act* by fostering collaboration and strengthening people by giving them power and support (1995:18). Fourth, exemplary leaders *model behavior* in a manner that is consistent with the organization’s shared values and achieve “small wins that promote consistent progress and build commitment” (1995:18). Fifth, they *encourage the heart* by recognizing the efforts of individuals and celebrating team victories (1995:18).

**William Taylor (WEF).** Of particular relevance to this study is a World Evangelical Fellowship’s (WEF) study on missionary attrition. Research reveals that one “career missionary in 20 (5.1% of the mission force) leaves the mission field to return

Problem attrition occurs when missionaries, because of mismanagement, unrealistic expectations, systemic abuse, personal failure, or other personal reasons, leave the field before the mission or church feel that they should. (McKaughan 1997:18)

Organizational leadership addresses this issue through better training, screening, and on-site management.

**Summary**

Together, the theories and insights of these various authors form a theory basis for this study. Their insights on organizational vision, identity and leadership inform the documentation and analysis of LAM’s history, and the proposals for its future effectiveness.

**Restatement**

As the study makes evident, LAM is an important and innovative mission agency. The following historical documentation benefits both the body of missiological literature and those LAM leaders looking to LAM’s past for clues to an effective future. This study chronicles LAM’s history primarily from an organizational perspective by looking at LAM’s major leaders, organizational culture and processes, a sampling of stories about ordinary LAM missionaries, major events, theological challenges, and significant missiological contributions. The study is guided by key research questions focusing on organizational vision, organizational identity, organizational leadership, and to a lesser degree theological issues. Organizational analysis is offered for various historical periods.
Following the historical chapters (Chapters 3 through 6) Chapter 7 describes LAM’s current internal and external context. Chapter 8 articulates a series of proposals for LAM’s future organizational effectiveness. These proposals integrate LAM’s historical culture, values, vision and strengths, with contemporary challenges and opportunities. Chapter 9 includes this study’s most important conclusions, and suggestions for possible future studies.
Chapter 3

The Foundational Years—Harry and Susan Strachan (1921-1945)

The Latin America Mission (LAM) founders cast a long shadow of influence across the pages of LAM’s history. The majority of the ministries in which LAM missionaries engage today can be traced in some way to the efforts of Harry and Susan Strachan. As will be seen in the coming pages, the breadth of work in which they engaged left virtually no facet of life untouched. Although LAM is only a mid-size mission, it has a wide scope of ministry. This chapter explores the founding of the mission, the activities of its founders, their hopes and dreams, and their theological assumptions and motivations. Just as important, it will document the manner in which their vision was adopted by others and eventually passed along to a new generation of laborers.

The Founders’ Background

Harry and Susan Strachan’s founding of LAM, or the Latin America Evangelization Campaign (LAEC), as it was first known, took place after many years of solid upbringing, training and practical ministry experience. Those early experiences solidified many of their assumptions about God’s call on their lives, which in turn resulted in the founding of LAM.

Susan Beamish Strachan

Susan Beamish came from a long line of Protestants. Following the 17th Century English civil war, Oliver Cromwell rewarded her ancestors with an estate in Ireland. In fact, when she was born two centuries later in 1874, she still saw herself more English
than Irish. “She was raised to believe that the Pope was anathema and that the Roman Church was a masterpiece of error and deceit” (Roberts 1993:5).

As she grew up, she attended the Church of Ireland’s Christ Church. However, she was converted to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ at the local Methodist Church. She continued going to Christ Church on Sunday mornings, while attending the evening meetings of the Methodist Church. Before long she began wondering about sharing Jesus with the unconverted peoples of Africa by becoming a medical missionary (Roberts 1993:7-9). With this intention in mind, she found herself studying at Harley College, London, where she met Harry Strachan (Roberts 1998b:645).

Harry Strachan was born June 27, 1872 to Scottish parents who had sought work in Canada. At age seven, however, the family left Fergus, Ontario and returned to Aberdeen, Scotland (Roberts 1998a:645). Harry’s brother James, who was ten years older, remained behind in Canada to begin life on his own.

The desire to strike out on his own gripped Harry in his late teens and he “found work in the English industrial city of Sunderland” (Roberts 1996:29), where he hung out at the pub and played soccer in his free time. Continuing on like this, he rebelled against the nominal Presbyterian faith of his family.

At age 20 an incident occurred that changed the course of Harry Strachan’s life forever. As he contemplated the meaninglessness of his life, he saw an image of his mother praying for him and he fell under the “terror of the Lord” (LAE 1945:3). He called out to God for forgiveness and the burden slowly lifted (Roberts 1992:33-34). His new piety endured for a time until he once again fell into sin. Again, God came to him,
this time in a dream at night. In the dream he “dreamt that the end of the world had come, and that everyone else had been caught up to be with the Lord except” him (Roberts 1992:36). Thus, at age 21, Strachan latched onto God.

Harry’s Christian growth was assisted by joining the YMCA and the Bethesda Free Church of Sunderland, where he learned to actively share his faith in Jesus Christ. While in this church Harry first heard of missionaries who would share the gospel in such continents as Africa. At the conclusion of a sermon by Dr. H. Grattan Guinness on the needs of Africa, Harry expressed his interest and soon was on the way to Cliff College, London (Roberts 1992:39). His time there was followed by missionary training at Guinness’ Harley College, where he met Susan Beamish.

Two Lives Become One

Given Harry’s Scottish reserved manner and Susan’s initial disinterest, the relationship progressed slowly. Beyond that, the college frowned on coed intermingling. Yet, their mutual interest in missionary service in Africa continued to draw them together, in addition to the natural attraction they felt for one another.

Eventually Harry became convinced that God wanted them together, so he proposed marriage. No doubt he was shocked when Susan not only turned him down, but also informed him that for health reasons she had been denied permission by the Regions Beyond Missionary Union (RBMU) to go to Africa. Instead, she was asked to serve with the RBMU in Argentina. Accepting this blow as from God, the two went on with their separate preparations. In his final year of college, Harry applied to RBMU for service in the Congo. He also was refused permission for health reasons (a congenital heart weakness which never manifested itself at any point in his later life), and was instead
offered service in Argentina (Roberts 1992:49-51). The die was thus cast for the future couple. At almost 31 years of age, Harry arrived in Argentina March 9, 1902, nearly a year after Susan’s arrival in 1901. The couple was married in 1903.

**Ministry in Argentina**

After completing their training, language studies, and apprenticeship, the couple relocated to Tandil, Argentina for their ministry assignment on November 2, 1904. (Roberts 1992:67). During their 18 years in Tandil “a strong church was built up and from which center they were also enabled always to reach out to the regions beyond” (LAE 1945:6).

Harry’s drive to share the gospel of Christ with those who would not set foot in the small evangelical churches led him to innovate. Instead of holding evangelistic meetings in a local church, he rented theatres and secured the services of a native preacher. On other occasions Strachan used a tent, held open-air meetings, and even converted a horse-drawn wagon into Argentina’s first bookmobile, “selling Bibles and Christian literature” (Roberts 1992:85). Little by little, it became clear in Harry’s mind that his first calling was to evangelism—and on a much larger scale.

After seven years of marriage, Susan gave birth to Robert Kenneth. “In a little more than a year, Kenneth had been followed by Harry Wallace, and two years later by Grace Eileen” (Roberts 1993:24). For the Strachan family, Harry’s work was always the main priority. Susan wondered, however, whether in addition to supporting Harry’s vision and raising the children, she should also have a ministry (Roberts 1996:35). She realized that God had called her to Argentina even before she had met Harry. She
concluded that God wanted her actively ministering in addition to her family responsibilities.

Susan’s first major contribution to Protestantism was the formation, along with a missionary by the name of Arizona Smith, of the *League of Evangelical Women in Argentina*. This English version, begun in 1915, was succeeded by the Spanish version, *Liga Argentina de Mujeres Evangélicas*. Although the English league closed in 1928, the *Liga* and its “bimonthly magazine, *Guía del Hogar*,” (Home Guide) impacted Argentine society for the next fifty years and helped to develop “Argentina’s female Christian leadership” (Roberts 1993:29).

Harry Strachan’s vision, however, extended far beyond Argentina. Thus, as they left the country on furlough in August, 1918, Harry formulated a plan for continent-wide evangelism based in Argentina. He embarked on the leave with the intention of securing financing and permission from the RBMU for his new plan. Due to the hazards of crossing the Atlantic Ocean during World War I, they opted to furlough in the USA instead of returning to Europe.

**A Mission is Born**

Harry & Susan were destined for disappointment in their hopes that the financially strapped EUSA (the RBMU had merged with the Evangelical Union of South America—EUSA) would endorse their plan. The mission lacked the resources to fund the venture, although they agreed that there was a need for continent-wide evangelism. The Strachans were virtually alone and unknown in the USA, with no financial resources, and Susan needed to be hospitalized for surgery. Nevertheless, after a period of time the Strachan’s tendered their resignations to EUSA/RBMU.
After making the decision to pursue their vision without the EUSA, things began to happen through contacts that Harry had made in New York City at the Fulton Street noonday prayer meeting. Someone gave him a check for “the unheard-of-sum of two thousand dollars” after a meeting at Hepzibah House in New York City, where the guest speaker had referred to Harry’s vision during the course of his sermon (Roberts 1996:60). The momentum built over the ensuing months as others caught Harry’s vision at various “Victorious Life conferences throughout the Northeast” (Roberts 1996:60). One of the Strachans’ most important early supporters was Robert C. McQuilkin of the *Sunday School Times* (Roberts 1992:105), who later became the Dean of Colombia Bible School.

Harry and Susan decided that it was God’s will for them to form the *Latin America Evangelization Campaign* (LAEC), which would later become known as the *Latin America Mission* (LAM). Their first major hurdle was to decide who would make the initial exploratory trip in Latin America to verify the need for evangelization. Of course Harry would go, but he also insisted that Susan accompany him so that she would be better able to communicate the vision to their supporters while he was out campaigning. After much anguish, Susan agreed to accompany him on the yearlong trip. They left their three children in the care of three families who lived in Kansas City, Missouri. Having received the necessary funds, they left in 1920 for their survey trip in South and Central America.

Their trip confirmed to them the pressing need of the millions of unevangelized people living in Latin America. The missionaries they encountered, and the small groups of Protestant Christians, all agreed that their vision was on target. Protestants were so few in number that they were unable to significantly impact the multitudes.
Initially assuming that they would base the LAEC in Buenos Aires, Argentina, regarded as the “cultural center for all of Latin America,” they became convinced that God wanted them to locate in San José, Costa Rica (Roberts 1996:67). The relative political stability and centrality of this country served them well in the ensuing years.

The Strachans returned in January 1921, exactly one year after they had left. During their year they had “traveled 30,000 miles in 17 different countries,” speaking with “more than 550 missionaries and national leaders, representing more than 25 different missions” (Roberts 1992:114). Beyond this, they held “more than 250 public meetings in 365 days” seeing conversions in “virtually every one of them” (Roberts 1996:69-70).

The Strachans and a select group of friends met at Stony Brook, Long Island a few months later while the USA Keswick conference was in session. On July 24, 1921 the group incorporated the *Latin America Evangelization Campaign* (Roberts 1992:116; LAM Collection 236, Box 67:11). The LAEC’s USA headquarters was the office of the LAEC Executive Council chairman, Clarence E. Mason. Harry and Susan Strachan were the designated Field Directors, and Edward A. Steele was the Secretary-Treasurer. Other members of the council included Dean W. W. Rugh, Robert C. McQuilkin, L. L. McShane, F. M. Weaver, A. M. Myers, and A. H. Stetson. A Women’s Auxiliary was formed with officers Mrs. Mason and Mrs. Stetson (Roberts 1992:117). The LAEC also created a list of references including the Rev. A. B. Winchester, Toronto; Dr. G. H. Dowkonntt, New York City; Pastor G. McNeely, Newark, New Jersey; Rev. I. R. Dean, Toronto, Canada; Rev. W. Leon Tucker, New York; Dr. W. B. Riley, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Dr. C. A. Blanchard, Wheaton, Illinois; Pastor R. E. Neighbour, Elyria, Ohio;
and Rev. Paul Rader, Chicago, Illinois (LAE 1921(1)1:2). Harry Strachan was 49 years old.

From the beginning, the LAEC had some very clearly defined theological assumptions and motivations. *The Latin American Evangelist* (LAE), the mission’s chief communication device, regularly published the following theological statement:

The Directors and Executive Council of the Latin America Evangelization Campaign adhere to the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, as originally given; the Virgin Birth and Deity of Christ; His bodily Resurrection; the doctrine of Salvation through the Blood of Christ, whose vicarious sacrifice is the only remedy for man’s lost condition; the doctrine of the eternal salvation of the regenerate and the eternal condemnation of the unregenerate; the scriptural doctrine of a life of victory over sin through the power of the indwelling Holy Spirit of God, and the imminency of the pre-millennial coming of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. (LAE 1921(1)2:2)

From today’s standpoint, their doctrinal statement was thoroughly evangelical and set them apart from the increasingly popular modernism of their day. One can also discern the teachings of the Keswick Victorious Life movement with the emphasis on the Holy Spirit and power over sin. Their belief in Christ’s imminent return and the limited time that people had to respond were motivation enough for the Strachans to be about their evangelistic work with their whole energies.

In October 1921, the Strachan family, accompanied by Miss Mary France, arrived in San José, Costa Rica where they rented a house. At the time, they were the only foreign missionaries in Costa Rica, since two other women missionaries had just left due to ill health (LAE 1926(1):15). A few days later Harry took off to begin campaigning in Guatemala, leaving his wife and children to complete the unpacking. In his haste, however, he only left them $100 cash and a check that he had failed to endorse (Roberts 1996:85). “To him, nothing was so important as the forthcoming evangelistic effort”
(Roberts 1992:131). This became the life pattern for the Strachan family. Harry would spend most of his time on the road campaigning or representing the mission to their home supporters, while Susan raised the family and ran the growing mission at its base in San José.

Observations

The following observations of Harry and Susan Strachan’s leadership and LAEC’s development are noteworthy.

Vision. The Strachans’ early vision for the LAEC was clearly evangelistic. They unashamedly professed their desire to “reach the unevangelized millions of Latin America by a forward movement of aggressive evangelism” (LAE 1921(1)2:2). Beyond this number one priority that would consume the majority of Harry Strachan’s time, it was also assumed that Susan would develop the ministry at the local level. The co-founding of the Argentine Liga clearly demonstrated that she too possessed the ability to begin new ministries. The Strachans saw their work as evangelistic and were not intending to begin a full-fledged mission organization (McQuilkin 1921:6).

Identity. Although the Strachans had formed the LAEC and had an Executive Council, they themselves were the fledgling organization’s focus. More particularly, Harry was the center of attention since he would be organizing and leading the evangelistic campaigns. Even at this early stage, however, the Strachans envisioned a greater cooperative movement that went far beyond themselves. They were purposefully interdenominational and anticipated cooperating “with the missionaries of all denominations working on the field” (LAE 1921(1)2:2). They saw themselves as part of a larger effort and work for the kingdom of God.
**Leadership.** Obviously the Strachans, Harry in particular, were the unquestioned leaders of the LAEC. From the beginning, however, Harry shared leadership with his wife and those representing the interests of the mission in the USA.

**Theology.** The Strachans were motivated by the expectation that Jesus would return soon. Beyond this, they were a *faith mission*. As such, they believed that God alone, albeit through his people, was responsible for taking care of his servants. Their policy was to depend on God for what they needed, with no guaranteed salaries, and they were not to go into debt (LAM Collection 236, Box 66:15).

**The 1920s**

Fortunately for mission historians, one of the first ministries that the Strachans began was the *Latin American Evangelist* (LAE) magazine. This vehicle provides the most complete record of mission activities to be found within the LAM. Indeed, apart from Susan’s recollections which she passed along to their children, this is the primary record of Harry’s activities. Although he kept records himself, he destroyed them all when he thought that someone might write his biography, preferring that all glory go to God and not to him (Roberts 1992:178).

The first issue of the LAE in October 1921 laid out the Strachans’ plans for the LAEC. They intended to hold evangelistic tent campaigns, distribute the Scriptures, translate and create evangelistic tracts, engage in evangelism through the newspaper, start a correspondence department and a training school for women. Harry would conduct itinerant, continent-wide evangelistic campaigns and train native workers on site. Susan would manage everything else, including the school for women.
The first LAEC field missionary, besides the Strachans, was Miss Mary G. France, who arrived with the Strachan family. Her initial task was to “devote herself to the literature department of the campaign” (LAE 1921 (1)1:12). Of course, there were also volunteer representatives of the LAEC in the USA.

Life for the Strachans and the LAEC fell along two tracks. First and foremost was Harry’s ministry of public evangelistic preaching campaigns. Second was the development of ministries at the home base in San José, Costa Rica. The vast majority of the articles and focus in the early years, however, were clearly devoted to coverage of the campaign work.

Although Harry spoke Spanish and managed the campaigns, he always sought out the best native preachers to do most of the public speaking. The Rev. Juan Varetto was engaged as a Latino preacher in the first crusade. Varetto was an ordained Argentine Southern Baptist and pastor of the largest evangelical church in La Plata, Argentina (LAE 1921(1)1:11).

Guatemala

Harry’s first campaign under the auspices of the LAEC was held in Guatemala in 1921. Typically these meetings would last for several days or weeks in one city or town, and then move on to another in the same country. Since travel was often via foot, horseback, boat, train, or an occasional motor vehicle, these national campaigns would easily stretch into months in length.

After several smaller meetings held in outlying provinces conducted by two associates, Harry held a meeting in Zacapa, Guatemala. Preferring to use public meeting venues, the largest theatre in town was secured. Having a capacity of 300 to 400 people,
the meetings filled the theatre nightly. For the most part, those who attended the meetings had never “darkened the door of the mission hall,” and thus had never before heard the gospel (LAE 1921(1)2:12). The public nature of the theatres ensured that the largely Catholic audience would feel less threatened than if the meetings were held in an evangelical church. Beyond that, most evangelical churches were far too small, where they even existed, to contain the crowds.

Harry Strachan wrote,

The believers are enthusiastic to an extraordinary degree. They have never heard of such preaching, and seeing the crowds increase day by day is a great inspiration to them. At the first meeting there were 125 persons present, and this was thought a wonderful audience. But now (this was written some days after the meetings began) many of the leading men of the town, doctors, lawyers, etc., are coming along. Last night the body of the theatre was packed, with a considerable overflow into the gallery.

Don Juan preached with great power and lucidity and without a solitary reference to the clergy. My soul was thrilled with joy to see that splendid audience listening with rapt attention to such a clear, forcible and convincing presentation of the Gospel message. (LAE 1922(1)3:4)

From Zacapa the team moved on to Guatemala City where the meetings were much larger. Since printing services were available, they advertised the services on 10,000 handbills. The result was they packed out the theatre with 2,000 people. Strachan read from the Bible and Varetto preached the gospel. On another night in the theatre, Strachan experimented with the use of a native band. He employed a band that had “an instrument called the marimba, made entirely of wood, on which seven men play at a time, and with this and the big bass fiddle and a drum” the orchestra was complete (LAE 1921(1)2:13).

As a result of these nightly meetings, thousands of people were exposed to the gospel and were talking about it. One night alone saw 2500 people stand to their feet to
express their agreement with the preacher’s message (Hayter 1922:7). The good news was going forth and stirring up the city. Since their gospel tent had not arrived in time for the Guatemala campaign, the men were compelled to use less advantageous venues on some of the nights, such as local evangelical churches. Even these meetings, however, were well attended.

Although the crusades themselves were well attended and the people quite responsive to the gospel, there was opposition. The Roman Catholic Church in Latin America was extremely zealous in their opposition to both Protestant churches and Liberal governments. Protestants, of course, signaled an alternative religious system that threatened to undermine the authority of the Pope and the veneration of the Virgin Mary. Political Liberals threatened the power of the Roman Catholic Church’s closeness with the political Conservatives. So Catholics attempted to stop or disrupt the LAEC’s campaigns whenever possible.

From the beginning of the LAEC work in Guatemala, Catholic propaganda malignied the Protestants. They denounced Martin Luther from their pulpits and the local Presbyterian Mission. Finally, they warned the people that they would be committing grave sin (mortal) if they attended any of the conferences (Hayter 1922:7). One Catholic writer wrote that people who attended the meetings would be considered apostate because, “the children of Jesus cannot be confounded with the children of Luther, because Jesus is the Son of God and Luther was the filthy abortion of unbridled passions . . . [thus] these meetings are satanic” (LAE 1922(1)3:11).

While the Guatemala City crusade proceeded without violence, the same could not be said for all of the cities. An ugly riot took place when the LAEC team reached
Amatitlan, Guatemala. A theatre had been secured, chairs set up, and guests arriving by the time Strachan and Varetto arrived. An angry mob was milling outside the theatre when four policemen with rifles arrived. It appeared that the police were in cahoots with the mob. Nevertheless, the evangelists began the meeting. They tried singing a hymn, but were almost drowned out by the noise of the crowd. When Varetto began to preach, stones pelted the roof of the theatre. Soon, despite the presence of the policemen, the rocks began to fly into the auditorium.

Strachan decided to suspend the meeting and escape the theatre. The crowd inside had swelled toward the platform, to escape the shower of stones coming in from the doors. Meanwhile the evangelists made their way out a door and were met by a mob and a spray of sand. The mob shouted, “*Aquí viene el Diablo*” (Here comes the devil) (LAE 1922(1)3:18), and they began to stone them. The mob swarmed them and Strachan knew that, if he was pulled down, he would be killed. Thus, as they hurried to their hotel, Strachan periodically turned and faced the mob—at which point they would cease their progress, but when he turned his back to them they pelted him with more stones. Although the stones whizzed by his head and struck his arms, back and legs, he made it to the shelter of the hotel. The other members of the party reached the house in safety since most of the crowd’s fury was directed toward Strachan. While the mob continued to stone the hotel and threatened to break in, a contingent of soldiers was sent for protection. After a time of prayer for their enemies, the team went to bed.

They shook the dust of that town off of their feet and left by train. As they were leaving, however, a coffin was brought on board containing the body of the man in whose home the plan to stone the LAEC workers had first surfaced. Harry Strachan wrote, “It
may only be a coincidence, but it almost looks like a judgment [from God]” (LAE 1922(1)3:18). They also heard that the mob had been stirred up by four women from a Catholic religious order (LAE 1922(1)3:17-19).

The experience in Amatitlan was not unique. In another town where Varetto was speaking in a Presbyterian church, a procession of Catholics passed by. As they did, some men attempted to place three sticks of dynamite in the church. Some church members, however, had the sense to bar the doors and thus prevented a tragedy (LAE 1922(1)4:7).

For their part, the LAEC seems to have done what it could to avoid antagonizing the Catholics. While they featured Protestant Christian beliefs, they did not attack Rome or the local priests. Their purpose was to clearly present the claims of the gospel in the language of the people. Varetto assumed no Bible knowledge in his target audience. They even took pains to avoid invitations that might lead to superficial decisions or public harassment. Instead the preachers gave invitations for raised hands to which only a few serious people would respond. In this manner, by the end of a series of meetings a local pastor would have a list of several serious inquirers to follow up and incorporate into a church. Additionally, thousands would have heard a clear presentation of the gospel, many for the first time (McQuilkin 1922a:5-7). It must be remembered, however, that in a continent of millions, this was a very small percentage.

Although the focus of the LAEC was on continent-wide evangelism geared to the Latino masses, they were also concerned with the plight of the minority indigenous population. This part of the Latin American challenge, however, featured myths to overcome. For instance, many people in Guatemala had heard that Indians eat Whites
and that Whites eat Indians—as well as other Whites. A native pastor, Javier de la Cruz, was working in the town of Tactic. Gradually it became obvious to the local mission that Indians didn’t eat Whites, but Indians still believed that Whites would eat them. One day a pastor’s child died, and the local people watched and waited to see if he would consume the body. When instead the body was treated with honor and the people heard the message of the hope of the Resurrection, they accepted the truth. With the myth dispelled, a small Nazarene church began to grow (LAE 1922(1)4:10-12).

Totonicapan, Guatemala was thought to be the city with the largest concentration of Indians in the country. The campaign’s arrival was met with unusual acceptance. The city’s authorities had even printed handbills advertising the meetings. These bulletins stated, “The Corporation Municipal, believing it will be to the interests of the community to have the lectures of Sr. don Juan C. Varetto, who will speak upon moral themes, has the honor to invite” the community to attend (McQuilkin 1922b:10). Often the team began their crusade in a town by speaking on moral themes as it was believed that this would have a greater initial appeal to the public.

The subjects of the meetings were centered around biblical themes. This translated advertisement for one of the meetings in Guatemala provides an example of what one might hear in a campaign:

Today, Wednesday, at 8 P.M., the renowned Argentine orator and writer, Sr. Juan C. Varetto, will speak in this theatre on the following theme: “Why Did Christ Come Into the World?” Admission is free. These conferences are carried on by the private effort of believers in the Gospel, and have nothing to do with either the home or foreign politics of any people or nations. It is a universal propaganda, carried out and paid for by disinterested people who are persuaded in their hearts that the thing of greatest benefit for individuals, as well as for peoples, is the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ.
The only object they have is to proclaim the great salvation which is in Christ and which is received by means of a sincere repentance and a living faith in the work consummated by Him on the Cross of Calvary. Although these things are spoken with frankness and sincerity, they are not an attack on the ideas or sentiments of anybody. We recognize the good faith of those who do not think as we do. We believe that man is morally obliged to search for, receive and defend the truth and acknowledge it, although to do this he may have to abandon beliefs and customs which he has followed all his life. Christ said: “I am the light of the world. He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.” That is why we proclaim the glorious doctrines of Christ which illumine the mind and heart. We believe that His Gospel is the power of God to give salvation to everyone that believes. We know that a living faith in Christ gives a man the strength necessary to overcome all the evils of his fallen nature; it instills in him a comforting and well-founded hope and it leads him in triumph through life’s pathway.

Jesus knew that He had power to solve all the problems of the human heart and that is why He said: “Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest.”

Do not fail to be at the conference tonight. Invite your friends! Go with your family! (LAE 1922(1):16)

The crusade did not meet with success in every city. Beyond resistance from Catholic clergy and authorities, the local missionary situation had to be taken into account. In Chichecastenango, for instance, two mission groups were disagreeing about the work. The LAEC decided not to attempt a campaign there, because one of their policies was to work in cooperation with existing missionaries and churches when possible. The problem in this case would have been figuring out where to send the new converts, since the two evangelical groups were arguing. So, they bypassed that town (McQuilkin 1922c:6).

When the campaigns were over in Guatemala and the team was heading for El Salvador, the LAE took the occasion to summarize what had been accomplished thus far. Thousands of nonchristians had been introduced to the gospel. Believers were reached in a new manner and revived. The evangelical message was shown to have dignity and
value to the intellectual classes. Finally, both local churches and believers were stirred up to a greater vision for evangelism (LAE 1922(1)7:3).

The early LAEC campaigns were very flexible. For instance, although they had hoped to use their evangelistic tent for meetings in Guatemala, the tent arrived in Costa Rica. Due to this misdirection, from a human perspective, the tent was saved the shredding that would have occurred had it been present during the stoning in Amatitlan. They felt that God had intervened to preserve the tent from being destroyed. Harry’s vision for having a traveling ministry school also had to be postponed, due to a revolution and active opposition from priests, among other factors.

El Salvador

The team proceeded to El Salvador. They arrived soon after a revolution had been stifled and the country was under martial law. Large public meetings were now prohibited (LAE 1922(1)5:8). A conservative government and a very loyal Catholic population made it difficult to secure a theatre for the meetings. Instead, the LAEC used their tent when possible (McQuilkin 1922d:3).

Despite the difficulty, the team did secure a theatre in Santa Ana for El Salvador’s first gospel meeting in a theatre. After some preliminary meetings in a mission hall, a crowd approaching one thousand pressed into the theatre. McQuilkin described the meeting as follows:

The meeting was opened with several little Gospel choruses, made possible by the boys and girls of the school, who learned them in a really remarkable way . . . . When the preacher started his sermon on why Christ came into the world, it was quite evident that he was to have opposition, and right through it was a conflict with noise inside and out. After fifteen minutes about twenty young men in the gallery started to file out, each one jumping the railing to the lower level . . . but the audience kept their attention fixed on the speaker. As soon as these young men were out of the building there started shrill whistling and cat-calls . . . . The
preacher continued undisturbed through periods of the greatest confusion and toward the close nearly all the noise quieted down and there was a real sense of the Spirit, driving the closing words home to personal application. (McQuilkin 1922d:5)

The team counted the meeting a success since the gospel was preached.

Although the LAEC did not go looking for trouble with the local priests, it was typically found. Preaching from the Bible itself was an offence in the eyes of the Catholics who held that tradition was just as important (LAE 1922(2)1:13). Most of the mob violence that the team encountered in its campaigns could be traced to the instigation of local Catholic clergy and devout laity. Beyond reporting such occurrences, the LAE at times contrasted its biblical positions with those of the Catholics. For instance, the July 1922 edition quoted the Rev. Charles Inwood’s remarks, “No, it is not Christianity, but Romanism, and we cannot call such a monster ‘a sister church’! South America is cursed by Rome with a baptized paganism” (LAE 1922(1)8:1). Given this perception, born out of experience, it is understandable that the LAEC felt compelled to preach the pure gospel that liberates captives.

In addition to confronting error by preaching the basic gospel, the Strachans called on their supporters in the USA to stand with them in intercessory prayer (LAE 1922(1)9:1). They believed that nothing could be accomplished without God moving in response to prayer. Hence, many articles on prayer were included in the LAE, and many prayer needs were suggested.

When one considers the difficulties that the early LAEC encountered in presenting the gospel, their persistence reflects an important theological assumption. The Strachan’s believed that Jesus was returning soon to take his people home. This belief motivated the Strachans and their financial backers in the USA to turn from their
“frittering away small sums on trifles,” in order to support aggressive evangelism (LAE 1922(1)9:3). So, they unashamedly presented the LAE reader with the challenges and responsibilities of being world Christians.

Women’s Bible Training School

While Harry’s itinerant training school had yet to get off the ground, Susan was busy beginning a residential program for women at their base in Costa Rica. Although the plan had always been in her mind, the Lord seemed to confirm the idea through the offering of a young woman in the USA who committed “five dollars per month towards the support of a student in the Bible School” (S. Strachan 1922:10). This story was retold many times throughout the early history of the LAEC as a testimony to how the Lord can accomplish large things through small beginnings. Susan was careful to point out to the LAE readers, however, that the evangelistic campaign work must have first priority for giving and attention (S. Strachan 1922:12).

By the end of 1922, the construction of LAEC’s first building was complete. Soon the new school had a “large class room and two dormitories capable of holding twelve students” (LAE 1922(2)2:7). Thus, after a year on the field, the LAEC began its residential training ministry. The two-year program consisted of courses in the Old and New Testament, Christian Doctrine, “Bible History, Homiletics, Dispensational Truth, organ and singing, sewing and housework, as well as practical evangelistic work” (S. Strachan 1923a:7).

In 1923, LAEC purchased land for a new school and headquarters. The vision and growth drove Susan to press on for greater impact. The supporters in the USA supported the dream and the additional funds arrived (LAE 1923(3)1:7).
Costa Rica and Colombia

Although the Costa Rican campaign was briefer than ones in Guatemala and El Salvador, it was another positive experience for the young mission. Held in a large theatre, they attracted a crowd of people who would not have dared enter a Protestant church (McConnell 1922:6).

The LAEC finished the year with a crusade in Colombia. The Rev. Robert Elphick Valenzuela, a Methodist from Chile, was the featured evangelist (LAE 1922(2)2:3). About fifteen years later the mission would again enter Colombia in a more permanent manner.

In addition to the Strachans and Mary France, the LAEC employed two native evangelists. Joaquín Vela worked in Guatemala where his audiences would at times run as high as five hundred. Señorita Magdalena Kramer served in El Salvador. Both of these evangelists were under the supervision of local mission agencies and were supported by LAEC funds (LAE 1922(2)2:14).

Venezuela

The fifth campaign was held in Venezuela. The Latin evangelist was the Rev. Angel Archilla of Puerto Rico. Archilla had been redeployed by the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions to the evangelistic work, and was also endorsed by an Evangelical alliance in Puerto Rico for the Venezuelan crusade (LAE 1923(2)6:4).

A humorous incident in Venezuela illustrates the difficulty that the evangelists had in even traveling from one location to the next. On one occasion, Harry Strachan, Archilla and a Mr. Poehner were attempting to travel to the town of Sabanete to discuss a matter with a man there. The three of them set off in their car and were doing well until
they reached the river Guanare. Upon attempting to cross the river in their car, the carburetor filled with water and the engine died, leaving them stranded in the river. With no other options, the men stripped naked and attempted to push the car across the river. Three hours later they had made little progress, and the biting sand flies only added to their discomfort and despair. Finally the men united in earnest prayer to the Lord about the matter. Redoubling their efforts, the car was out of the river in fifteen minutes and they were on their way (LAE 1923(2)8:11).

On another occasion in Venezuela, Strachan responded to the need for evangelistic work in the interior. As a result of answering that call, the team ended up traveling eight days, 300 miles roundtrip, in a dugout canoe (Christiansen 1923:5). At one point, Strachan noted that the river was “literally teeming with alligators and crocodiles” and that it was not unusual for them to see thousands of these in one day (LAE 1923(2)9:13).

Although the work went well in the country, Harry had an attack of malaria, a disease with which he had struggled in the past. He was thus sidelined with the doctors who were treating him, while the other members of the team continued on with the campaigns (LAE 1923(2)11:7).

Roman Catholicism

Not everyone understood why the LAEC would be at work in Latin America. The Panama Congress of 1916 had cast doubts upon the validity of missionary work in a continent that was supposed to be already Christianized. Some Protestants saw the type of evangelistic work undertaken by the LAEC as a form of poaching on the Catholics (S.
Strachan 1923b:9). In response to these concerns, the LAE would occasionally publish articles clarifying the need for evangelical work in a Catholic continent.

The evangelicals’ biggest concern with Catholicism was doctrinal—they did not believe the Catholics were offering the good news. Evidence of this was cited in three areas. First, Rome denied the sufficient, once-for-all atoning work of Christ. Instead, they modified this doctrine with a Eucharist that kept offering Christ up again, a doctrine of purgatory that displayed the insufficiency of Christ’s forgiveness for all sin, and penance which added works to grace. Second, they believed that Rome corrupted, destroyed, and denied the authority of the Bible. The use of the Bible in preaching and evangelistic work was one of the Catholics’ chief complaints about the LAEC. Third, they contended that Rome substituted the Pope for the Holy Spirit who alone should represent Christ’s true church. Given these beliefs, the LAEC, with other evangelical missions, justified their work of evangelism in Latin America (S. Strachan 1923b:10-11).

Later that same year, LAE documented the practice of Bible burning at the direction of Catholic clergy. As a consequence of one of these burnings, a priest by the name of Juan Esteban Roldan left the priesthood. His own subsequent accounts of his exodus may have influenced others to question the practices and doctrines taught by Rome (H. Strachan 1923:12-13).

Latin American Evangelist

*The Latin American Evangelist* (LAE) was an indispensable tool for communicating the vision and needs of the Latin America Evangelization Campaign (LAEC) to her home base. Originally offered free of charge, the LAEC attempted to put the LAE on a subscription basis to offset costs. With a mailing list in the thousands
(LAE 1923(2)7:13), the sixteen page monthly journal represented a serious outlay of resources for the young mission.

The LAE was written, published and mailed from San José, Costa Rica, which created both blessings and difficulties. On the one hand it was from the field, close to the action, and thus had a real adventurous flavor to it. On the other hand, the typesetter knew no English and the mail service was occasionally disrupted. Yet, it was more cost effective and desirable to produce the document from LAEC headquarters than to farm it out to someone in the USA. For much of its early history, Susan Strachan served as the magazine’s editor (LAE 1923(3)3:10).

The magazine itself could be read at two different levels. Some readers noted that it read like an interesting travelogue with the stories of various countries and the wanderings of the evangelists. While acknowledging this quality, Susan assured the readers that the journal’s intentions went far beyond entertainment value. The main object was “to make people acquainted with the spiritual needs of the continent so that they be aroused to take their share in the task of supplying those needs,” in prayer and giving (LAE1924(3)10:11).

Costa Rican Base

The Strachans took the Lord literally when he said (John 10:10) that abundant life was available in this earthly existence. They lived “life with broad margins,” believing the Lord for extraordinary things in the face of unprecedented opposition and opportunity (LAE 1924(3)8:3). Following this conviction, they had launched the LAEC and its ministries.
Other people soon caught the Strachans’ vision, and a trickle of missionaries began arriving in Costa Rica to supplement the work of the LAEC. One of the most enduring of these new missionaries was Miss Jessie J. Elder of New Zealand (LAE 1924(3)4/5:5). Having worked with the Strachans in Argentina, she transferred to Costa Rica in order to serve with them. Over the years she offered invaluable service to various LAEC ministries.

1924 also signaled a perceptible change of focus for the LAEC. Although the campaign work of the mission continued, the limelight began to be shared with various ministries developing at the home base in Costa Rica. Hints of ministries to come can be discerned in the articles written. For instance, from her first contact with Costa Rica, Susan was concerned with the plight of “nobody’s children” (LAE 1924(3)8:13). These orphans and street children constantly reminded Susan that there were pressing needs in Costa Rica. Although they were unable to address this need immediately, work with these children-at-risk would become a future priority. A second example of ministries to come can be seen in the arrival of a missionary nurse. Again, with her own background in medicine, Susan was concerned with the medical needs of the poor in Costa Rica (LAE 1924(3)9:8).

The immediate focus of the LAEC in Costa Rica was on the completion of their ambitious building program for the Bible school and LAEC headquarters. The new facility was dedicated on July 27, 1924 (LAE 1924(3)11:8). The building was inscribed with the words, *Instituto Bíblico* (Bible Institute). This was itself a witness to the public, noted Susan, “in a city and a country where the Bible is a forbidden book” (LAE 1924(3)9:8). While reporting this dedication in the LAE, Susan took the occasion to
remind readers of the “five dollars and a song” that had begun the LAEC on the road to their current facilities (S. Strachan 1924:9). Thus, the five dollar story began to take on mythic qualities.

One of the most important developments in LAEC history occurred when the Bible Institute became coed. Although Harry had originally planned for a traveling training school for men tied into his campaigns, this did not materialize. He did, however, find men interested in a residential program while working in Nicaragua. Referring to these young men, he wrote back home to Susan and said, “If you can arrange to put them up in San José ten of the boys will come overland, five from the Central American Mission and five from the Baptists. If it is convenient for you to receive them” (LAE 1924(3)10:5). That refrain, “If it is convenient for you to receive them,” signaled the beginning of one of LAEC’s most important mythic stories. Susan used it in the LAE to motivate giving for the expansion of the Bible Institute.

The first eight young men arrived in San José on August 6, 1924 after remarkable journeys. One fainted while crossing a mountain summit, some were taken ill, and the boys were thrown into jail on their first night in Costa Rica by a Commandante who paid “more attention to their appearance than to their passport” (LAE 1924(3)11:14). Nevertheless, the process had begun and the Strachans envisioned the Bible Institute training native evangelists who would then evangelize their continent. This, it was hoped, would be the mission’s “largest contribution to the evangelization of these American countries,” (LAE 1924(4)2:4). The new men’s dormitories were completed in 1925.
USA Base

Not only did they strengthen their home base in Costa Rica, but also the USA support base was built up. In 1924 Harry traveled 46,295 miles visiting 30 states and Canada. He gave 240 addresses to many denominations. This wider base provided them with finances, prayer, and missionaries to expand the work and influence of the LAEC (LAE 1924(3)6:10).

Nicaragua and Dominican Republic

In addition to his travels in the USA and Canada, Harry and the team conducted campaigns in Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. The featured evangelist in Nicaragua was Robert Elphick Valenzuela. Their tent crusade in Managua, Nicaragua saw an average of 500 in attendance (Valenzuela 1924:17). The Dominican Republic meetings were conducted with evangelist José L. Delgado (LAE 1924(4)1:5).

The Nicaragua campaign provides an interesting insight into what was apparently the follow-up procedure utilized by the LAEC after a typical campaign. Since the LAEC had no permanent workers or facilities in most of the places where it conducted its meetings, the few local evangelical churches and missions that existed were responsible for gathering in the evangelized. For instance, the Rev. Arturo Parajon noted:

The outward results of the campaign in Managua may not seem great, but in reality they are very precious. About fifty people manifested their desire to follow Christ while many others who did not at the time make any outward profession, are still frequenting the services and showing interest. Some twenty-five persons have joined the Baptist church and as many more the Central American Mission church. What is cause for great thankfulness is that many people hitherto fearful are now showing a good spirit towards the Gospel. (Parajon 1924:20)

Additionally, Harry Strachan encouraged the church to continue with regular evangelistic trips by organizing themselves into an Evangelization League (Parajon 1924:20). Thus, it
is obvious, that whatever garnering of converts occurred was left largely up to the few local churches and missions.

Internal Affairs

1925 saw the LAEC continue to consolidate its own identity and ministry. Although stateside it had been incorporated in New Jersey in 1921, the LAEC was also officially incorporated in Costa Rica in February 1925, thus enabling it to hold property and conduct business in the country (LAE1925(4)7:6).

Theologically, it distanced itself from the fear of modernism destroying the church, calling instead for a widespread revival of preaching (LAE 1925(4)5:3). In terms of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit then going on in the USA, it assured its supporters that fundamentalism did not imply a denial of the need for the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit (LAE 1925(4)6:4). This position would become particularly important for the mission when dealing with the Colombian charismatic movement in the 1950s and 1960s.

The Strachans recognized that God was blessing their young mission. As a growing organization they realized that more attention would need to be devoted to increasing its capital base (LAE 1925(4)9:8). In light of this, the entire five member Strachan family went to the USA to do deputation work.

The occasion of the Strachans’ fund raising tour in the USA, gave the LAEC family its first real opportunity to carry on in the absence of the founders. Those left behind in Costa Rica included Jessie Elder, Superintendent of Women, Mary Pruitt who held a Bible class and acted “as housemother and superintendent of the men’s building,” and a few others.
Puerto Rico was the site of the LAEC’s eighth campaign. It does not appear to have been as significant as some of the other campaigns. Reyes noted that while a “good number” of people made professions of faith, “the principal triumph was in the heart of each church” (Reyes 1925:9). If they continued in the spirit of what they had heard, they believed better days would lie ahead.

**Bible Institute**

The Bible Institute, later renamed *Seminario Bíblico Latinoamericano* (LAE 1941:110), dominated the work in Costa Rica and became the fountain for a number of other ministries. During the week and on vacations, the students were expected to apply what they had been learning in active evangelization. One of the first areas that the school focused on was the remote northern region of Costa Rica known as Guanacaste. By February 1926, the LAE could report, “souls have been saved and a little group of twelve believers has been formed—the nucleus of the first church in that neglected field” (LAE 1926(1):8).

Student work also began in Heredia, a province close to San José. Despite resistance on the part of local Catholics, a small lot was purchased upon which to build a hall that would be the only evangelical witness in that whole area (LAE 1926(10):12).

1926 heralded the beginning of the Spanish magazine, *El Mensajero* (The Messenger). This monthly evangelistic magazine put out by the Bible Institute would eventually grow to have a circulation in the thousands throughout Latin America (LAE 1926(10):13). In 1927, the Rev. Sergio M. Alfaro arrived from Puerto Rico to become the magazine’s editor (LAE 1927(8):9).
The Rev. and Mrs. W. L. Thompson joined the mission in 1926 (LAE 1926(2):7), a couple whose leadership skills would greatly assist the LAEC in its early life in Costa Rica, Colombia, and the USA. Incidentally, new missionaries came with the understanding that they were under a one-year probationary period during which time they would need to demonstrate their fitness for the work and the ability to learn Spanish. Additionally, all LAEC missionaries worked without any guarantee of a salary (LAM Collection 236, Box 66:15).

**Bolivia**

The only crusade in 1926 was held in Bolivia. Juan Varetto of Argentina was again the featured evangelist for Bolivia’s first mass evangelistic campaign (LAE 1926(8):6). Their first week of meetings saw audiences averaging 500 and Strachan felt that the gospel had gone forth without compromise (H. Strachan 1926:6).

**Costa Rica**

In 1927, the evangelical tide turned in Costa Rica. Until that year, evangelicals, as all Protestants were called there, had been a small, fairly private minority. After 40 years of work on the part of various missionaries, there were only a few hundred believers (LAE 1927(4):7). Even the LAEC’s half-hearted attempt at evangelistic meetings in 1922 had produced little results. However, the Strachans determined that God would have them conduct a serious campaign in their own “back yard.”

The Rev. Angel Archilla Cabrera was secured to work with Harry Strachan for the fourth time. Since they could not rent a theatre in San José for evangelical meetings, they secured a lumberyard capable of holding 800-1000 people for a period of six weeks. The meetings were filled nightly and the response was tremendous (LAE 1927(4):7-8).
As the meetings went on, hundreds of people learned to arrive early to secure a spot for themselves. In the end, “over five hundred names [were] handed in and many of these represented entire families. But, besides these, hundreds more [had] turned into friends and sympathizers with the cause” (LAE 1927(6):8). So many responded, however, that there was no way that the two other established missions in the town could follow up on them (LAE 1927(6):8). This situation seemed untenable to the Strachans. Although they had not intended to begin a permanent evangelistic facility in San José, it seemed to be the only option. With hundreds of people interested in the gospel, and virtually no ability on the part of the established churches to follow up on them, the LAEC began to petition its supporters for the funds to construct an evangelistic hall to address the need (LAE 1927(6):6).

Evangelistic work in Costa Rica did not always progress smoothly. The LAEC crusade met with defeat in the Catholic stronghold of Cartago. Although they had tried to secure a theatre in the city of Cartago for meetings, they were continually blocked. Toward the end of Archilla’s stay in Costa Rica, however, they secured a theatre for one evening. The local priests and people would not stand for this, threatening the LAEC with violence if they went through with the meeting. The situation became so tense that police had to guard the theatre before the meeting as people were prepared to shoot Archilla. People from Cartago had also been sent to scout for cars leaving the Bible Institute for Cartago to waylay them. “Every bus and automobile that went into Cartago during the late afternoon and evening was examined by [flashlight] to find out who the occupants were” (LAE 1927(6):6-7). The meeting had to be canceled.
Stiff resistance from Catholics was also encountered in the Costa Rican province of Heredia, where a chapel and parsonage had been erected. Miss Elder, Miss Piper, some Institute students and the Strachans were having a meeting in the chapel when violence broke out. Although most escaped unscathed, Harry and Susan did not. Susan was struck by a stone that left her bleeding and Harry was hit just over the eye. They were grateful, however, that the damage was not greater, and the work continued in Heredia (LAE 1927(7):7-8).

Nicaragua and Chile

LAEC launched another Nicaraguan crusade in 1928. 9000 handbills advertised the first evening meeting drawing a crowd of 1000. The subsequent night’s group was even larger. Meetings were held at a variety of locations throughout Nicaragua, despite some opposition (Alfaro 1928a:6).

Chile hosted the second campaign of the year. Thousands heard the gospel in Talca (LAE 1928(10):6), and meetings in Chillán averaged over 900 nightly (LAE 1928(11):5). Meetings in other towns had similar results.

Buildings

Construction began on the new evangelistic hall in San José (LAE 1928(5):7), as well as a hospital (LAE 1928(9):6). More nurses arrived to serve with the LAEC as a result of the medical focus. In keeping with the name of the Instituto Bíblico, they named the church Templo Bíblico (Bible Temple), and the hospital, Clinica Bíblica (Bible Clinic). The LAEC chose to maintain “Bible” in the names of these institutions since they were becoming known in Costa Rica as “los Bíblicos” (the Bible People)—an
originally derisive name given them, as best they could determine, by the priests (LAE 1928(4):6).

Missiology

The Strachans were ahead of their times in clarifying the type of missionaries needed in Latin America. Missionaries should (1) disassociate themselves from the politics of their own government; (2) respect the customs of the people, rather than try to impose sending-country customs; (3) love the people they serve, identifying with them to the point of laying down their own language and culture; (4) train Latin missionaries to evangelize their own people; and (5) conduct large-scale evangelistic campaigns with evangelists familiar with the Latin reality (Alfaro 1928b:10-11). In large measure, this became the standard for the LAEC.

Dedications

After a busy period of fund raising and construction, the LAEC declared 1929 a year of prayer. Prayer focused on the need for revival and a fresh baptism of the Holy Spirit, beginning with the missionaries (LAE 1929(1):5-6).

Buildings were dedicated to the Lord in 1929. The evangelistic hall opened for worship and evening meetings on Sunday May 5, 1929 (LAE 1929(5):5). The congregation was “formally constituted” on January 3, 1930 (Elder 1930:9). By 1944 the Templo Bíblico was “the largest protestant church in Costa Rica,” with a seating capacity of 900 (W. Nelson 1944:46).

The hospital was dedicated July 14, 1929 (LAE 1929(6/7):4). Both the hospital and the evangelistic hall were seen as evangelistic tools for reaching people with the gospel. The hospital would treat anyone regardless of his or her religion. It was,
however, decidedly evangelical (LAE 1929(6/7):11) and “no priest would be allowed to
enter the building in the capacity of a priest, under any conditions whatever” (Walker
1930:7). Given the experience of the LAEC with the Catholic clergy, this position is
understandable. However, it did create tension.

Of the two institutions, the hospital drew the greatest ire from the Catholic clergy. They distributed a handbill warning Catholic doctors not to lend any support to the
Protestants (LAE 1929(6/7):13). Their vehement opposition negatively impacted the
reception of the hospital in Costa Rica. In time, however, the tables were turned, and the
hospital became one of evangelicalism’s best advocates in the country. Dr. Marie
Cameron of Canada arrived in 1930 to head up the new work where she remained for
here entire distinguished career, wedding evangelism and medicine (LAE 1930(1):16).

LAEC Status

By the end of the 1920s, the LAEC counted among its members, eight
missionaries, four nurses, five national workers, and the Strachans (LAE 1929(6/7):22).
In the USA, Mary Frances Pruitt, who had left the field for health reasons, was working
in the home office in Philadelphia (LAE 1929(11):8). In Canada, the Rev. R. H.
Ballantyne had agreed to represent the LAEC, hoping to alleviate the necessity of Harry
Strachan spending so much time in deputation (LAE 1929(11):7).

Observations

The 1920s saw the LAEC develop along several lines that are pertinent to the
study at hand. Behind the events that have been narrated, important assumptions were
being clarified and institutionalized.
**Vision.** The vision to evangelize the Latin American continent is apparent throughout the 1920s—with two modifications. First, the Strachans realized that they alone could not possibly evangelize the continent. In fact, as the LAEC developed, Harry had less time to conduct campaigns. Hence, they constantly reminded their supporters that the real key to evangelizing Latin America was the Latinos themselves. So, second, the Bible Institute became crucial to training the future evangelists who would win the continent.

**Identity.** Most of the early focus of the LAEC was on Harry Strachan’s work. Slowly but surely, however, Susan and the LAEC team in Costa Rica became prominent. Although the campaign work was still central, the multiplicity of ministries and missionaries created a corporate identity apart from the Strachans. The first great test of this new identity was the ability of the LAEC to function while the Strachans did deputation work in the USA. LAE articles displayed many new names and faces for the USA and Canadian stakeholders to identify with the LAEC. By the end of the 1920s, the LAEC roster included 19 missionaries (LAE 1931(1):16).

**Leadership.** Harry and Susan continued as the undisputed leaders of the LAEC. However, new faces were emerging in leadership roles. Elder and Pruitt in particular were directing various ministries. With the launching of the LAE, Instituto Bíblico, *El Mensajero* magazine, preaching points in Costa Rica, Templo Bíblico, Clinica Biblica, and continued campaign work, it became increasingly difficult for one or two people to manage everything.

**Theology.** The LAEC continued to be motivated by the expected return of Jesus Christ and the desire to cooperate with his church in evangelizing the lost. Additionally,
the Strachans featured some of the important distinctions between evangelical and Catholic theology. Their personal experiences of violent opposition undoubtedly solidified those beliefs.

The 1930s

Following the American stock market crash in October 1929, the world was plunged into the Great Depression. Faith-based mission agencies, like the LAEC, were impacted. Although building construction slowed, the work of the mission deepened and expanded through the resources at its disposal.

Criticism

The LAEC was not without its critics. Some wondered why it had undertaken so much construction in Costa Rica if continent-wide evangelism was its true objective. These criticisms provided the occasion for the Strachans to clarify their view of theology and missions. They reaffirmed their conviction that Latin Americans themselves must evangelize Latin America. They also assured their detractors that LAEC missionaries received an allowance that was barely enough to live on; the present allowance was only sufficient for buying food. The missionaries lived in the Institute/Headquarters facilities and ate together in a common dining room (LAE 1930(1):10-12).

The other response to critics was more theological. While Modernists often addressed social concerns to the exclusion of evangelism, others focused on evangelism to the exclusion of any social ministry. To counteract this, an LAE article demonstrated the balanced nature of the gospel, beginning with evangelism. The author noted while the end objective of all missionary work should be evangelism, “preaching the gospel by
word of mouth [is not] the missionary’s only task” (E. Nelson 1930:13). The LAEC engaged in both social ministries and evangelism because both were a part of the gospel. They preached the good news not only with words in massive campaigns, but by meeting practical needs through their nurses and native evangelists.

**Orphanage**

1931 saw the long-awaited addition of a farm intended for orphanage work. The 200 acre spread on the hills overlooking San José (S. Strachan 1931:12) would prove to be one of the mission’s most enduring legacies to Costa Rican children at risk. Although originally envisioned as an orphanage, it developed as a temporary care facility for children whose parents were going through difficulties. The orphanage was called, *El Hogar Bíblico* (The Bible Home) (LAE 1937:76).

Students from the Bible Institute had visited a town near the farm, Santa Barbara, for several months. The people seemed receptive to the gospel and when evangelist Palomeque went there, “about a hundred people attended his meeting and more than twenty expressed their desire to serve Christ” (Elder 1931a:14). Soon after this, the local priest instigated a plot against a student and an LAEC missionary staying in the area. A dynamite explosion near their quarters blew off a shutter. Thankfully, the bomb had been incorrectly placed; the force of the blast went toward the street instead of the sleeping men. With their lives preserved, the LAEC rejoiced in another victory for the gospel (Elder 1931b:16).

**Campaigning**

1931 saw LAEC campaigns and meetings in Guatemala, Honduras, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Brazil conducted by Harry Strachan and LAEC missionaries. William
Thompson and Samuel Palomeque helped in the Guatemala and Honduras campaigns (LAE 1932(1/2):3). The Thompsons also represented the LAM on their deputation trip (LAE 1931(4):10).

**Guanacaste**

After six years of evangelizing on the part of the Institute students, LAEC workers settled the Guanacaste region of northern Costa Rica. Jessie Elder and a nurse moved to the city of Liberia, while two others set up quarters in Santa Cruz (LAE 1932(3):6). The work progressed slowly but steadily with the workers experiencing occasional health problems. By 1938 they were able to hold their first evangelical congress with over 100 believers in attendance (Tryon 1938:80).

**Latin Missionaries**

The LAEC continued its policy of empowering Latinos for evangelism by recruiting them as LAEC missionaries. Joaquin Vela, Roman Lopez (LAE 1932(4):8), and Indalecio Bustabad (LAE 1933(2):6) all participated in various LAEC campaigns in 1932 and 1933. Strachan and Palomeque manned the one in Spain (LAE 1934(1)4). Samuel Palomeque, in fact, stayed on for months in Spain representing the LAEC in evangelistic meetings (LAE 1935(5):10).

**The Strachan Children**

Harry and Susan’s children were rarely mentioned in the pages of the LAE until they were adults. The magazine reported that both Ken and Grace had answered the call to ministry. Grace would study medicine while Kenneth proceeded from Wheaton College to Dallas Theological Seminary. Son Harry had indicated no desire to enter vocational ministry (LAE 1932(5):7).
A year later, however, LAE reported Harry’s untimely death (LAE 1933(11):6). After being expelled from Wheaton Academy for goofing off, he finished high school at a private school in Florida and then registered to begin classes at the University of Florida. A hurricane hit the area, and Harry, with other students, worked at cleaning up the debris. The young Harry Strachan caught malaria from which he never recovered.

The family converged on the hospital, Ken from Dallas, and the rest from Costa Rica. Mr. Strachan was particularly grief stricken as he had hoped Harry would take over his ministry some day. Harry was more like his father in terms of being outgoing and confident, unlike his elder brother Ken. Thus, his passing was a blow to the family and to the future of the LAEC. The elder Strachans aged perceptibly and the pain lingered as they returned to ministry activities (Roberts 1996:134-137).

Expanding Base

The LAEC expanded its ministry base in Costa Rica, and its stakeholder base abroad in the years 1934 to 1936. Harry did deputation work in England and Scotland, renewing acquaintances and stirring up interest in the work of the LAEC (H. Strachan 1935:7). They greatly expanded their list of representatives and honorary treasurers in those countries.

The Bible Institute held its first Evangelical Congress in 1936. As a result, numerous USA LAEC stakeholders visited the field and saw the various ministries. Many graduates of the Institute attended and overall the successful congress saw 150 in attendance. The event made LAEC realize what a family it had become (LAE 1936:39).

LAEC headquarters in the USA moved from Philadelphia to New York City where most of the meetings were held anyway (LAE 1935(8/9):18). In 1937 changes
were made in LAEC’s executive structure. Clarence E. Mason, who had been the chairman of the LAEC Executive Council became President. Lawyer Jacob Stam, who joined the Home Council in 1936 (LAE 1936:52), was named Vice President (LAE 1937:39). The Home Council and the Field Directors (Harry and Susan Strachan) were responsible for administrating the affairs of the LAEC. The Strachans were entirely responsible for the fieldwork and the disbursement of funds (LAE 1936:75). With the gift of a house in 1939, the LAEC USA headquarters moved to Ridgefield Park, New Jersey (LAE 1939:159).

These internal adjustments to the LAEC were quite important considering the ages and health of the founders. Harry had suffered from bouts of malaria and other sickness from time to time, and he needed to spend time in a sanitarium in the USA, after which he continued his deputation work (LAE 1935(8/9):18). Strachan, again in ill health, was treated in Mayo Clinic in 1936 (LAE 1936:150). Susan too, was intermittently ill and spent time recuperating in the States (LAE 1934(12):16).

The greatest harbinger of hope for the LAEC’s future, was the arrival of Harry and Susan Strachan’s son Kenneth into the LAEC fold as a full-fledged missionary in 1936 (LAE 1936:115). Eventually, Kenneth would lead the LAM. The Strachan’s daughter, Grace Strachan, joined the mission in 1939 (LAE 1939:48).

Wilton M. Nelson, Kenneth’s friend, joined the mission with Kenneth. The two of them worked with youth at the Templo Bíblico and taught at the Instituto Bíblico. Wilton served in Costa Rica until his death in 1984, teaching Church History and authoring a number of books including, *A History of Protestantism in Costa Rica*. His
future wife Thelma served as a nurse at the Clinica Biblica and headed the nursing school (C. Nelson 2001).

**Colombian Ministry Established**

Colombia weighed heavily on Harry and Susan’s mind. With the arrival in Costa Rica of Kenneth Strachan, Rogelio Archilla and Wilton Nelson, the senior Strachans felt less needed administratively (Roberts 1992:174). A trip was scheduled to survey Colombia’s needs (LAE 1937:7). Although evangelistic campaigns had been held in this country, no LAEC missionaries had taken up residence there. After consulting with the few missionaries in Colombia, the Strachans decided LAEC would settle in the Bolivar region. The first LAEC missionaries to answer the call to Colombia were nurses Kathryn Jephson and Jenny Jorgenson (LAE 1937:10). Manuel Diaz, a Colombian who had attended the Bible Institute, worked with them (LAE 1937:12). From this humble beginning a start was made in Colombia.

The LAEC did not intend to establish a full mission organization with a wide range of local ministries in Colombia. Rather, they hoped to catalyze itinerant native evangelists to spread the gospel and gather the converts into new churches (LAE 1938:6). While Colombia never grew as large as Costa Rica, it became LAEC’s second largest occupied field. Ministries began in Montería, Sincelejo, Magangué, El Banco and San Andres (LAE 1939:29). Eventually the mission wanted to enter Cartagena where “there [was] not a single preacher of the gospel in all that great city” (LAE 1938:11).

**LAEC Becomes LAM**

In a significant close to the 1930s, the mission changed its name from the *Latin America Evangelization Campaign* to the *Latin America Mission*—LAM for short (LAE 
1939:22; LAM Collection 236, Box 67:12). This move recognized that the mission had become far more than an evangelistic campaign. The new name took into account the range of ministries in which LAM missionaries engaged (LAE 1939:12).

**Observations**

As the 1930s came to a close and World War II began, the LAM had evolved into a complex of ministries. Health concerns and a family tragedy left the elder Strachans in less than prime condition. Hope, however, was renewed as Kenneth joined the mission, although no one had expected him to take his father’s place.

**Vision.** In the 1930s, the LAM consolidated and strengthened its ministries at its base in Costa Rica and conducted a few campaigns. Some of the Institute’s graduates joined the mission’s work in Costa Rica and other countries. Toward the end of the decade, Harry’s attention was increasingly directed toward the evangelistically barren fields of Colombia. His vision was that the mission should enter that territory in a major manner, hoping for a significant impact.

**Identity.** The LAM deepened its identity as an organization. The team demonstrated that they could maintain the ministries in the founders’ absence (S. Strachan 1930:7). Besides tracking the Strachans’ whereabouts, the LAE highlighted many missionaries’ activities on a regular basis. Some stateside stakeholders attended the Evangelical Congress held in Costa Rica, and this contributed to organizational identity.

The LAM had around 36 field missionaries at the end of the 1930s. The LAM monthly budget of $3000 covered Costa Rica’s 24 missionaries and 5 native workers, board for 68 Bible Institute students, Colombia’s 12 missionaries and native workers, and
Bolivia’s 2 native workers. The money also funded the campaigns, USA office expenses, Templo Bíblico, the Farm and Orphanage, the hospital, and other scattered buildings and ministries (LAE 1939:12).

**Leadership.** Although the Strachans continued as the undisputed leaders of the mission, other missionaries, like William Thompson and several Latino evangelists, attained higher leadership profiles. Additionally, rearrangements in the USA Executive Council opened more space for organizational level input.

**Theology.** The LAM gave biblical justifications for going beyond campaign work and including social ministries. While gospel ministry included the verbal proclamation of good news, it also included ministries like medicine and shelter for children. They were moving toward a more balanced understanding of the gospel.

### Harry Strachan’s Closing Years: 1940-1945

With World War II in full swing, LAM expanded their ministries in Colombia and Costa Rica. War conditions interrupted the mail service, thus impacting distribution of the LAE magazine—their primary artery for communicating with supporters. They continued publishing, but less frequently. Yet, the work continued to blossom even as Harry’s health began to falter.

**Columbian Expansion**

To evangelize the inner reaches of Bolivar, Colombia, the Strachan’s determined that a launch was needed. LAM dedicated the boat, *Buenas Nuevas* (Good News), on December 18, 1939. Señor Ricardo Glahn served as its captain and evangelist, Domingo Silva from the Bible Institute assisted him. (LAE 1940:4-5).
After about fifteen years of work in Costa Rica, LAM missionaries Mr. and Mrs. William Thompson were named LAM General Superintendents of Bolivar (LAE 1941:27). Since the Strachans could not be both in Costa Rica and Colombia, this move effectively extended the mission’s leadership. The Thompsons oversaw the workers and ministry in this new territory.

Despite their initial intentions not to begin a fully-orbed mission work in Colombia, the LAM dug in deeply. More workers arrived and property was secured for future ministries. Pearl Phillips and Dora Shulert began a Bible training school in 1942 (U. Padilla 1995:23), and churches were also started. The mission signed contracts for their second gospel boat, *El Heraldo* (The Herald), in August 1941 (LAE 1941:108). In 1943 the mission entered Bolivar’s capital city of Cartagena, and by 1945 it formed the *Iglesia Evangélica “El Templo”* (“The Temple” Evangelical Church) (U. Padilla 1995:28).

**Future Leaders**

On December 27, 1940 R. Kenneth Strachan married Elizabeth Simmons Walker (LAE 1941:13). Like all LAM spouses, Elizabeth Walker Strachan went through the process of becoming a LAM missionary in her own right (LAE 1941:31).

In 1942 Kenneth and his wife furloughed in the USA (LAE 1942:129). During this period, he took time for further graduate studies at Princeton. The concepts gained there helped to guide his future leadership of the mission.

Grace Strachan married W. Dayton Roberts (LAE 1941:80). After service in Costa Rica, the Roberts moved to Cartegena, Colombia (LAE 1945:15). Dayton later
became an important LAM leader, providing strategic direction for many LAM initiatives.

Rome Revisited

Both Kenneth Strachan and Dayton Roberts wrote on Roman Catholicism’s influence in Latin America. Kenneth stated that Rome was essentially anti-Christian, and had always been the enemy of Evangelical Christianity due to “her old ruthless intolerance and dogmatism” (R. Strachan 1942:11). Dayton affirmed that Rome could not be trusted. Her expertise in political intrigue and “religious sophistry” left a void in the continent that could only be filled with the true gospel of Christ (Roberts 1943a:53-54). Rome’s desire to see “all North American protestant missionaries” withdrawn from Latin America in the interests of “good neighborliness,” was simply another example of her fascist-minded hierarchy (Roberts 1943b:4-5). After Vatican II in the early 1960s, Strachan and Roberts’ views on Rome softened.

Denominations Formed

In time, LAM-related churches in both Costa Rica and Colombia became denominations and LAM ordained pastors into the ministry (LAE 1944:62). The Costa Rican churches settled on the name, *Asociación de Iglesias Bíblicas Costarricenses* (Costa Rican Bible Churches) (LAE 1945:22). The Colombian brethren chose, *Asociación de Iglesias Evangélicas de Bolivar* (Association of Evangelical Churches of Bolivar) (LAE 1945:9), which, in 1953, was changed to *Asociación de Iglesias Evangélicas del Caribe* (U. Padilla 1995:40). LAM planned to transfer all responsibility from the mission to the Costa Rican denomination over a period of seven years, at which time the churches would be completely independent (LAE 1945:22).
The Death of Harry Strachan

On March 28, 1945 Harry Strachan died. His health had declined for two or three years, his spirit slackened as a result of the war, his memory failed, and sicknesses prevented him from engaging in campaign work (LAE 1945:26). At 72, he left behind a family, a mission, and the legacy of thousands who had first heard the gospel through his witness. Hundreds paid their last respects to Harry at the funeral held in Templo Bíblico (LAE 1945:26).

Observations

The increased focus on Colombia and Harry Strachan’s declining health, dominated the war years. Sufficiently laid groundwork, however, provided for a smooth leadership transition after his death.

Vision. LAM believed the Post World War II period would be a time of increased interest in mission work (LAE 1942:109). They envisioned God calling many young people into the field, and they hoped to quadruple their mission force of 23 in Colombia (LAE1943:3).

Identity. LAM had approximately 52 missionaries at this historical juncture (LAE 1946:3). In one way, LAM renewed itself in the 1940s. By entering Colombia it doubled its fields. From its two locations LAM’s spanned the continent. While movement between the two fields continued, increasingly its members identified with one or the other. For those in Costa Rica, the Wednesday night missionary prayer meetings continued to encourage and build their sense of family (LAE 1940:68), while the Colombian team developed its own rites.
Leadership. Although Harry and Susan continued as LAM’s obvious leaders, the Home Council recognized the coming changes. At the behest of the elder Strachans (Roberts 1996:161), the Council named Kenneth Strachan as LAM Deputy Director in October 1944 with the expectation that he would succeed his father (LAE 1945:17). Following Harry’s death, the Council named Kenneth as LAM Co-Director along with his mother Susan (LAE 1945:66). Organizationally, LAM developed an Inter-Field Council to mediate between the ministries in Costa Rica and Colombia (LAE 1945:28).

Theology. LAM struggled with knowing when and where to plant deep roots, and when and where to be mobile. It originally reacted against missions that dug in and did not get around to evangelism. Yet, the mission realized that ministry longevity required putting down roots. While LAM believed God could convert people even after hearing the gospel only once, as in an evangelistic campaign, this would be an infrequent occurrence. Experience taught the missionaries that God normally reached people through a ministry of teaching over time (LAE 1940:24-25). Thus, LAM worked at the balance between sowing, which meant routinizing ministries, and reaping, which often required evangelistic campaigns (R. Strachan 1940:103).

In many ways, the position described above left them open to attack from both Liberals and Fundamentalists. Liberals could of course identify with LAM’s social ministries, but were less insistent on evangelizing people. On the other hand, Fundamentalists could identify with LAM’s evangelistic agenda, but reacted against “social work.” Kenneth maintained that there should be “a proper approach which should be neither the doctrinally and psychologically unsound approach of the modernist, nor yet
the pugnacious and polemical approach of some fundamentalists” (R. Strachan 1943:47).

The LAM walked a fine line.

**Organizational Analysis**

Some analysis of LAM as an organization was indicated in the *Observations* sections above. The period of 1921-1945 requires, however, a more detailed analysis.

**Organizational Stage**

It will be recalled that Schein’s first stage of organizational development is *Founding and Early Growth* (See Figure 3-1). The LAEC experienced this first stage from 1921-1945. During this phase, according to Schein, the founders and their assumptions dominate the organizational scene, create a culture, and carve out a competency niche (Schein 1992:303-304). Clearly, without Harry and Susan Strachan, there would have been no LAEC. Their personal drive and vision created a mission out of a dream. As has been shown above, their theological and organizational assumptions were the rule of law for any missionaries wanting to unite with the LAEC. The mission was not a democracy; it was more like a benevolent dictatorship.

As LAEC missionaries and personnel developed the various ministries with their myriad experiences, an organizational culture was created. Stories like the *five dollars* that began the Bible Institute and the coming of the *first men* to attend classes became the substance of legends. These and other stories were frequently repeated in the pages of the LAE and became part of the LAEC lore. Through examining the LAE and observing the founders, new members discerned LAEC’s priorities and culture.
The mission carved out a clear ministry niche in the continent-wide evangelistic campaigns. Harry broke new ground with many of his innovative approaches such as using tents, native musical bands, public forums, and advertising. Through his ministry, and that of the associate LAEC evangelists, tens of thousands heard the gospel for the first time.

Figure 3-1  LAM Founding and Early Growth Stage

Despite the success of the campaigns, however, the ministries in Costa Rica really defined the mission. Evangelism had been established as part of the warp and woof of the mission, but the campaigns did not continue at the fever pitch of the first years. Evangelism became more personal and local as evangelists, nurses, and pastors were trained through the various LAM institutions. Through its institutions, the Instituto Bíblico, Clinica Bíblica, Templo Bíblico, Hogar Bíblico, Iglesias Bíblicas, El Mensajero
and others, LAM performed its distinctive services for years to come in Costa Rica and, increasingly, in Colombia.

Among the types of change mechanisms that can characterize an organization in the early stage, Schein’s “incremental change through general and specific evolution” best describes LAM’s experience (Schein 1992:305). Many things simply changed over the years in response to current needs, new workers, and changing circumstances. In small ways, Harry and Susan’s health issues created opportunities for other members to exercise leadership in LAM’s future.

Figure 3-2  LAM Growth Through Creativity and Crisis of Leadership

Specific changes were involved in entering the field of Colombia and in beginning the other major ministries. In terms of leadership, appointing William
Thompson to oversee Colombia and Kenneth Strachan to be LAM Deputy Director are examples of planned change. Overall, however, the change appears to have been of the normal, gradual variety, right up to the end of Harry’s life.

![Figure 3-3  LAM Early Growth/Crisis Overlay](image)

Greiner observes that this early phase of organizational development is characterized by *Growth through Creativity* (See Figure 3-2), as demonstrated above, initiated by the founders (Greiner 1972:41). Over time, organizations increase in size and complexity. This creative growth creates the first major *Crisis of Leadership*. This can also be discerned in LAM’s history. In the early years Harry and Susan were unencumbered with complex leadership responsibilities, and could conduct ministries at their discretion. As these ministries produced converts and increased missionary recruits,
their leadership style needed to change (See Figure 3-3). Although the complexity was unintentional, it was their job to adapt (Greiner 1972:42). LAM had its share of misunderstandings and adjustments to make during this transitional period.

Organizational Effectiveness

Recall that in this study organizational “effectiveness is a function of the interrelation of core values and beliefs, organizational policies and practices, and the business environment of the organization (Denison 1997:6). Specifically these are seen in the areas of organizational vision (Denison 1997), organizational identity (Denison 1997), organizational leadership (Schein 1992), and theology. What follows is an evaluation and approximation of the motivation that each of these four areas provided toward organizational effectiveness.

Vision. Harry and Susan Strachan generated a vision that strongly motivated their mission. Their agenda was clear and they followed it to the best of their ability. They evangelized locally and continentally, and developed supporting ministries to enhance the gospel.

What is remarkable here is not that the Strachans had a vision, but that so many other people saw it and were caught up in it. The LAEC had advocates scattered all over North America and Europe, and its missionaries championed the vision as well. They were able to translate the vision “into goal-directed behavior on the part of each member” of the organization (Denison 1997:196).

Identity. Initially the LAEC began as a “family business.” When people outside the Strachan family joined the mission, they joined an extended family. There was a high level of member involvement (Denison 1997:195). A clear vision and unambiguous
expectations facilitated peoples’ adjustments. As in a biological family, the parents, Harry and Susan, were the undisputed pacesetters.

As the mission expanded and matured, people identified in other ways with one another than strictly through the founders. The weekly Wednesday night prayer meetings for the missionaries and weekly chapel services at the Bible Institute built both a worshipping community and a family-like atmosphere. In these meetings the “shared values and norms that make up the core of [the] organization” were rehearsed (Denison 1997:195). However, not all were satisfied with the quality of these occasions. Speaking for the committee on spiritual welfare, Wilton Nelson reported that some wanted “quarterly meetings in which missionaries should be free to present problems and suggestions concerning the work and policy of the mission” (LAM Collection 236, Box 1:5). Despite these occasional grievances, LAM’s family identity motivated the missionaries.

Leadership. While the leadership style was authoritarian and conceivably even reminiscent of McGregor’s Theory X (1960), it was effective and perhaps appropriate for founding a mission in that era. Someone needed to make decisions, and the Strachans, perhaps Susan in particular, were willing and able to be decisive. This is not to say, however, that the leaders always led wisely—just that they always led.

With the growth of the organization toward the end of Harry’s life, their style of leadership may have become counter-productive to their goals. For instance, although the Strachans spoke highly of nationals directing their own affairs in Colombia, the Strachans dictated policy. Soon after Dayton and Grace Roberts arrived in Colombia, a letter from the elder Strachans named Dayton as the field’s new director, and named the
other people on the Field Council. Roberts himself was unhappy about this letter, because neither he nor the missionaries in Colombia (some of whom resented his appointment so soon after arriving) had been consulted (Roberts 2000a). It was an edict from above. This type of event illustrated that a crisis of leadership was imminent.

Theology. Theology surfaced as a key component in the motivation cycle. Although it often existed below the surface, it dramatically impacted the mission’s vision, identity, and message. Without the strong eschatological impetus to share Jesus in the face of hostility, little might have been accomplished. Their expectation of Christ’s imminent return, coupled with their belief that people were lost without responding positively to God’s gift of salvation, contributed greatly to organizational effectiveness.

Although often explicit, the mission’s theology can also be discerned in its decisions. For instance, Harry Strachan employed very innovative methods in the evangelistic campaigns. Why did he innovate or adapt? His theological compulsions drove him to innovate, to discover any means possible to gain a hearing for the gospel. In studying mission movements, it is insufficient to locate their motivation, and account for their effectiveness, from a human perspective alone. Their faith-based worldview, and their experience of divine intervention, must be considered. The Strachans called people to pray, to intercede for the mission, because they believed that only God could accomplish the task of mission.

As Denison verified, organizational theorists assert that effectiveness is enhanced when organizations have a strong culture and identity as seen in member involvement and consistency, coupled with clear goals and vision (Denison 1997:6). It is the role of leaders, particularly founding leaders, to create this initial culture around their
assumptions and priorities (Schein 1992:226). Their ideology, in secular settings, or theology, in religious institutions, “can be seen as a set of overarching values that can serve as a prescription for action vis-à-vis other groups and the broader environment” (Schein 1992:89). To the degree that LAM’s founders cast a seemingly compelling vision, created an organizational sense of identity, exercised strong leadership in forming the organization’s culture, and articulated a clear theology of mission, they contributed to its organizational effectiveness. Harry and Susan Strachan had successfully birthed an organization that was quickly growing out of its childhood and into its adolescence.
Chapter 4

Succession Phase—R. Kenneth Strachan and Evangelism in Depth (1946-1965)

Upon the passing of Latin America Mission (LAM) co-founder Harry Strachan, son R. Kenneth Strachan succeeded his father as director. Although Kenneth’s mother, Susan Strachan, and he were co-directors until her death, the major decisions during this phase came from Kenneth. With these changes LAM entered a new day.

This chapter is divided into three parts with a concluding organizational analysis at the end. The first section covers the period of Kenneth’s rise to leadership and various LAM activities. The second and third sections cover the latter half of Kenneth’s time as LAM General Director. Section two describes the charismatic outpouring occurring on the Colombian field and its impact on LAM. Section three, which takes place in the same timeframe, begins with Kenneth’s reorganization of LAM administration using a team leadership model. He also launched Evangelism in Depth (EID). The spontaneous charismatic outbreak, accompanied by widespread grassroots evangelism, provides an interesting contrast with the well-programmed evangelistic approach of EID.

Continuation and Expansion (1946-1954)

Stepping into the leadership role of the LAM did not come easily for Kenneth. Plagued with self-doubts, he seemed an unlikely successor to the executive position once held by his father. Yet, he succeeded not only in maintaining the established ministries, but he also made his own contributions to LAM culture and programs.
The Tale of a Son

Kenneth must be understood in his own right and not seen merely as an extension of his parents. On the one hand, unlike them, he did not feel adequate for the task of conducting campaigns and leading others, at least initially. On the other hand, while Harry and Susan had learned much about the Latino mindset through years of experience, Kenneth, having been raised in Latin America, knew the culture from the inside. Eventually, Kenneth’s insider status endeared him to North American and Latin American colleagues alike.

Kenneth was born in 1910 while Harry and Susan Strachan were serving in Argentina. When he was seven, the family furloughed in the United States. It was there that Harry and Susan concluded they must break with their old mission in order to follow God’s plan for them—continental evangelism. Before the couple had children, they decided that Harry’s work of evangelism would always be their first priority. Later, Susan concluded that God would have her not only support Harry and raise the family, but also be involved in various ministries (Roberts 1996:35). With difficulty, the family balanced ministry and family life.

In 1920, while Harry and Susan conducted a yearlong tour of Central and South America discerning the needs and the work ahead of them, the children were left behind with trusted Christian families. That this decision was hard on Kenneth can be seen in a letter he wrote to his own daughter years later:

I was only ten, and the Weavers who took care of me couldn't have been nicer to me. But some Sunday nights when they went off to church I would stay alone in the house and as the darkness and silence settled over the house, it was hard not to feel completely desolated. Maybe because of that experience I've always dreaded lonesomeness almost more than anything else. I know that it causes one of the
deepest and sharpest agonies that humans are called to experience. (R. Strachan 1962:164)

While Kenneth understood the importance of his father's work, his absence left an indelible imprint on Kenneth’s young psyche.

The senior Strachans maintained a busy lifestyle. As seen in the previous chapter, Harry spent most of his time away from home carrying out his work. Susan, who was anything but idle, provided most of the childcare. Nevertheless, the family understood the importance of the work, and the children enjoyed life in Costa Rica.

Interestingly enough, while Harry and Susan loved their children, public displays of affection between them were infrequent—no doubt reflecting the spirit of the times. "In fact, God and love, two subjects profoundly revered in the family, were rarely mentioned at all in a personal rather than theoretical way" (Elliot 1968:5). Perhaps some of the acute sense of insecurity that Kenneth developed can be attributed to a lack of overt demonstrations of love.

After enjoying a childhood of relative freedom running and playing in the Costa Rican out-of-doors, at age 15 Kenneth went to the Wheaton Academy in Illinois to complete his secondary education. This structured environment, complete with school regulations, did not set well with the young Strachan. Kenneth struggled against the authorities.

Kenneth also endured tremendous battles of self-doubt. Although his parents continually wrote and reminded him of the hopes they had for him, he interpreted these expectations as pressure. Kenneth, never satisfied with himself, felt he was letting his parents down. One example of the type of parental pressure that he lived under is seen in a letter from his mother.
I don't think, Kenneth, that you are doing as well as you should with only four subjects . . . . Your grade oscillates between eighty and eighty-seven. Is it because you are not working hard enough? I would expect you to get always above ninety and hope you may be able to top your class . . . . It should always be the upward look, and no rest while there are others above you . . . there's always room at the top. Of course there is because most people will stay comfortably somewhere along the route and do not exert themselves to get to the top. But your place is up there, Kenneth. (Elliot 1968:7-8)

While Kenneth eventually excelled in life, at the time, his parent’s expectations were met with resistance.

One of Kenneth's greatest challenges was the ongoing shortage of money. While there was always money for the projects in Costa Rica that he read about in his mother's letters, there never seemed to be enough for his necessities. "He did persuade her, by the time he was in his junior year, that long pants were a must" (Elliot 1968:8). This was a real point of contention for Kenneth. Years later he wrote an editorial on one of the struggles he had with his mother as a seven year old boy living in the States over the issue of long pants. When he yielded to his mother's demand to wear short pants, he proclaimed, "All right. I'll wear them. But when I get to heaven I'm going to ask God if a seven-year-old boy should wear long pants or short, and if He says long ones, you'll be sorry!" (R. Strachan 1961:1) Apparently money for the ministry took priority over money for self-conscious little boys.

When Kenneth completed his studies at the Academy, he enrolled at Wheaton College in 1928 where his problems persisted. He struggled with health problems, homesickness and a general desire to return to Costa Rica. His father continued his demanding travel schedule and at times Kenneth discovered his whereabouts by reading the Latin American Evangelist magazine instead of being informed in a more personal
manner (Elliot 1968:11). Yet, he did not doubt his parents' love for him or the importance of their work.

Another member of the Wheaton College freshmen class of 1928 was a young man named Horace L. Fenton, Jr., whom his friends knew as "Dit." They hit it off well and years later Kenneth recruited Horace to join LAM. Fenton wrote that,

during that first year in college, Ken was rebelling against God and, more particularly, against traditional Christianity. As the son of widely known missionary leaders, he felt the Christian public expected too much of him. He wanted a life of his own, unhampered by restrictions not of his own choosing. (Fenton 1990:11)

Kenneth often did things which he did not truly approve of doing. He would then confess his faults, usually to his mother, and condemn himself. This cycle repeated itself over the next several years. Fenton recalled that Kenneth rededicated his life to Christ in the middle of their sophomore year and became zealous in serving God (Fenton 1990:11).

Although short of stature, Kenneth determined to prove himself an athlete. He enjoyed popularity and starred in three varsity sports. Interpersonally, he was loved by many for "his genial, transparently honest personality" (Fenton 1990:11).

By 1930 both his brother Harry and his sister Grace were living in Wheaton, Illinois attending school. Particularly after Kenneth’s own experience of repentance, he felt the need to help them along. Kenneth made an even deeper spiritual decision when in March 1931 he wrote, "Without much thought or prayer, I suddenly realized that my work would be in missionary service, and I have a feeling it will be in Costa Rica" (Elliot 1968:15). Obviously his parents were glad about this decision, but they had not pressured him in that direction. In fact, it was his brother Harry whom they hoped would
eventually take his father's place, as he more closely resembled his father in temperament and abilities (Roberts 1996:136, 160).

Kenneth continued to have his ups and downs during college. He even took time out for a trip to Costa Rica, which meant he would not graduate with his college classmates when he returned. He tried to experience total surrender to God, but still struggled with dancing, movies and smoking. A confused young man, he could not please himself, nor did he think he pleased the Lord or his parents. Without graduating from Wheaton College he enrolled at Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas, and prepared for Christian service. He hoped to follow in his parent’s footsteps, and for him that meant seminary (Elliot 1968:24-25).

When his brother Harry contracted malaria after collecting debris from his college campus following a hurricane, Kenneth visited him in the hospital. Kenneth believed that he had a promise from God that Harry would not die (Elliot 1968:34). Nevertheless, as the family converged on the Florida hospital, Harry did die. Harry Senior was not only distressed by the passing of his son, but also by the realization that Harry would not succeed him in the mission work. Kenneth was filled with doubt and resentment about what God had allowed to happen. He dropped out of seminary for the remainder of the year and accompanied the casket back to Costa Rica (Roberts 1996:136).

Kenneth returned to seminary for two more years and continued to grapple with his own fitness to serve God. Yet, during this time of struggle, God softened his heart in regards to interracial issues and how other people ought to be treated. He came to believe that deeper respect and partnership would be needed between nationals and the mission
for continued effectual ministry. This changed heart heralded Kenneth’s attempted latinization of the mission—a truly radical thought in his day.

During this time Kenneth told his mother that it would be good to form friendships with other missions and boards so that more gospel work could be accomplished. This type of cooperation would later characterize the LAM under Kenneth’s leadership. At the time, however, it "must have been a bombshell to his mother, who had never found it necessary to work in any situation of which she was not in charge" (Elliot 1968:38). The concepts that later endeared Kenneth to thousands were now crystallizing in his mind.

Despite other areas in which the young Strachan matured, he continued to be lax in attending Sunday morning church, thinking it better to use the time for rest (Elliot 1968:41). This supplies further evidence of his willingness to question every assumption about what characterized the Christian life. This same attitude of unconventionality would later be harnessed to produce new missiological insights and methods.

Kenneth finished his course work for Wheaton College in 1935 and his studies at Evangelical Theological College in 1936. In 1936 he began his career as a missionary with Latin America Mission.

After arriving in Costa Rica, Kenneth served as professor and acting dean of the Instituto Bíblico. His days were filled with teaching and having tea with his mother who had charge of all of the work in Costa Rica. He grew and struggled. Once again Kenneth engaged in behavior that disappointed him. After repenting, he made public confession at an Institute chapel (Elliot 1968:44-47).
Kenneth’s courtship of Elizabeth Walker provides an interesting glimpse into the young Strachan’s life. Between being put off by Elizabeth and the stress of working under his parents, Kenneth escaped to join the Royal Canadian Air Force (Elliot 1968:49). This venture did not materialize, and Strachan returned to Costa Rica. Finally in August 1940, Elizabeth responded to a letter Kenneth had sent her in 1939, and the relationship moved forward quickly. Through a series of letters the young couple worked through such issues as Kenneth’s demand for unconditional love from Elizabeth, without the promise that he would reciprocate. For her part, Elizabeth desired to be adored. Strachan, however, would not agree to such adoration as he felt it had the implication of "worship." Despite these thorny issues, they married on October 19, 1940 (Elliot 1968:52-59).

As is true of any young couple, Kenneth and Elizabeth had their share of difficulties. Elizabeth faced the hurdle of learning Spanish, a problem her husband never had to deal with as an adult. They also wrestled with their differing views of Christian morality. She was stricter and more certain of her convictions than Kenneth. Elizabeth gave birth to their first child in November 1941. In August 1942 they moved to Princeton Seminary (Elliot 1968: 64-66).

Kenneth’s studies at Princeton radically affected his thinking. Perhaps his most profound revelation concerned the importance of the local, visible church. Since LAM was initially formed to conduct evangelistic campaigns, the role of local churches had been largely overlooked. Kenneth freely quoted China Inland Mission's Bishop Houghton when he said, "the Church is central to God's purpose in this dispensation, and must therefore be central to all our thinking and planning and action" (Roberts 1971:45).
This revelation later led Kenneth to refocus both LAM's evangelistic and church planting ministries.

Kenneth received a Th.M. degree from Princeton in 1943 and by August 1944 Kenneth and his family were back in Costa Rica armed with new insights (Roberts 1998c:645). In October 1944, the LAM board of trustees appointed Kenneth LAM Deputy Director. Following his father’s death in 1945, he became Co-Director along with his mother. Even during the funeral God dealt with Kenneth, and he shrank from the thought of stepping into his father's shoes. "It turned out to be very fortunate that Kenneth had been able to move right into the administration, because within a few weeks of Harry's funeral, Susan slipped and broke her arm in a bathroom fall" (Roberts 1996:161). Ready or not the younger Strachan took over greater control of the mission.

Transition to Leadership

LAM celebrated its 25th anniversary in 1946 and Kenneth decided to spend the year doing deputation work in the USA and Canada (LAE 1946:8). That same year, Kenneth’s friend Horace Fenton became a member of the Home Council—LAM’s advisory partners (LAE 1946:26). William Thompson became LAM’s Home Director representing LAM to interested parties and conducting its affairs stateside (LAE 1946:54). Susan Strachan spent her time visiting and encouraging the various ministries.

By 1948 Fenton had joined the LAM and was named Field Director for Costa Rica. Fenton recalled, "When Ken first talked to me about coming with the Mission, I was pleased that he should invite me, but it seemed utterly impossible that such a thing should ever be, and I told him so. There were just too many obstacles in the way" (LAE 1965(3):6). Nevertheless, the way opened.
With the almost “miraculous” arrival of Horace Fenton to take up the administrative duties, Kenneth felt God freeing him to pursue aggressive evangelization. Strachan committed himself to follow in his father's footsteps and spent the rest of his days in intense evangelistic endeavors. He relied on Hudson Taylor's maxim that "God's work, done in God's way, will never lack God's supply" (Roberts 1971:59). Kenneth now embraced the very life and work he always felt so inadequate to pursue.

Radio

In 1942 the LAM-related Templo Bíblico church began a twice weekly radio program. Encouraged by its success, LAM entered broadcasting. In 1945 LAM purchased an inoperative station and secured the all-important frequency license. By 1946 personnel began arriving, but necessary equipment was delayed in the aftermath of World War II. The year 1947 saw the station established on the mission’s small farm in San Francisco de Dos Rios, with Chief Engineer Phil Smith, a licensed radio operator (LAE 1947:48), and radio technician David Solt (LAE 1947:63). TIFC, Faro del Caribe (Lighthouse of the Caribbean) (LAE 1949(3/4):23), went on the air December 25, to the strains of Handel’s Messiah (P. Smith 1953:246).

The following February TIFC began daily broadcasts becoming the “second missionary radio station in the world,” (Quito, Ecuador’s HCJB being the first). By July 1948 the station received word of its first decision for Christ (P. Smith 1953:246). The station also received permission to broadcast on short wave radio. The popularity of the local broadcast increased so rapidly that by the end of 1948 it was “already the fifth most popular radio station in Costa Rica—out of some 25 different broadcasters” (P. Smith 1953:247).
Literature

In addition to the local radio station, which made a positive contribution to the evangelical cause in Costa Rica, LAM made an impact on an increasingly literate public. Through a merger of three literature sources, LAM became almost overnight one of the most significant Spanish publishers. LAM acquired $30,000 worth of titles from the American Tract Society, “Spanish books with a Bible study emphasis; from Moody Colportage, a series of books with popular appeal; [and] from the Gospel Light Press, a series of Sunday School lessons” (LAE 1949(29)5/6:48). W. Dayton Roberts led the new publishing house named Editorial Caribe (Caribbean Publishers) (LAE 1949(28)11/12:87).

The Death of Susan Strachan

Sensing the need to step aside, Susan Strachan had tendered her resignation to the Home Council. They, however, encouraged her to continue overseeing the Evangelist magazine and to keep in touch with the Colombian field (Roberts 1993:75). Between mission activities and her grandchildren, Susan lived a dynamic and full life right up to the end. Succumbing to a sudden pancreatic attack and subsequent stroke, Susan Strachan breathed her last breath on December 5, 1950 (Roberts 1993:76). Her funeral, attended by hundreds of believers, was held in Costa Rica. She was entombed with her husband and son (LAE 1950:84). After Susan’s death, Kenneth Strachan’s title changed from Co-Director to LAM General Director with the full support of the mission family (LAE 1951:20).
Struggles in Colombia

Colombia has been, and continues to be, a political cauldron fraught with danger, particularly to those who oppose the current power brokers. While modern adversaries may be drug lords, in the 1950s the antagonists were a conservative government and an even more conservative Catholic Church. Prior to the 1950s the Protestant church in Colombia enjoyed a time of relative growth. During those years, missionary Ernie Fowler began his ministry in Colombia under the Evangelical Union of South America (LAE 1952:112). In 1952 he transferred to the LAM, bringing his passion for Colombia’s indigenous tribes with him. His story, more particularly his death, forms an important chapter in LAM lore.

In 1943, after about nine years as a missionary in Colombia, Ernie found himself again trudging through the mountain jungle. On this occasion two fellow missionaries, Harvey Hammond and Alexander Clark, accompanied him. Together the trio was attempting to evangelize the unreached Motilones Indians high in the Sierra de Perijá region of Colombia near the Venezuelan border. As the days passed, both his friends became severely ill with malaria. The unfriendly Indians offered them no assistance and Harvey succumbed to death in Ernie’s arms. Ernie located a small cave in which to lay the body, but first he spent several hours widening its opening with a machete (Howard 1966:1) Ernie nursed Alick back to health and a few weeks later they reported the events of Harvey’s death to his wife. “Ernie could not know then that twenty-three years later his own body would be buried on the western slopes of that range, with Alick presiding at his funeral” (Howard 1969:40).
Following these events, Ernie’s years were filled with normal missionary activities. Ernie gave his whole effort to each task he was assigned. Yet, his heart’s desire continued to be the evangelization of the Indians.

Time passed and Colombia was soon embroiled in a ten-year period known as *La Violencia* (The Violence) (1948-1958). Since new missionary visas were not issued during those years, the Fowlers became an even more valuable asset to the mission enterprise. In 1953 the Fowlers, who were then operating as independent missionaries, joined LAM. At that time LAM desperately needed missionaries in Colombia to staff its various ministries.

*La Violencia* must be properly understood if one is to comprehend the times in which mission work was conducted in Colombia. The assassination of “Jorge Eleizer Gaitan, the popular and charismatic mayor of Bogota,” triggered the civil war (Brabon & Erny 1993:132). This attack on a liberal candidate for president sent the country into a tailspin. Using the lawless atmosphere as an occasion for airing old grievances, various persecutions began. By the time the civil war ended some 300,000 Colombians had perished (Brabon & Erny 1993:132).

Sadly, the Catholic Church used the occasion of civil unrest to air its grievances with evangelicals. Since most Protestants were followers of the liberal party, “fanatical elements within the Roman Catholic Church, including many priests, took advantage of *La Violencia* to persecute the Evangelicals” (Read, Monterroso & Johnson 1969:124). 126 evangelicals were killed, 270 of their schools closed, and 60 evangelical churches destroyed (U. Padilla 1995:52).
By 1953 Colombia’s violence peaked as more evangelicals were martyred for their faith. For example, a man named Pérez and his 12-year-old son were tortured by local police who demanded they renounce their Protestant faith. Several days later, after the father and son returned home, a mob entered their sleeping household. They shot the parents and hacked the children with machetes leaving six of the seven children dead. All the while the murderers cried out, “‘Down with the Protestants!’ and ‘Long live the Virgin!’” (Howard 1969:73). At times local priests instigated these acts of violence. Commenting on this period, LAM authors Berg and Pretiz remark, “Life was cheap. The years of violence made it so. Poverty left people in despair” (Berg & Pretiz 1992:20).

A liberal government took power in 1958 and freedom returned to Colombia. Along with it came a new air of interest in the message for which evangelicals were willing to die.

Early Campaigning

With Harry Strachan’s death, LAM’s evangelistic campaigns and meetings diminished for a time. In October 1947, however, Kenneth wrote to Dayton Roberts saying, “The Lord has been leading very definitely and I believe that it is His will that the L.A.M. embark upon evangelistic campaign work as soon as possible” (LAM Collection 236, Box 43:1). Following this, Kenneth Strachan, William Thompson, Israel García and Institute students planned a series of meetings for Colombia in 1949. Rogelio Archilla and Wilton Nelson arranged for a crusade in Venezuela (LAE1948:52). These campaigns were followed by events in New York City, San Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua in 1950.
In 1951, campaigns were conducted not only in Spanish but in English speaking contexts as well. Evangelist Efraim Alphonse, Horace Fenton and Wilton Nelson led meetings in Belize, followed by campaigns in Limón, Costa Rica and Panama (LAE 1951:5, 26).

In 1952 Strachan planned a series of evangelistic campaigns, the first one held in Managua, Nicaragua. Due to complications with the scheduled evangelist, Kenneth spoke. Although extremely insecure about the situation, he felt God had given him the promise that 50 people would be saved and that the impending rain would be not come. One can only imagine his disappointment as the torrents of rain came down, scattering the crowd and ruining the evening. He wavered between seeing the rain as an attack from Satan and it being the will of God (Elliot 1968:88).

Kenneth the Recruiter

Although campaigning continued with various LAM members, Kenneth and his family, now numbering six children, were stationed in the USA from October 1952 to January 1955 to strengthen the LAM supporter base. During that time Strachan made some of his most fruitful contacts, including the recruitment of many of LAM's most outstanding missionaries (Roberts 1971:70-71). It was said of Kenneth that he "had the ability to see potential in individuals, often a potential which they themselves did not see, and to draw them into places where that potential could be realized" (Elliot 1968:100). By the time Kenneth returned to Costa Rica in 1955, LAM's morale had increased and there was an optimistic outlook for the future.

Many missionaries entering LAM during this period continued to serve almost to the present time. Several of these have recently retired, taking with them an incredible
storehouse of experience in serving the Latin America Church. In addition to Horace Fenton, who eventually succeeded Kenneth as LAM General Director, numerous others could be mentioned. For instance, David and Phyllis Howard arrived in Costa Rica in 1953 (LAE 1953:208). Recognizing the potential in people, Kenneth placed such up-and-coming leaders into positions for which they may have felt unprepared. David Howard was named Director of the Seminario Bíblico at age 28. By age 30 Howard was appointed Colombia Field Director, as well as LAM Assistant General Director (Howard 2000). In 1995, after a lifetime of service with various Christian organizations, Howard returned to serve as LAM interim president.

Others who joined LAM in that era were Jessie Stevens, best remembered for her years of service at the orphanage (Hogar Bíblico), William and Ellie Gyatt who served in Colombia, and Ladoit and Ruth Steven (Ruth was the daughter of longtime LAM trustee Jacob Stam) who worked at the farm and orphanage for many years (LAE 1953:189). Further recruits included future LAM-Mexico (MILAMEX) leaders Juan & Elizabeth Isáis (LAE 1956:45), John and Doris Stam who taught for years at the seminary level (LAE 1955:110), Norm and Donna Piersma who worked in Colombia (LAE 1955:140), Clayton and Jo Ann Berg who served as LAM president following Horace Fenton (LAE 1955:187), Hugh and Olive Worsfold who worked in radio ministry (LAE 1956:61), John and June Macadam who labored in English-speaking ministries (LAE 1956:62), and Milre Lisso who worked in radio and then with the orphanage (LAE 1956:12). Hal and Virginia Cocanower who served in literature (LAE 1958:96), George Taylor who worked in education (LAE 1958:96), Bill and Sheila Burchett who labored in communications and later in the LAM home office (LAE 1958:115), Ruben and Donna Lores who served
in evangelism and became LAM Assistant General Director under Horace Fenton (LAE 1961:14), Bob and Nancy Sabean, who worked heavily in Christian camping (LAE 1962:23), and Jack and Mary Anne Voelkel who developed LAM university work in Colombia (LAE 1964:19), were all further evidences of Kenneth’s recruiting abilities. While this may appear to many readers as simply a list of names, those familiar with LAM in recent years will be acquainted with many of these distinguished missionaries. The voids created by their departures are challenges not easily filled.

Observations

At this halfway point in R. Kenneth Strachan’s administration, it would be beneficial to pause and make several observations. While he inherited many missionaries and ministries from his parent’s efforts, new faces and works were beginning to appear. The transition to new leadership described thus far has implications for the four areas listed below.

**Vision.** With the passing of Harry Strachan it fell to Susan and Kenneth to continue promoting LAM’s vision. Although he may have felt inadequate for the task at the time, Kenneth proved entirely capable of maintaining the mission’s priorities. Beyond maintaining, however, hints were beginning to be seen of a renewed organizational vision which was uniquely Kenneth’s.

**Identity.** By the end of 1955 the LAM had approximately 110 affiliated missionaries (LAE 1955:179-180). For many of the new faces, joining LAM was like joining a family. John Stam remarks, “The inspiration and dynamic leadership of the Strachans survived in the person of Kenneth” who galvanized the LAM into a unified family (Stam 2000). Ladoit and Ruth Stevens, and Stam, remarked how the Wednesday
evening missionary prayer meetings held in English were a time of inspiration and familiarity. This family atmosphere was possible, they surmised, because of LAM’s relatively small size (Stam 2000, Stevens 2000). LAM missionaries in Costa Rica were kept informed of mission family news via the weekly *Entre Nos* (Between Us) newsletter (LAM Collection 236, Box 41).

New missionaries were assimilated into the LAM family through a multi-step process. Candidates received orientation prior to leaving for the field, and once on the field participated in the mission’s weekly meetings. After a year of language school, new recruits, other than those going to Colombia, spent at least three months in Costa Rica’s rural Guanacaste region assimilating the local culture. There they learned to love the people while helping the local church and improving their Spanish (Lisso 1957:24). The rural setting provided the novice missionary with the opportunity to become familiar with people of different cultural and economic levels than would normally be encountered in San José (LAM Collection 236, Box 61:16). Recall that part of Schein’s definition of organizational culture is that patterns of shared assumptions that have worked well in the past are “taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel” (Schein 1992:12). New missionaries were both intentionally and unintentionally being indoctrinated into the LAM organizational culture.

Hints of change were in the air. The Korean War, the Colombian Civil War and rising feelings of nationalism all affected LAM missionaries. Beyond this, the mission struggled to meet its financial commitments. Consequently, as his father had done, Kenneth Strachan spent much of his time in deputation.
Leadership. Kenneth’s style of leadership appears to have been less overt than either Harry or Susan’s. Although he was a decisive leader, he was not authoritarian. He preferred to develop and multiply leaders, including Latinos. In McGregor’s terminology he would have been a *Theory Y* leader (McGregor 1960). Kenneth became more confident in his leadership abilities and realized he could indeed fill his parents’ role as LAM’s leader. He did however, maintain a lower public profile that that of his parents with regard to the LAM *Latin America Evangelist* (LAE) magazine—the mission’s principle means of public relations.

Theology. Theological issues, especially those affecting motivation for mission, hardly surfaced in this phase of LAM development. The doctrines remained intact; the manner in which they were used to inspire evangelist witness, however, seems to have lessened.

On a personal level, Kenneth Strachan continued to struggle inwardly with feelings of inferiority and with his own sense of spirituality. Perhaps his father’s positive experiences with the Keswick holiness meetings and the then popular Pentecostal movement in Latin America contributed to Kenneth’s own spiritual hunger. Kenneth eagerly desired to have an experience with God that would once and for all settle his spiritual struggles. In 1950 he believed he had finally experienced what the Wesleyans called *sanctification* (Elliot 1968:84). He continually doubted, however, the effectiveness of his spiritual breakthroughs.
Spontaneous Combustion—Grassroots Colombian Evangelism (1955-1965)

The second half of Kenneth’s tenure may be viewed from two different perspectives. The first track documents an example of the Latin American charismatic outpouring and its affect on LAM. The second track focuses on Kenneth Strachan’s Evangelism in Depth (EID) movement and LAM’s overall development.

The following developments occurred without the instigation of missionaries or Pentecostal believers. As best can be determined, this was a spontaneous out-breaking of God’s Spirit in the lives of several hundred rural Colombians, which then spread to thousands of others. Many people were converted and older churches experienced renewal. Although LAM played only a small part in the events that follow, the outpouring impacted LAM at a deep level.

Victor Landero

On a hot day in 1941, Pedro Gutierrez, a Colombian Latin America Mission (LAM) worker, arrived in the rural town of Providencia, Colombia. As usual, he sold Bibles and preached to those who had gathered to listen. One man, noticing the commotion, arrived to see what was happening. “What’s going on?” he asked and was told that the man was selling Bibles. “What’s a Bible?” he questioned. The bystander responded that it was a book that told how God made the world. Since they were so inexpensive, the questioner, Victor Landero, purchased one. However, being illiterate he put the book in a suitcase where it sat for several years. Little did he realize how that Bible would transform him and how he would be used to change the face of Christianity in the backwoods of Colombia (Owen & Howard 1979:17-19; Padilla 1995:66).
While Victor stuffed his Bible in a suitcase, there were others who did not. One of Rev. Pedro Gutiérrez’s converts was a man named Eliécer Benavides. After graduating from LAM’s Caribbean Bible Center he began evangelistic work in the village of Nueva Estación where Victor lived (Howard 1969:106).

By 1955 Victor had found his Bible in the suitcase and began to read it as best he could. In those days he ran a bar and brothel house, and kept company with three different women—none of whom he had married.

Rumors began to circulate that something was going on with Victor Landero. When Eliécer Benavides arrived he began looking for someone who had a Bible as a starting point for his evangelistic work. After many visits with Eliécer over the course of several months, Victor accepted the gospel of Christ and was converted in 1956.

Due to his high visibility in the community, Victor’s conversion attracted much attention. Over time, Victor’s life was transformed. This was attributed both to the conviction of God’s Spirit and the expectations of nonbelievers as to what evangelicals did or did not do. People could hardly believe what they were seeing. “Victor Landero, the former turbulent, explosive, short-tempered bartender, was now the tranquil, peaceful evangelist” (Owen & Howard 1979:36).

Victor shared his new faith immediately. While still bar tending, one of Victor’s friends came into the bar. Victor witnessed to him and read from the Bible. However, the man was drunk and eventually fell asleep. Unable to rouse him, Victor thought to pray for Roberto to wake up. Victor describes what followed:

“Lord, wake him up. Take away his sleep!”
Instantly Roberto sat up. His eyes popped wide open. He was wide awake, with no sign of sleepiness. And, miraculously, he was stone sober. He blinked at me in amazement. “I heard you pray for God to wake me up.”
I was as surprised as Roberto.

“Such power!” Roberto exclaimed. “I’ve never seen God answer a prayer like that! In the big church [Catholic] there is much praying, but no power. Nothing happens. But you pray just a few words, and I wake up. I’m wide awake. I’m sober! It is a miracle.”

This time, when Roberto left the cantina, he was a changed man. (Owen & Howard 1979:39-40)

Victor converted his bar and brothel house into a general store and settled with one woman to be his spouse. They were not legally married for several years because of political red tape and the Catholic dominance over marriage ceremonies (Victor had become an evangelical).

It is interesting to note that the persecution occurring in the more populated areas was not nearly as evident in the rural sectors. In general the country people had been ignored by the Catholic Church. Therefore, they did not have the built-in animosity toward evangelicals that characterized many devout urban Catholics (U. Padilla 1995:76).

Victor experienced only the normal taunts that accompanied abandoning a decadent lifestyle. Fortunately, his conversion in 1956 closely coincided with Colombia’s cessation of violence in 1958. The events being described about Victor Landero, however, were totally unknown outside of this isolated rural area of Colombia.

1958 was a monumental year on many levels. The national civil war ended and new missionaries were allowed to enter the country. LAM’s David Howard arrived in Colombia to assume Ernie Fowler’s job as Field Director. The LAM related denomination Asociación de Iglesias Evangélicas del Caribe (AIEC) had 600 members, 13 organized churches, and 12 congregations (U. Padilla 1995:72). However, following Landero’s conversion these numbers would dramatically increase.
For Victor it was a year of new beginnings. Having lost his general store because so many people took advantage of him and his new evangelical faith, he settled on a farm where he could better serve the Lord as an evangelist. The gospel flowed as naturally from his lips as water flows from a faucet. Upon arriving in his new home in the village of Corozalito, he was dismayed to find he did not know anyone to whom he could witness. He remarked, “For the first six days in that area I found no one to whom I could speak of Christ. Imagine! Six whole days without witnessing to one soul for Christ! I thought I would burst” (Howard 1969:120). He was a stranger only a short time and soon 92 of the 94 inhabitants had been converted (U. Padilla 1995:67).

LAM missionaries began hearing about this unusual move of God around 1958 and sent Robert Reed to visit the area. The trip into the back-country took him three days.

For an outsider to visit Corozalito, it required an interminable bus ride, then several hours in a jeep to the end of the trail. From there it was still nearly a full day’s ride upriver in a Jonson (a Johnson Sea Horse-powered dugout canoe), then a three-hour hike. (Owen & Howard 1979:53)

Everywhere Reed went he encountered people who told him that missionaries had never been there and that they were converted to the faith by a man named Victor Landero. Reed termed this grassroots evangelism “spontaneous combustion” (Howard 1961:7-8).

By 1959 Victor confided to one of his brothers that he felt their church in Corozalito was beginning to “slip into some sort of rut” (Owen & Howard 1979:59). He began to study the Book of Acts and felt God wanted to pour out his Spirit on their church. Soon God gave Victor’s friend Juan the gift of tongues while he was alone. Fascinatingly, “he was experiencing a phenomenon which he had never heard of and for which he could find no explanation…. Neither Victor nor Juan had ever met a
Pentecostal nor had they heard anything about charismatic gifts” (Howard 1973:108).

Since he had been studying Acts, Victor reasoned what Juan had experienced was the gift of tongues. “Two weeks later Victor experienced the same phenomenon, except in his case he experienced it in public” (Howard 1973:109).

The gift of tongues was only the beginning of the charismatic outpouring. Victor began contemplating the Book of Mark 16:17 and 18 where it says,

And these signs will accompany those who believe: In my name they will drive out demons; they will speak in new tongues; they will pick up snakes with their hands; and when they drink deadly poison, it will not hurt them at all; they will place their hands on sick people, and they will get well. (NIV)

At that point they had only experienced tongues and Victor wondered when God would fulfill the other four signs among them.

Victor and his brothers, who had also come to the Lord, preached the gospel in the surrounding towns and many people were saved. Claudio, one of Victor’s brothers, pastored a church in the town of La Guaripa. As Victor attempted to evangelize the area surrounding the town, he encountered hostility and rejection by the people. Yet he felt they could somehow be reached. After learning about the town’s “crazy woman” he devised a plan based on the verses he had read in the Bible. Victor and the other believers had this woman, who needed to be kept in chains, brought to them so they could pray for her healing and deliverance. They prayed for three days and she was made whole.

Many people heard about the woman’s healing, and they came from everywhere to see for themselves. Even her parents, who were not believers, came to see the miracle of release. Because of her healing, this woman received Jesus. Also, her parents and many other people from her village accepted Him. (Owen & Howard 1979:76)

As a result of this incredible event a strong church was established in La Guaripa.
Dreams and visions were a part of the way God communicated his will to Victor. On one occasion Victor followed up on one of his dreams. In the dream he saw a house in an unknown village where God told him to hold an evangelistic service. After two days of traveling he spotted the house he remembered from his dream. The lady of the house, an unbeliever, had also had a dream three nights before “in which she saw her house jammed with people. A stranger with a book in his hand talked to them about something he called the ‘gospel’ (which she had never heard of before)” (Howard 1969:123). Needless to say, many were converted.

These scattered groups of rural believers grew in their faith and God accompanied their preaching with miraculous signs. In 1961 the church in Corozalito began sending out a ministry team based on spiritual gifts to evangelize and encourage believers. In addition to going out among the people, people came to the small village of Corozalito bringing “the sick, the lame, the blind, the poor in spirit. And the power of God would heal them and fill them” (Owen & Howard 1979:93).

By this time LAM missionaries were occasionally sought for their counsel on some spiritual manifestation or pastoral problem that had occurred. As missionaries, they were held in high regard even though the spontaneous movement occurred without their direction (LAE 1961(5):12).

In 1961, Victor’s brother Gregorio had invited LAM missionary David Howard to an isolated town where Gregorio had been working for several months. Gregorio had formed a church with approximately 30 believers and they were hosting a series of meetings during Easter week. 150 people arrived to participate and food began running low on Thursday. Although the men desperately tried to net some fish for an entire
afternoon, they caught nothing. With a prayer of faith they gave the net one last cast with four men at each corner. David Howard narrates what followed:

Suddenly one man shouted, “Come to this corner quickly! I have a *bagre*!” This giant catfish sometimes reaches four or five feet in length. But a second man shouted, “No, come to my corner! I have a *bagre*!” Then the third shouted that he had one! And finally Gregorio too shouted that he had a *bagre* in his corner of the net! Four giant catfish in one cast!

I shall not soon forget the scene as the men returned to the little chapel. A group of worried women in an improvised outdoor kitchen were preparing a scanty meal for one hundred and fifty people. The men staggered in, each one bent under the weight of a huge fish slung over his shoulder. They threw the fish on the ground amidst cries of delight and told how the Lord had honored their faith. (Howard 1969:115)

The rural Colombian believers exercised simple faith in the God of the Bible, and he demonstrated himself totally trustworthy.

People were speaking in tongues, casting out demons, and healing the sick. Only two of the five signs remained to be seen from the *Gospel of Mark*, chapter 16. Although they did not intentionally seek out the final signs, they did eventually occur. On separate occasions, Victor’s sister-in-law Simona and a woman named Maria were miraculously cured after having been bitten by poisonous snakes. When Simona was bitten she fell into the water and the snake began to approach her again. In her weakened state she said to it, “I command you, in the name of Jesus, to stay there so the men can come and kill you” (Owen & Howard 1979:112). The snake obeyed and was soon killed.

The final sign occurred when a disgruntled unbeliever deliberately poisoned Victor Landero with rat poison. The rat poison used in the jungle was very potent and capable of quickly killing a dog or a human with just a small amount. Victor unknowingly drank the water mixed with poison she offered him and began feeling sick. Instead of dying, he went outside, vomited, thanked her for her hospitality and went on
his way. Thus, God fulfilled the fifth sign by protecting Victor Landero (Owen & Howard 1979:120-121).

The team sent out from Corozalito had a tremendous impact on the LAM related AIEC denomination as they visited the churches. In this group of ten believers,

one man had the gift of preaching, so he would exhort the church. Another had the gift of evangelism, and he would be used in this way. Another had the gift of faith, so he led them in their prayer ministry…. Another had the gift of healing and used it with the prayer backing of the others. Several had the gift of tongues, and one had the gift of interpretation to accompany it. One woman had the gift of helps and used it constantly in the service of others. (Howard 1973:95-96)

This group, which called itself the Campaign of Health and Life, visited various AIEC churches teaching the word of God with a particular emphasis on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit (U. Padilla 1995:71).

Despite the inevitable controversies accompanying a work of the Spirit, the churches grew and matured. Together with some timely input from LAM missionaries, including Kenneth Strachan (Howard 1964:2), the movement weathered the storm and the face of Christianity in the AIEC changed forever.

Prior to the charismatic movement, Ubaldo Restan Padilla described a normal AIEC church service as traditional, solemn, and very orderly. They sang only hymns translated from English accompanied by a piano. They did not clap to the music or use indigenous instruments. Prayers were offered by only one individual at a time, and they did not fast or hold prayer vigils (U. Padilla 1995:65). The outpouring of the Holy Spirit changed all of this and the services became more exciting, indigenous, and culturally relevant.

By 1965 the AEIC had grown to 1100 members with 22 organized churches and 12 congregations. They had experienced 95% growth since 1958, primarily in the
regions around Corozalito where God poured out his Spirit and used Victor Landero in a special manner (U. Padilla 1995:72).

Ernie Fowler

1965 also signaled the year that Ernie Fowler returned to Colombia after what would be his final furlough. During the years when God so powerfully used Victor Landero, Ernie faithfully fulfilled a variety of functions in the LAM. In 1960, commenting on the end of La Violencia, he wrote, “the blood of our martyrs has watered the seed, and now we hope for better days” (Fowler 1960:12).

The Fowler family moved back into the same mountain region where Harvey Hammond had died in Ernie’s arms 22 years earlier in an attempt to reach the same Indians. David Howard, whose son David Howard, Jr. had been staying with the Fowler family, explained what happened in the summer of 1966:

On Wednesday, August 3, a band of heavily armed bandits attacked the house while Ernest was out on a hike with Valerie [one of Ernie’s daughters] and a Colombian girl. Eve [Ernie’s wife] and the children were threatened and terrorized for an hour while the house was being plundered. When the sacking was completed, Eve was shut up in a room with the children and ordered at gunpoint to stay there. Then the outlaws left. Ernest was returning from his hike with the two girls when he was met by the bandits about 500 yards from the house. Posing as policemen looking for fugitives, they demanded Ernie’s shotgun and machete. Then without warning one of them shot him point-blank in the face with a pistol and again in the back as he fell…then they went off down the mountain. (Howard 1966:2)

A period of chaos and terror ensued for the survivors and for mission personnel as they tried to determine what had happened and how to aid the family.

Alick, the friend Ernie nursed back to health from malaria, presided over Ernie’s funeral (Howard 1969:40). The AIEC denominational history book proclaims Ernest Fowler a, Martyr for Love of the Indigenous (U. Padilla 1995:58). He was typical of the
many faithful missionaries of that period who spent their careers in the struggle to bring
the gospel of Jesus to the people of Colombia.

Observations

This amazing series of events warrants several observations.

**Vision.** The events in Colombia did impact the LAM but often in indirect ways. LAM leaders realized something significant occurred in Colombia and that God was its source. Writing in that period, Dayton Roberts noted four lessons the younger churches had to offer. First, they depended on prayer in their witnessing for power to speak boldly (Roberts 1964:3). Just as the elder Strachans had claimed that nothing could be accomplished without prayer, so also were the new Christians reminding the mission of that same fact. Second, the evangelicals in Latin America tended to be more unified (Roberts 1964:3). This united front in witness gave them a level of synergy in the face of opposition that they would not have had alone. Third, the Pentecostals, in particular, had learned how to appropriate the power of God in witnessing (Roberts 1964:3-4). Moving beyond mere words, the Spirit confirmed his reality and relevance in the lives of believers. Fourth, lay people carried out the majority of witnessing and church expansion (Roberts 1964:4). Motivated by their love for God, new believers shared the gospel wherever they went leaving new churches in their wake. In a land with a scarcity of trained pastors and missionaries, the laity rose to the occasion.

**Identity.** The charismatic outpouring produced some natural questions and tensions among the mission family—the vast majority of whom were not from charismatic backgrounds. At one point Arthur Glasser was asked to speak to the missionaries at their annual meeting in Colombia on the Holy Spirit. David Howard told
him that among the missionaries there were a variety of opinions but that none appeared
dogmatic. In fact, Howard only knew of one missionary who spoke in tongues (LAM
Collection 236, Box 23:6).

Individual LAM missionaries reacted remarkably well. For instance, Norm and
Donna Piersma, who came from a conservative church background, attributed the
charismatic movement to God. Although they were uncomfortable with people praying
all at one time, they could see that what the Spirit was doing produced good results in the
Colombian church. They encouraged the believers and did not quench the Spirit
(Piersma 1999). The ability to embrace a move of the Spirit, without personally
experiencing it, shows the great level of tolerance and trust the LAM missionaries
invested in both the sovereignty of God and the trustworthiness of Colombian Christians.

Leadership. LAM leadership appears to have dealt with the growth of the church
in Colombia in a fairly proactive manner. Missionaries assisted and observed, then
reported their findings to the larger mission family. LAM’s leadership role was to
support what God was doing in the Colombian church and to be available for counsel
when needed. In this way they demonstrated their commitment to indigenous church
principles. Also, unlike some mission groups, they did not distance themselves from the
source of controversy. Instead, they identified with the church. Those mission groups
that reacted negatively alienated themselves from the Colombian church (Piersma 1999).

Theology. Obviously the position in which LAM missionaries found themselves
was difficult for some. Many came from theological backgrounds that precluded the
kinds of spiritual phenomena they were witnessing. This tension created a significant
opportunity within the LAM to which a response was required. David Howard said that
when the Spirit of God began to do things beyond the scope of our theological system, we were forced to listen as Peter did in Acts 10. God wanted to show us that He is sovereign, and that our understanding of His ways was too limited. If He chose to give charismatic gifts of tongues, or of healing, or of casting out of demons, for the edification of His church, did He not have a right to do so? Who were we to tell God what He could do?

Slowly, God removed our skepticism, confirming the gifts of the Spirit by showing the fruit of the Spirit in the lives of the believers who received these gifts. (Howard 1969:146)

This attitude demonstrated that LAM was truly responsive to both God and the needs of the Colombian church. David Howard went on to share his perspective on the Colombian movement and to articulate LAM’s unofficial position on charismatic gifts, in a book for Intervarsity called, *By the Power of the Holy Spirit* (Howard 1973).

**Team Leadership and Evangelism in Depth (1955-1965)**

The previous track described events that took LAM by surprise. The second track focuses on Strachan’s Evangelism in Depth (EID) movement and LAM’s overall development.

**Team Leadership**

Kenneth not only saw the potential in people, he created space for them to exercise their capabilities. Not interested in building his own empire, Kenneth formed leadership positions around him for new leaders to fill. The highest levels of influence in the mission became open to fresh ideas when in 1955 he named Horace Fenton LAM Associate General Director (LAE 1955:109), and then again in 1958 when Dayton Roberts and David Howard were appointed LAM Assistant General Directors (LAE 1958:92).
According to David Howard, under this new arrangement each person had defined areas of responsibility delegated to them by Kenneth. Strachan then kept his "hands off," allowing the other three leaders great freedom and authority to get their jobs done. Horace Fenton oversaw the USA concerns, David Howard was in charge of Columbia, and Dayton Roberts directed the ministries in Costa Rica. Normally the "Four Horseman," as they were called, met at least once a year in Costa Rica and then again in the USA for their executive sessions. While it was certainly a team effort, Ken continued as the undisputed, decisive, and visionary leader of the mission. Under these layers of leadership was another layer that allowed many of the up-and-coming leaders to exercise their talents in specific areas. Many of these missionaries were in their early to mid-30s with an overall average age of 40. It was an exciting time, with many opportunities for the multiplied leadership staff to participate in overseeing the ministries of LAM (Howard 1999a).

**Latinization**

Strachan not only opened the LAM to a greater plurality of leaders, he also pushed for a greater representation of Latin Americans in the organization. He desired to see more Latinos integrated “into positions of leadership in the Mission” (LAE 1955:126).

After the death of his mother, the vision of latinizing the mission became one of Strachan’s main areas of focus. He had long been concerned over the inequitable treatment of Latin missionaries and the racist attitude displayed by those who opposed interracial marriages. In light of this, he opened the LAM for “people of color” to serve as missionaries (LAM Collection 236, Box 74:7). Although it was slow in coming
he took steps to bring Latinos in on an equal par with North Americans. He was well aware that unless the mission opened leadership positions to Latin Americans it would risk losing the valuable services of some of the most gifted Christians available for the work. (Tucker 1983:464)

Spanish became the official language of business and mixed marriages were encouraged.

In a period when nationalism, urbanization, population explosion, and the growth of both the Latin American middle class and the national church—especially the charismatic variety—were hot topics, the LAM responded. Kenneth sought to empower the Latin church with his views on partnership. Certainly Kenneth was not alone in this desire. In fact, Dayton Roberts had been raised in Korea where he was exposed to the “Nevius Plan” for indigenous churches. Roberts argued for a similar implementation on the Colombian field years before Strachan embraced the idea wholeheartedly. Robert’s ideas had been instrumental in shaping the LAM-related denomination in Colombia in the mid-1940s (Roberts 2000a). Nevertheless, Kenneth was the lightning rod for LAM’s renewed focus on the Latin American church. In 1960 Strachan spelled out his intentions.

First, and most important, the missionary effort of the next ten years should be concentrated on building up and strengthening the national evangelical church. This is the number one priority. It is the Latin American evangelicals and not the foreign missionaries, the national churches and not the mission societies, who hold the destiny of the Protestant movement in their hands. (R. Strachan 1960:7)

Recognizing the tremendous changes that had occurred on the continent since the beginning of the mission, the LAM attempted to respond in a Christ-like manner. They did not want to abandon the continent or the brethren, so they invited the maturing church to participate in the labor at every level. One way used to picture this ideal of partnership was as two oxen laboring together toward shared goals under a common yoke (Stam 1957:45).
Evangelism in Depth

Kenneth’s concepts of team leadership and partnership led to his decision to participate in cooperative evangelistic work centered on local churches—Evangelism in Depth (EID). The decision to move in this direction came about as Kenneth contemplated his own father’s ministry. He came to the conclusion that “evangelism has got to come first,” which to him also meant that it took precedence over social concerns (Roberts 1996:176-177).

Beyond looking at LAM’s past, Kenneth looked outward. He “observed growing churches, Pentecostal and non-Pentecostal alike” (Berg & Pretiz 1992:72-73), as well as the spread of Communism and Jehovah Witnesses. Kenneth came to the conviction that the mobilization of the church was the key to ongoing evangelism. His early thinking can be observed when in 1954 he noted that missions was entering a third stage. He believed the mission agencies needed to become absorbed by the national church and come under their supervision in the evangelization of unreached areas (R. Strachan 1954:6). Mission agencies were to be merely catalysts spurring on the true work of evangelism.

Finally, Strachan came to the conclusion that made him famous: “The expansion of any movement is in direct proportion to its success in mobilizing its total membership in continuous propagation of its beliefs” (R. Strachan 1968:108). Although he admitted this was nothing new (R. Strachan 1964a:197), Kenneth believed this was the key to reaching Latin America’s masses.

Strachan laid down four objectives for EID:

1. Every Christian without exception, according to his gifts and situation, is called upon to be a witness for Christ.
2. This personal witness must centre in the fellowship and communal witness of the local congregation.
3. This individual and communal activity must relate constructively to the total witness of the entire Body of Christ.
4. The witness of all individuals and communities must aim at nothing less than total and complete outreach. (R. Strachan 1964a:194-195)

The goal in all of this was to see churches renovated and involved in ongoing witness, not simply to record conversions at EID campaigns.

Just before the 1958 LAM-coordinated Billy Graham Caribbean Crusade was to open in Jamaica, Strachan addressed the “Fifth International Missionary Convention sponsored by Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship at Urbana, Illinois.” There Kenneth first publicly shared his ideas on EID (Roberts 1971:86). Beyond challenging the crowd to personal evangelism, he articulated the role missionaries should play in the process. He stated, “the full-time Christian worker is the trainer to train the layman to get out and do the job” (Roberts 1971:87). These pronouncements signaled a new day for mission agencies.

By 1959 the stage was set for LAM's inaugural Evangelism-In-Depth program that took place in Nicaragua. LAM missionaries Juan and Elisabeth Isáis coordinated this campaign that included a preliminary pastor's retreat, the setting up of 500 prayer cells by these pastors, special offerings for the project, and training classes for 2500 laity. The people were motivated to go door-to-door witnessing and to share the gospel with their friends and families. The next phase of the project was the united evangelistic campaigns in 13 of the larger cities. "For publicity the Christians staged parades, dropped handbills from airplanes, painted huge signs on cloth and stretched them across the streets, mailed invitations to all box holders, and invited everyone they knew" (E. Isáis 1960:12).

Nicaragua serves as a good illustration of the situation that many evangelicals faced in those days when living in a predominantly Roman Catholic country. Protestants
were often actively persecuted and were certainly treated as second-class citizens. For instance, in the town of Masay, Nicaragua, a Catholic flier was circulated in an attempt to keep the common folk from participating in the EID meetings. Among other things, it said:

Catholics who rent houses, loan houses, or sell them to be used for Protestant meetings, or those who attend the meetings, or in any way contribute to them, are BRANDED as excommunicated; and if they repeat the offense or do not obey, they are excommunicated and therefore also SIN by attending these conferences…because PROTESTANTISM is for Nicaragua a social scar, a bubonic plague, and with the so-called FREEDOM OF WORSHIP it has intruded like poverty. (Latin America Mission 1961:76-77)

Such was the atmosphere with which the first EID campaign had to contend.

Kenneth Strachan participated in the EID effort. In the town of Rivas, Nicaragua he marched shoulder to shoulder with other believers proclaiming that "Nicaragua Shall Belong to Christ" (Latin America Mission 1961:8). In thinking about his father, Kenneth recalled that it was Harry, "who had pioneered campaigns in Rivas thirty-five years before—and I wondered whether he might be looking down on the scene that night, rejoicing with the angels in Heaven over souls that were being saved" (Latin America Mission 1961:9).

After months of preparation and activities, LAM’s first attempt at EID came to a rousing climax in Managua, Nicaragua. 7,000 evangelicals stretching for 26 blocks paraded through the streets singing “Only Christ Can Save” and “Nicaragua Shall Belong to Christ” (E. Isáis 1960:13).

Evangelicals had achieved a new level of awareness in Nicaragua as can be clearly seen in the following dialogue overheard between two parade onlookers:
“Caramba.” Said one, “I had always believed that the Protestants in Nicaragua were only ‘four cats’ (a tiny group). There must be ten thousand of them in this parade!”

“That’s nothing,” the other was heard to answer, “You wait and see. Next year they will be fifty thousand!” (Latin America Mission 1961:98-99)

Evangelicals had come into the light and there would be no returning to the dark.

After the campaigns, Isáis noted that "throughout Nicaragua, pastors report increased attendance in their churches. Many Christians have 'found their tongues' for witnessing" (E. Isáis 1960:13). EID staff hoped the evangelistic work would continue “for years with new strategies and new vision…without further help from the outside, after the stimulus of the first year of concentrated training and mobilization” (J. Isáis 1962:3). Evangelicalism in Nicaragua was forever changed.

1961 proved to be one of Kenneth Strachan's toughest years. The Costa Rica EID campaign turned out to be less effective than the previous one had been in Nicaragua and LAM had fiscal problems. While speaking at a pastor's conference in Columbia, something snapped. Kenneth was broken in spirit and health. His mind went blank, he became dizzy and he suffered awful headaches. Some months later he reported:

I had had a premonition that I had fifteen years to live and I must put my house in order. But then I experienced a physical breakdown and was knocked out completely for the next five months. Mentally and spiritually I hit bottom or pretty near. In repeated dreams I saw myself dead or felt I was completely washed out as far as the future was concerned. (Elliot 1968:119)

Although the doctors could find nothing physically wrong with him, attributing his symptoms to stress, it was later suspected that these were the first signs of cancer.

Strachan’s premonition was inaccurate; he would not die in fifteen years, rather in four.

All of these factors delayed the plans for the Guatemala EID campaign.

However, God intervened and the Latin America Evangelist reported in November 1961
that the campaign would move forward. Again coordinated by Juan Isáis, the project was predicted to be "larger and more complex than those of either Nicaragua or Costa Rica" (LAE 1961(6):13).

Guatemala had also been the site of one of Harry Strachan's evangelistic campaigns in 1921. He had filled a theater with 2000 people and the event became the first of its kind in Guatemalan history. It was also the first place where Harry "was able to bring to a reality the vision the Lord had given him for large-scale campaigns in the population centers of the continent" (LAE 1961(4):7-8). Now, 41 years later, LAM again prepared to impact the small country.

The campaign was a huge success that concluded under unusual circumstances. While a crowd of 30,000 gathered in the stadium, Guatemalan president Ydigoras Fuentes fought off a military coup. “Guatemalan Air Force planes swooped down from the skies, machine-gunning their targets” (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:37). Nevertheless, the closing ceremony went on and even the president made an appearance.

The Guatemala campaign would be "the last Evangelism-In-Depth movement in which Ken personally participated" (Roberts 1971:105). While the program continued and expanded, it developed toward teaching and communicating the EID principles. The primary emphasis had "now shifted from 'saturating a country' in a twelve-month period to 'mobilizing the church'" (Roberts 1971:106). The next EID campaigns were held in Honduras (1963-1964), Venezuela (1964), Bolivia (1965-1966), and the Dominican Republic (1965-1966).
Good Will Caravans

Not only did the LAM focus on the preached word in those years, but on the demonstrated word as well. *Caravanas de Buena Voluntad* (Good Will Caravans) were formed in Costa Rica, and later in Colombia, to minister to people’s physical needs. Sponsored by Costa Rica’s Evangelical Alliance and coordinated by LAM’s own Grace Strachan Roberts, the teams rendered medical services to the poor living in rural areas (LAE 1963(3):12). These caravans consisted of volunteer “doctors, dentists, agronomists, teachers, evangelists, literacy workers, nurses, audio-visual technicians and coordinators” (LAE 1964(3):9).

Radio/Literature

Radio and Literature ministries developed rapidly in the LAM. In addition to radio station TIFC in Costa Rica, LAM cooperated in Panama’s HOXO, Nicaragua’s YNOL, and El Salvador’s YSHQ. LAM’s team of specialists kept busy not only at their primary base in Costa Rica, but in traveling to the other sites as well. A service organization, *Difusiones Inter-Americanas* (DIA) formed by a number of cooperating gospel broadcasters, facilitated the “duplication and distribution of gospel programs, making of phonograph records” and other trade items (Worsfold 1960:18).

*Literatura Evangélica para América Latino* (LEAL) was formed as a cooperative literature organization (LAE 1955:207). Under Kenneth Taylor’s direction, LEAL was actively sponsored by the USA-based *Evangelical Literature Overseas* (ELO), which was in turn endorsed by both the *Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association* (IFMA) and the *Evangelical Foreign Missions Association* (EFMA). Perhaps due to these
sponsoring mission conglomerates, many missionaries felt free to support LEAL’s activities, thus contributing to its success (Roberts 2001a).

Together LEAL and DIA began sponsoring communication conventions in various major Latin American cities. The tradition of conducting these well-attended events eventually passed to *Congreso Latinoamericana de Evangelización* (CLADE), “the successor of the Billy Graham Evangelistic congresses,” and *Confederación Iberoamericana de Comunicadores Cristianos* (COICOM)—a communications organization (Roberts 2001a).

**The Role of Missions**

Though hailed by many, Kenneth Strachan and the LAM had their share of critics. Some, like Victor Hayward, questioned why LAM did what it did, while others had questions about those with whom LAM worked. For instance, in 1961 Bishop Lesslie Newbigin, who served as editor of *The International Review of Missions*, asked Strachan to write an article on Evangelism-In-Depth. This article appeared in the April 1964 edition of the journal and generated much interest. In October 1964 the review published three lengthy comments of the debate that arose between Strachan and Hayward (R. Strachan 1964a; R. Strachan 1964b; Hayward 1964). Hayward contended that Strachan limited the gospel by addressing it to the individual rather than to the society and the world as a whole. Although Hayward claimed he was not a Universalist, this was how he appeared to those in the evangelical camp. The debate generated considerable attention at the time (Fenton 1965:1-4).

Some in the evangelical wing were unhappy with LAM as well. Although LAM did not claim to be ecumenical, it was certainly open to cooperating with many different
churches in evangelistic outreach. LAM actively engaged in dialogue with other groups, as the Hayward incident illustrates. They also hoped for improved relations between Roman Catholics and Protestants. In 1962 Jack Wyrtzen, of Word of Life Fellowship, Inc., wrote a note to Strachan and Fenton regarding his concerns. He stated,

All I can say is that I hope and pray that you men will realize the danger and solemnity of the position into which you are gradually drifting…. It seems to me that we who love the Lord must hate the evils of modernism and neo-orthodoxy, and the leaders. (LAM Collection 236, Box 43:6)

LAM walked a fine line in its quest to partner with others in evangelizing the lost, helping those in need, and empowering the national church.

The Death of R. Kenneth Strachan

In 1964 the Strachans were in the USA where Kenneth had some nodules on his neck examined. By March he wrote "telling of the doctor's assurance, by that time, that his disease was not Hodgkin's, as had at first been suspected, and clearing him to go 'full steam ahead' with his planned schedule of teaching for four months in California" (Elliot 1968:144). With his family comfortably situated in Pasadena, California Kenneth lectured at Fuller Theological Seminary.

His teaching at the seminary was well received and his lectures were later compiled and published posthumously as, *The Inescapable Calling*. His health continued to deteriorate with periodic signs of hope. Many prayed for him and some believed God would still heal Kenneth. At the end he choked, gagged, and gasped for breath. Kenneth’s final words were, "I feel trapped" (Elliot 1968:156). After sinking into a coma, R. Kenneth Strachan died on February 24, 1965. With his death, and the earlier deaths of LAM pioneers Mary Pruitt and Jessie Elder, the links to LAM’s early history quickly passed.
Following a memorial service at Fuller Theological Seminary, Kenneth’s body was flown back to San José, Costa Rica where he was buried with his mother, father, and brother Harry. The funeral service in Costa Rica filled to capacity as people came to pay their last respects. The song *Just As I Am* was sung—a fitting tribute to Kenneth’s life. The service was held in the Templo Bíblico church, which Susan Strachan had established 35 years earlier. It was one of the largest funerals ever seen in San José, with more than 3000 mourners in attendance (Elliot 1968:158).

The *Latin America Evangelist* memorial issue was filled with accolades of people whom Kenneth had impacted. From a Latin perspective, pastor Roberto Navarro stated,

> How much *Don* Kenneth meant to me! Teacher, colleague and brother, in the most intimate and real sense of the word! How much inspiration- from his humility; from his human insufficiency and his God-given ability; from his zeal and dedication! *(LAE 1965(3):14)*

W. Dayton Roberts perceived both sides of Kenneth’s life when he wrote,

> in the United States, except by his closer friends, Ken was hailed as a missionary statesman, the architect of a hopeful new form of evangelism, a prophet whose insights into the contemporary scene delighted his students and associates. In Latin America, however, Ken was mourned as a person. *(LAE 1965(3):7)*

Thus, the final Strachan General Director was laid to rest. On May 5, 1965 LAM leadership passed from the Strachan family to former LAM Associate General Director Horace Fenton (Kenyon 1965:4).

**Observations**

Kenneth’s leadership and the launching of Evangelism in Depth (EID) profoundly impacted the LAM in the areas of vision, identity, leadership and theology.

**Vision.** Kenneth Strachan renewed the original LAM vision for continental evangelism under EID. The commitment to a geographical area stretched from several
months to a year, and centered on mobilizing local churches. Ministries to social needs continued and media ministries expanded.

The concepts of partnership and latinization made great strides under Kenneth’s tenure. In fact, LAM’s concept of partnership with the Latin church appears to have outstripped its ideas of partnership with the USA church. On the field LAM believed “in partnership to get the job done—working with Latin Americans” (LAE 1962(3):22). However, partnership on the home front meant, “you [USA Christians] working with us [LAM] for the gospel advance in Latin America” (LAE 1962(3):22). Today, as seen in chapter seven, the USA church is no longer content to simply work for a mission organization. Churches either want to work with a mission organization or to have the agency work for them.

Identity. In 1965 LAM had approximately 170 missionaries (LAE 1965(2):15). LAM continued to operate with a family atmosphere. Missionaries were drawn into the mission not only for its ministries, but also because of Kenneth himself and the supportive mission family. For example, LAM missionary Lois Thiessen noted even a visitor could feel the “sense of unity” during LAM’s weekly Wednesday missionary prayer meetings (Thiessen 1963:3). This was especially true when the night concluded with the singing of the traditional hymn, Bllest Be the Tie that Binds.

LAM missionaries seemed particularly poised to follow Kenneth Strachan into uncharted territories. When Kenneth floated his EID plans to the missionary family, they readily agreed. They were open to new ideas. One LAM missionary speculated that this ready willingness might have been due to the “general youthfulness of our mission” (Kenyon 1959:10-11).
Below the surface, however, fiscal matters no doubt dominated the thoughts of many missionary families. LAM’s long lists of under-supported missionaries included Kenneth Strachan’s own family (LAE 1963(5):20). Beyond these more personal financial concerns were the financial pressures inherent to the ongoing operation of major LAM institutions, not to mention the tremendous costs of conducting the EID campaigns.

**Leadership.** Kenneth led LAM not only by programs and decisions, but by example as well. His concern that Latinos be given equal treatment in the LAM could be attributed, at least in part, to the sensibilities he gained while being raised as a bi-cultural missionary kid. He easily related to Latin Americans, because he himself was raised in Latin America.

Strachan’s leadership, however, was appreciated far beyond the confines of the LAM. At the time of Kenneth’s death, Arthur F. Glasser of the Overseas Missionary Fellowship (formerly know as the China Inland Mission) wrote:

> Never before have evangelical Christians been in such desperate need of leadership. Ours is a generation of mediocrity. Few of our leaders seem able to discern the times and discover what God’s people should do. Those who do seem lacking in the courage needed to call for necessary changes and forward moves. But Kenneth Strachan was different. Where is the missionary fellowship in the world today that has not begun to face up to the challenging implications of his vision and service? We are all terribly in his debt. (LAE 1965(3):13)

Despite his personal insecurities, or maybe because of them, Kenneth Strachan stands out as one of the mission enterprise’s exceptional leaders.

**Theology.** Kenneth and other LAM leaders were unafraid to confront the difficult issues of their day. Not only did they address modernism, communism, and Marxism in the LAE, but they also dared to reevaluate Roman Catholicism. With Vatican II in process, they entertained the possibility that the Catholic/Protestant standoff might thaw.
National churches became less polemical toward Catholics and more focused on expository preaching—taking advantage of Catholics’ increased interest in the Bible’s contents (Roberts 1962:6; Lores 1962:9). LAM did not surrender its commitments to biblical Christianity and evangelism.

**Organizational Analysis**

In addition to the analysis provided under the *Observations* headings, the following section reviews LAM’s status in an overall manner for the period 1946-1965.

**Organizational Stage**

During this historical period, LAM underwent a subtle transition. Although the elder Strachans had died, Kenneth was still closely identified with the founding family. Indeed his time as a leader began while both his parents were living and continued when only his mother was alive. Finally he was the last Strachan serving in the capacity of LAM General Director. As such, the LAM still falls largely under Schein’s category of *Founding and Early Growth*, with a bit of overlap into the next stage—*Midlife* (See Figure 4-1).

Schein remarks that the transition between categories begins after the founders relinquish control, even “if that person is the founder’s son, daughter, or some other trusted family member” (Schein 1992:310). If a new manager is brought in, the opportunity exists to alter the cultural assumptions and priorities that have been developed. However, if the founder’s family maintains control of the organization, they are more likely to preserve the culture and may even expend efforts toward clarifying, integrating, and developing that culture (Schein 1992:310-311). Indeed, this pattern can
be discerned in Kenneth’s reexamination of his father’s evangelistic priorities followed by his own endorsement of those values in EID.

Figure 4-1 LAM Early to Midlife Growth Stage

The door cracked into *Midlife*, however, in the large number of other leaders LAM produced. LAM was not a single-celled organism with one focus; it was a growing multi-celled organization complete with upper and mid-level management and department heads. Schein contends that one of the signs of *Midlife* is “when the organization has grown in size to the point where the sheer number of nonfamily managers outweighs the family members” (Schein 1992:313). With Horace Fenton as LAM Associate General Director, Dayton Roberts and David Howard as LAM Assistant General Directors, a Home Director, Field Directors, Department Directors, etc., the LAM showed signs of maturity.
The LAM moved through Greiner’s first Crisis of Leadership by locating and installing a “strong business manager who [was] acceptable to the founders and who [could] pull the organization together”—namely, Kenneth Strachan (Greiner 1972:42). Hence, the LAM could now be located in the Growth through Direction stage (See Figure 4-2).

Typically, organizations in the Direction phase of development experience sustained growth, in part due to the streamlining of functions and strong decision-making on the part of upper management. The growth produced in the organization at this point creates multiple levels of workers who ultimately decide they want more control and
autonomy over their particular areas—thus precipitating the next crisis (Greiner 1972:42). Kenneth’s move toward team management and the creation of multiple leadership positions may have helped to ameliorate the Autonomy Crisis. This will be considered in the next chapter (See Figure 4-3).

Figure 4-3  LAM Early to Midlife Growth/Crisis Overlay

Organizational Effectiveness

Based on the organizational indicators, LAM experienced positive organizational effectiveness during this historical period. Campaigns were conducted, people were converted, and churches were strengthened and renewed. Ministries to physical needs continued and even expanded in the rural areas. Radio and literature ministries opened up new levels of society to the message of the gospel.
**Vision.** Kenneth had a clear vision of where he wanted the LAM to go. He did not assume that it should maintain the status quo. Rather, as he did in all areas of life, he questioned and probed until he was convinced that something made sense. Hence, after a period of examination, Strachan determinately engaged the LAM in renewed evangelistic efforts under the EID rubric. Convinced of the importance of focusing these events around the local church, the LAM invested time, money and personnel to achieve the vision. Denison notes that “a consistent vision, expressed in forms both symbolic and real, can serve to tie an organization together in a way that is highly functional” (1997:82). Kenneth’s renewed vision bound the mission together as it transitioned to new leadership and new goals.

**Identity.** Initially the transition from the elder Strachans to Kenneth created an occasion for concern. Pretiz and Roberts recall,

> When his parents aged and needed to pass the baton, Kenneth was their candidate and the unanimous choice of the mission trustees and the missionary family. But everyone feared that the ‘glory days’ of LAM evangelism had become a thing of the past. (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:20)

These concerns proved unfounded. The LAM sustained or even increased its level of evangelistic involvement and effectiveness.

LAM missionaries continued to have a healthy view of themselves as a part of a large family. They knew what they believed and held the LAM’s traditional values in common. As per Denison’s *involvement hypothesis*, the missionaries involved themselves in goals and projects that were external to the organization itself, and did not simply focus inwardly (Denison 1997:104). Thus, they helped achieve organizational effectiveness. With the coming of modernism, ecumenism, Vatican II, latinization and
Pentecostalism, however, new ideas began to surface. The homogeneous character of LAM was threatened, and the opportunity for further stretching, or discord, was at hand.

As mentioned earlier, Kenneth was an amazing recruiter. Interestingly enough, the Builder Generation who formed the bulk of these recruits during Kenneth Strachan’s days are fast approaching retirement. Their impending absence is creating a large void that the mission must face. McIntosh puts it this way,

Immediately following World War II missionaries were recruited and sent to foreign fields in large numbers. Most were in their twenties and thirties and today are retiring and returning home. This changing of the guard is forcing missionary organizations to face the future…. While the exact methodologies mission agencies will use in the future are not yet developed, clearly they must be designed to attract and meet the needs of people of younger generations. (McIntosh 1995:19)

That young generation of missionaries who swelled the ranks after World War II, are the same ones who are poised to pass along the baton to younger leaders today.

Leadership. Strachan appears to have been stronger in the area of visionary leadership than in administration or management. Although every leader must function in all of these areas to some degree, Kenneth built around himself a team of people who were strong in areas where he was weak. Thus, it often fell to leaders like Dayton Roberts and Horace Fenton to translate Kenneth’s ideas into concepts that could be articulated and implemented (Howard 1999b).

Authors Kouzes and Posner suggest several commitments to leadership that inform this analysis. First, leaders challenge the process.

They search for opportunities to change the status quo. They look for innovative ways to improve the organization. They experiment and take risks. And since risk taking involves mistakes and failure, leaders accept the inevitable disappointments as learning opportunities. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:318)
Strachan certainly sought new ways of accomplishing the task of evangelism and strengthening the Latin church. As alluded to earlier, he innovated the way in which the LAM viewed Latinos. No longer were they dealt with as simply the recipients of the mission’s activities. Rather, under Kenneth’s leadership Latinos were given increasingly greater responsibilities in the work of the mission itself. His most enduring legacy, EID, placed the mandate for evangelism, not primarily in the hands of an outside mission agency, but rather in the responsibilities of the local church.

The authors’ second leadership rubric speaks of the generation of a shared vision. Such leaders

passionately believe that they can make a difference. They envision the future, creating an ideal and unique image of what the community, agency, or organization can become. Through their strong appeal and quiet persuasion, leaders enlist others in the dream. They breathe life into the shared vision and get people to see the exciting future possibilities. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:318)

This description seems particularly applicable to the subject at hand. Strachan had the ability to produce enthusiasm around a vision of the future that created unity and momentum. Strachan derived some of his theories from conversations with others, from his seminary training, and from his own research into other existing organizations or movements. Joel Arthur Barker remarks,

Visionaries are not necessarily leaders. How can you tell the difference? Visionaries have great ideas about the future. But when they look behind them, no one else is following. Leaders always have people behind them. (Barker 1992:169)

Leaders may not be the originators of all great ideas, but they do know who the visionaries are and from what sources to select their concepts (Barker 1992:169).

Kouzes and Posner’s third leadership template is enabling others to act. Such leaders
foster collaboration and build spirited teams. They actively involve others. Leaders understand that mutual respect is what sustains extraordinary efforts; they strive to create an atmosphere of trust and human dignity. They strengthen others by sharing information and providing choice. They give their own power away, making each person feel capable and powerful. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:318)

Strachan was a team player as can be clearly seen in the formation of his leadership team. Like what is envisioned in McGregor’s *Theory Y*, he believed that people would motivate themselves toward goals to which they were committed, and assumed that people were creative and imaginative—eager for responsibility (McGregor 1960:47-48).

The fourth guideline under which one may evaluate LAM leadership is that of modeling the way forward. Leaders create standards of excellence and then set an example for others to follow. They establish values about how constituents, colleagues, and customers should be treated. Because complex change can overwhelm and stifle action, leaders achieve small wins. They unravel bureaucracy, put up signposts, and create opportunities for victory. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:318)

Strachan believed in partnership and equality. He demonstrated this commitment not only by empowering younger leaders, but also by making LAM more inclusive of Latinos and conducting business meetings in Spanish.

Elliot notes that Kenneth became quite popular, “not only because of his careful scholarship and interesting lectures, but because of his increasing ability to do what he had always said was one of the most difficult things for him to do: to take a personal interest in people” (Elliot 1968:79). This capacity to relate to Latinos earned him great dividends in his dealings with them. In fact, he may have related more personably with Latinos than he did with his fellow missionaries. He seemed to go out of his way to treat the Latin brethren with special consideration.
The fifth commitment offered by Kouzes and Posner concerns the type of leadership style that encourages the heart.

Getting extraordinary things done in organizations is hard work. To keep hope and determination alive, leaders recognize contributions that individuals make in the climb to the top. And because every winning team needs to share in the rewards of team efforts, leaders celebrate accomplishments. They make everyone feel like a hero. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:318)

Ultimately, in a non-profit organization such as a mission agency, if an individual is not enjoying the experience it is quite easy to leave. Lacking the economic incentive to stay, missions must capitalize on the satisfaction of ministry tasks instead.

While it often fell to others to “flesh out” Kenneth’s dreams, he was the point man that cheered on the troops and made leaders of others. He saw the potential in a person and gave them an opportunity to lead. This is a true mark of a mature leader, namely the ability to exalt others without himself or herself feeling threatened. Again, perhaps Kenneth’s own lack of self-confidence impelled him to encourage others in their own struggles. He seemed to have found the balance between giving people the appropriate amount of the relational attention they required without smothering them. He let people carry out the tasks delegated to them. In this sense practiced what Hersey and Blanchard have called, *Situational Leadership* (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson 1996:189).

**Theology.** The heavy reliance on theological motivation, namely the expectation of Christ’s imminent return, employed by Harry and Susan Strachan, seems mainly absent in this time period. While the doctrine is printed as a belief, it was not often emphasized as a motivation for evangelism. LAM did grapple, however, with the theological implications of the gospel in terms of balancing social ministries and evangelism—something that Susan had already demonstrated in the ministries that she
had initiated. In a climate of increased conflict between fundamentalists and ecumenicalists, the LAM sought to maintain its historic balance between the gospel in word and the gospel in deeds. Using Denison’s term, LAM’s organizational consistency was undergoing change as the older culture intersected with the newer emerging organizational culture (Denison 1997:104). As such, LAM’s values, beliefs, and theology may have contributed less to organizational effectiveness in this historical period.

No doubt due in part to his studies at Princeton, Kenneth Strachan reaffirmed the centrality of the local church and the role of the laity. Evangelism was ultimately the responsibility of every member, every believer. Campaigns simply assisted the local church in carrying out its God-given task.

Finally, in a time when some questioned whether mission agencies were themselves a thing of the past, Strachan brought people back to the Bible. Just prior to his death in 1965 while lecturing to a group of Fuller Theological Seminary students with a Bible study on Psalm 107:23-30, one of those present paid him tribute by writing,

You hardly seemed like a professor…. You were more like the Apostle Paul, and we…well, we were like the scared crewmen on the stormy sea. Many of us had given up hope for the missionary enterprise. Evangelism was not an option. All our hopes and ambitions would soon be smashed on the rocks…. Then you stepped out on the deck. Somehow all of us, from the captain to the sailors, felt you should take charge…. “Why, don’t you know the theological climate in this part of the world?” some of the sailors muttered. “There is no hope; we are all going under.” But because you spoke with such love and hope, reinforced by your life, we believed you. (Roberts 1990:12)

Strachan’s life and ministry combined to form a powerful and credible portrait of a missions leader who believed God still calls people into active evangelism.
LAM under Kenneth Strachan continued to possess a clear vision, a healthy identity, capable leadership and orthodox theology, which all combined to contribute, in varying degrees, to a period of exceptional organizational effectiveness. The LAM weathered its first major transition from the founders to the successor, and ministries not only continued, but new ones were developed as well.
Chapter 5

Mid-Course Corrections—CLAME, LAM’s Latinization Experiment (1966-1983)

Latin America Mission (LAM) history took a distinct turn after the death of Kenneth Strachan. For the first time in its existence, the mission was without a Strachan at the helm. Gone were the days when the majority of missionaries could claim they worked with the mission’s founders. A new generation of missionaries took their places under new leadership.

In its first 45 years of existence, LAM was led by either the founders, Harry and Susan Strachan, or their son, Kenneth Strachan. In the subsequent 35 years, LAM had five different leaders. While each of these men brought their own perspective to the task, two decisions affected the second half of LAM’s history far more than the personalities of its leaders. This chapter considers the first of these momentous resolutions: The decision to nationalize all LAM ministries and latinize the mission. The following chapter deals with efforts to reengage LAM in direct ministry.

Horace Fenton: Transition and Continuation (1966-1970)

The chapter is divided into three parts. This first section chronicles the transition to Horace Fenton’s leadership and the continuing impact of Evangelism in Depth (EID). Section two looks at LAM’s latinization attempt, while the third section documents LAM’s life during the first half of president Mike Berg’s tenure.

Horace “Dit” Fenton

Horace, or “Dit” as he was known to his friends and family, came from a Christian background. Raised in a Presbyterian household, he “was gripped by the
missionary call when he attended the Keswick Conference” (USA) (Kenyon 1965:4). He met Kenneth Strachan while attending Wheaton College and later joined LAM at Strachan’s invitation. Fenton had been a pastor in the USA and served as a chaplain during WWII in “an Eighth Air Force heavy bomber unit” (Kenyon 1965:4). He read extensively, 50 books a year, and reviewed books for the *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (Kenyon 1965:5). Horace also co-founded the “Seneca Hills” retreat center in western Pennsylvania (Roberts 2000b).

Fenton assumed the duties of Costa Rica Field Director right after language school and later that of LAM Associate General Director. Fenton was a tremendous preacher, some claimed he was even better than Kenneth Strachan (Pretiz, Berg & Berg 1999). In Costa Rica, his sermonic skills ensured that the Wednesday evening LAM prayer meetings were well attended, not only by LAM missionaries, but by expatriates as well (Roberts 2000b). Stateside he preached and represented LAM with great impact (Howard 2001). As an author he wrote, *The Trouble With Barnacles*, among other books (Fenton 1973).

While Fenton excelled in English, he felt inadequate in Spanish. Having learned the language later in life, he always spoke “with a strong yankee accent” (Roberts 2001b). For whatever reason, he does not appear to have connected as thoroughly to the Latin American context as did Kenneth Strachan (Pretiz, Berg & Berg 1999). Nevertheless, he was loved by North Americans and Latinos alike.

When Kenneth died, the remaining three administrators, Horace Fenton, Dayton Roberts and David Howard, along with board chairman Jacob Stam, unanimously settled
on Fenton as successor (Howard 1999a). Fenton intended to continue in the same vein as Strachan, both in administrative style and organizational focus.

**Evangelism In Depth**

While Kenneth conceptualized and inaugurated Evangelism in Depth (EID), he missed out on most of its expansion and successes. Following his death, EID moved on, thanks in part to an unusual prophetic word delivered by one of LAM’s General Council members before Strachan’s death. In the prophecy Satan had received permission to touch Kenneth’s body so that he would not be able to respond to invitations from other parts of the world wanting to hear the EID principles. The demon in the prophecy was convinced the movement would therefore be contained to Latin America. The narrative continued:

“Don’t be a fool!” responds Satan, “What’s the matter with his colleagues? Why can’t they go?” “Why, sir, we’ve taken care of that, too. We’ve sent a lying spirit to their hearts to make them think they are too busy.” (Roberts 1967:70)

Thanks to that experience, Dayton Roberts and Ruben Lores found it impossible to say “No” to an invitation to share the strategy in the Far East. Thus, EID principles were implemented by organizations in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, India, Lebanon, Portugal, and Africa (Roberts 1967:70).

**Colombia.** In 1968, LAM brought EID to Colombia. Strachan defined the underlying principle of EID as follows: “The expansion of any movement is in direct proportion to its success in mobilizing its total membership in continuous propagation of its beliefs” (R. Strachan 1968:108). In many ways *every-member evangelism* had also been Victor Landero’s message in the rural sectors. EID catapulted this kind of thinking
into the foreground of urban evangelicalism in Colombia, bringing about a greater degree of unity to the persecuted minority.

Rafael Baltodano coordinated the Colombian EID, which “coincided with [the] papal visit and the Medellin bishops conference” (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:189). Several thousand prayer cells formed and regional training institutes were conducted. These institutes trained over 1500 leaders who then trained 30,000 local believers in evangelism. 21,000 people went door-to-door in nationwide visitation, visiting 143,000 homes and passing out about 500,000 tracts. They held local evangelistic crusades, as well as literacy and medical campaigns (Howard 1969:179-180).

The LAM-related Asociación de Iglesias Evangélicas del Caribe (AIEC) denomination in Colombia considers its participation in the 1968 EID campaign as one of the factors in its growth (another would be the charismatic outpouring described in the previous chapter). The AIEC applied the philosophy of EID to their evangelistic work until 1975 (U. Padilla 1995:75). In the decade from 1965 to 1974, the denomination added 40 new mission stations with more than 20 members each and a full-time pastor. 91 mission stations became congregations, and 4000 people were baptized and added to the church. This represented a 373% increase over the ten year period (U. Padilla 1995:72).

Beyond any immediate results, there were long-term ones revealed in subsequent years. For instance, Otoniel Rios, the pastor of the largest grassroots congregation in Guatemala, was “converted to the gospel in an Evangelism-in-Depth campaign” (Berg & Pretiz 1996a:41). No one can say how many others are ministering in some capacity as a
result of these concentrated efforts. By 1969, church growth authors Read, Monterroso, and Johnson could say that

the practical effect of Evangelism-in-Depth has been to show many groups which had never experienced growth that growth was possible. They came to recognize more fully their own leadership resources and discovered that they could cooperate with other groups without compromising themselves or their principles. Consequently they began to believe and work for greater things for God. (Read, Monterroso & Johnson 1969:349)


**LAM Reflects.** By the end of the 1960s, EID claimed at least partial success in achieving many of its objectives. EID leaders reflected on the emerging data and analysis of their efforts and made adjustments in the program. Dayton Roberts articulated three misconceptions that critics had concerning EID. First, they had a “false
conception of the structure of Evangelism-in-Depth” (Roberts 1967:81). EID could not
cure all of the national church’s problems related to evangelistic stagnation. “The
program . . . is the program of the local national Christian community, reflecting its own
particular vision, vigor and shortcomings” (Roberts 1967:81). Since the strengths and
weaknesses of churches varied from context to context, EID results varied.

Second, Roberts felt the critics did not understand the true objectives of EID when
they focused solely on numerical gains. Beyond conversions, the EID team aimed at a
new level of “faith, courage and optimism” (Roberts 1967:84) on the part of the national
church. This enabled them to engage in ongoing, continuous propagation of the gospel.
EID invigorated attitudes about evangelism. Additionally, EID produced new leaders
and expanded the traditional concept of evangelism by including social outreach through
medical caravans and literacy projects (Roberts 1967:87).

Third, Roberts defended the movement from accusations of being either too
ecumenical or too fundamentalist. Strachan and the EID staff did not see unity in the
body of Christ as an option open to democratic appeal. Since the Bible clearly taught
unity, they reasoned that it was not their place to “dissolve it” (Roberts 1967:88).

Rosales. Due to its widespread popularity, EID attracted the attention of other
missionaries who brought their own critique to the program. Ray S. Rosales’ 1968 Th.M.
thesis identified EID’s dependence on the ability of the local Latin church to follow-up
on results gained during the project, as a possible shortcoming. Latin Protestants were
fragmented and could only agree on some basic tenets of evangelism (Rosales
1968:7/16). Thus, EID results varied from location to location.
**EID and Church Growth.** Perhaps the first person to make a serious attempt at integrating emerging church growth theory with EID, was Malcolm R. Bradshaw. Loaned to EID from his home mission, OMF, Bradshaw opened EID’s Asian office in 1970, thus acquiring firsthand knowledge of the movement. Bradshaw did his M.A. thesis under church growth guru Donald McGavran at Fuller Theological Seminary. He converted his thesis into the book, *Church Growth Through Evangelism-in-Depth* (M. Bradshaw 1969), where he not only gave his input, but also dealt with various critics, including Wagner and Peters.

**Bradshaw, Wagner and Peters.** As a missionary in Bolivia, C. Peter Wagner participated in the 1965 EID, giving him an insider’s perspective in some arenas. With a greater interest in *persuasion evangelism* than simply *proclamation evangelism*, Wagner felt justified in dubbing EID, “Revival in Depth,” since it did not “appear to cause quantitative growth” in churches (Wagner 1971:142, 144). He pointed out that whereas EID measured the following:

- Number of prayer cells organized
- Number of laymen awarded certificates of capacitation
- Amount of contributions toward the budget
- Number of homes visited
- Number of decisions through visitation and campaigns
- Attendance at campaigns
- Number participating in public parades
- The most meaningful statistics, those of church membership increase, rates of church growth, and increase in the number of organized churches, have not been stressed in official publications. (Wagner 1971:146)

Wagner’s assertion that EID was nothing more than a revival movement seems largely unfounded. The 1965-1966 Bolivia campaign alone, in which Wagner participated, saw over 19,000 conversions (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:188). Guatemala’s movement resulted in 15,000 conversions (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:39). Surely many of
these people eventually found their way into local churches. In Colombia, for instance, church growth was measured by James Goff for the Evangelical Confederation of Colombia. From 1960 to 1966 the churches grew by

5,000 people. In 1967 it was 7,000. In ’68, the year of E/D, it reached 14,000. But in 1969 it dropped back to 6,000. E/D had increased church growth, but not enough churches had adopted a permanent E/D lifestyle to make growth continuous. (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:94)

Indeed, the EID staff itself wanted to see even greater church growth and attempted to correct the program’s deficiencies. Besides the literally tens of thousands converted, there was also a positive deepening, reviving affect on the congregations involved.

Bradshaw reflected on Wagner’s charge, and claimed that both evangelism and revival were important. He based his remarks on J. W. Pickett’s work that demonstrated a “genuine ‘revivalistic movement’ would be an impossibility without its being at the same time an evangelistic movement” (M. Bradshaw 1969:93). He also looked to McGavran who said, “discipling and perfecting are frequently intertwined. When both are going on in the same population it is hard to say where one ends and the other begins” (McGavran 1959:98). EID revived the national church and contributed to evangelism.

Critics also claimed that the Strachan Theorem was too simplistic and claimed too universal a scope. Wagner remained unconvinced that total mobilization was the sole key to the success of a movement, since there were examples of movements occurring around single individuals and small groups (Wagner 1971:150). More precisely, the theorem did not address other complex sociological factors that could create climates for receptivity. George W. Peters remarked that EID needed to add to its idea of mobilization, those of a culturally relevant gospel message and cultural adaptation
The concepts of contextualization, receptivity levels, and the homogeneous unit principle eventually worked their way into EID’s ongoing evolution.

Wagner felt the idea of mobilizing every believer in continuous evangelism was a potential misrepresentation of spiritual gifting. He stated that “it is well to keep in mind that while all Christians are expected to be witnesses, not all are evangelists” (Wagner 1971:155). For its part, EID staff placed the onus for evangelism on the laity where it belonged, and not on professional evangelistic clergy.

To facilitate the continuous evangelism goal of EID, Wagner suggested that EID insert a church planting component (Wagner 1971:157). EID never integrated this idea in depth, until the days of its successor program, Christ for the City (CFC). Even then, the results were mixed.

Wagner also found fault with the theorem’s implication that unity was essential to the task of evangelism. He later called this hypercooperativism and stated that “the more a church cooperates interdenominationally, the less evangelism occurs” (Wagner 1979:285).

This criticism also seems unfounded. EID participants themselves felt that cooperation was an invaluable component of the program. Peters indicated that involvement in EID was voluntary and that although participation ranged between a phenomenal 65%-85%, in no country did EID enlist and mobilize all Protestants (Peters 1970:70-71). More importantly, Peters documented participant reactions like the following:

No pastor felt that he or his church has been hurt theologically, spiritually, or morally by such cooperation.

No pastor felt that his or his church’s loyalty to his own denomination had been weakened.
No pastor felt that his or his church’s attitude toward theological liberalism, and the ecumenical movement had been weakened or otherwise affected.

Most pastors felt that their lives and ministries had been enriched by the fellowship and cooperation, and their churches had benefited from it.

Most pastors felt that it had been one of the greatest things ever to happen in their community, and that it had been an impressive demonstration of evangelical unity in Christ and in the cause of evangelism.

Most pastors (more than ninety percent) would enthusiastically again enter such cooperation for a similar evangelistic thrust. (Peters 1970:71)

Thus, most people involved in EID felt the unity of the church was too important an element to ignore in its overall strategies.

Finally, Bradshaw encouraged EID to conduct research before, during and after campaigns, so that leaders could determine what worked and what needed adjustment.

He remarked, “the way the Holy Spirit is already winning men in a local situation should never be bypassed or replaced by a one-approach-to-all-situations method” (M. Bradshaw 1969:115). Accurate data would allow EID to respond more effectively.

Further Organizational Developments. These and other evaluative insights were directed toward the EID movement, whose staff then evaluated their accuracy and applicability to their context. Since EID was a fluid, dynamic movement, many of these ideas eventually emerged as new emphases. For instance, as the 1960s ended, LAM coordinators realized that although thousands were coming into the churches, “no one was personally taking the individual converts to help them with their problems” (Berg & Pretiz 1992:126). After LAM nationalized all of its former ministries in 1971, the newly-formed Institute of In-Depth Evangelization (INDEF) turned its attention to discipleship. Also, as more research findings emerged, the staff concluded that the time for traditional united campaigns in Latin America would be “less productive than other efforts” (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:114). INDEF gave birth to “a third generation of E/D [EID] church-
growth research and theory called IMDELA (Instituto Misionológico de Latino-América)” (Roberts 1993:15).

The Office of Worldwide Evangelism-in-Depth (OWED) became the communications arm articulating the “in-depth principles of evangelism to all interested parties in the United States and around the world” (Roberts 1993:15). LAM missionary Ruben Lores headed OWED in Miami, Florida. Malcom Bradshaw led the Asian office in Singapore, and Willys Braun, a CMA missionary, oversaw most of the operations in Africa (Roberts 1993:14-15). The Miami branch became the In-Depth Evangelism Associates (IDEA) and made some changes in the program to make it more applicable to local church contexts. The program-centered approach was replaced by a goal-centered focus, and the time table was left open-ended (IDEA 1973:9). Later IDEA evolved again to become Christ for the City Miami (CFC-Miami) which works under LAM auspices in Miami, Florida (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:115).

EID in Mexico was taken up by LAM missionary and EID veteran Juan Isáis, and became part of MILAMEX (Misión Latinoamericana de México) (Latin America Mission-Mexico). Evangelism-in-Depth International and MILAMEX have its own children’s version of EID called Evangelismo a Fondo Infantil (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:118-119).

Isáis developed his own convictions about EID. He felt that the constant evangelistic activities imposed from the outside were actually a “brake to the most effective evangelism” (J. Isáis 1989:14). Rather than trying to motivate people externally through programs, Isáis claimed that evangelism came naturally to new believers.
Christians, therefore, needed to return to the *romance* of their first love with Jesus, where evangelism was a natural lifestyle (J. Isáis 1989:48).

Orlando Costas also worked with LAM and EID. In the 1970s he became convinced that pastoral transformation was key to EID’s permanence. He created the *Latin American Evangelical Center for Pastoral Studies* “to reshape the pastor’s understanding of his responsibility and clarify for him his task” (Pretiz & Roberts 1998:117).

The most recent evolution of the EID legacy is Christ for the City (CFC), now called Christ for the Cities International (CFCI). Strongly influenced by urban studies, CFC is the “most holistic member of the family and probably deserves to be called the ‘third generation of LAM evangelism’” (Roberts 1993:15-16). Christ for the City will be taken up in the following chapter.

EID’s initial philosophy and motivations did not die out, but rather mutated into a variety of specialized forms. These more recent innovations synthesized the latest thinking into their approaches, thus becoming more responsive and effective within their given spheres of influence.

**Seminary Latinized**

LAM’s seminary continued to grow and attract increasing attention. Realizing that the institution needed to be more responsive to the issues that concerned Latinos, leaders published their intention to see both the faculty and the administration more fully latinized (LAE 1967(5):2). Among others, Orlando Costas joined the seminary’s faculty (LAE 1970(5):1). Changes were also made in the student’s evangelistic practicums.
While historically they centered around preaching and verbal proclamation, options such as literacy training were increasingly used as a means of evangelizing (LAE 1969(3):5).

**Hunger and Poverty**

In the 1960s and 1970s, hunger, poverty and unjust social systems dominated political, philosophical and religious discussions. LAM missionaries and related ministries were also affected by these discussions. For instance, Florida businessman Brooks Herman helped LAM set up a poultry business at its farm to supply needs at the orphanage and to provide quality stock for area farmers (LAE 1989(2):9). Likewise the orphanage, not content to maintain the status quo, addressed children’s needs by opening its first of several day care centers located around Costa Rica’s capital. Costa Rica’s director of social welfare praised the facility which was designed to meet the needs of working mothers (LAE 1970(3):17).

Although LAM’s hospital continued operating, it represented an increasing drain on mission personnel and finances. Thinking they would need to close the hospital, LAM instead rejoiced that a group of local Costa Rican evangelicals picked it up and ran it themselves (LAE 1968(4):3). To this day, the hospital continues to function as a premier treatment center in Costa Rica. With the city hospital out of its hands, LAM turned its attention to the rural sectors where greater medical needs still persisted (LAE 1968(4):3).

**Gregorio Landero**

After becoming a Christian during the Colombian charismatic outpouring described in the previous chapter, Gregorio Landero, Victor’s brother, felt called by God to minister to people’s material needs and created *Acción Unida* (known in English as *Evangelical Action*). During Colombia’s guerrilla war, Gregorio collected and then
distributed “clothes, bedding, food and other items” which were needed by refugees who had fled the fighting (LAE 1969(6):15). On another occasion, Gregorio helped a town secure its first power plant (LAE 1972(4):8). He laid out one town’s streets and encouraged people to get involved in civic affairs (Kenyon 1972:2). His actions impacted those who had felt that evangelicals were unconcerned with people’s social needs, progress, and poverty. Thus, they listened when Gregorio shared the story of Jesus.

Creating Acción Unida represented a brave move since most evangelicals did not want to be confused with those in Catholicism’s Liberation Theology camp. Nevertheless, his ministry raised awareness about the importance of development work in meeting people’s physical needs as well as their spiritual ones (U. Padilla 1995:90). Through the work of Acción Unida, Colombians took the initiative to address urgent problems faced by rural Christians (Kenyon 1972:20). As Gustavo Gutiérrez pointed out, “commitment to the poor means entering, and in some cases remaining in, that universe . . . being one of its inhabitants.” (Gutiérrez 1984:125). Colombian believers practiced their theology as one of the people.

One final element should be added to the Landero saga. In 1972 Victor Landero had a vision where he saw someone talking to his brother Gregorio, inviting him to do something important that involved a long trip. He told his brother about it and, although they did not know what it could mean, Victor believed Gregorio should accept the invitation. In an amazing series of events, LAM missionary David Howard, then on loan to Intervarsity Christian Fellowship, invited Gregorio Landero to speak at the Urbana ’73
missions conference. One can only imagine the apprehension this simple rural pastor felt addressing 15,000 American university students (Owen & Howard 1979:127-131).

**LAM Administration**

Life under Fenton’s leadership differed greatly from Kenneth Strachan’s tenure. Strachan had his team of Roberts, Fenton and Howard. Below this layer of leadership were mid-level managers who also had their areas of responsibility. Working with his team, Kenneth, being a decisive leader, delegated and then left the implementation of those decisions to the discretion of the particular leader involved (Howard 1999a). Teamwork did not mean the abdication of leadership.
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**Figure 5-1  LAM Structure Prior to CLAME**

Fenton attempted to follow Strachan’s pattern by working with a team. However, for Fenton this meant that all three team members were coequal and had to discuss everything together. Fenton’s reticence to make decisions between sessions, as Strachan had done, frustrated leaders at the mid-level who wanted to move ahead with their plans.
Instead, they were sometimes made to wait for months, until the team met again (Howard 1999a) (See Figure 5-1). Horace’s reluctance to lead decisively hampered LAM’s progress and crippled its leadership.

Fenton seemed torn between LAM’s commitments in Latin America and the need to represent the mission in the USA. Much of his time was spent in the states dealing with administration and promoting LAM. Consequently, it fell to other members of the administrative team to cover all the bases in Latin America. Pressure mounted for David Howard to relocate from Colombia to Costa Rica to assist Dayton Roberts in administration. But Howard enjoyed his lifestyle in Colombia. Although he was an administrator there, he could also escape into the jungles and do evangelism when he desired. Howard remained in Colombia for a couple more years enjoying the great things that were happening there. When he did yield and relocate to Costa Rica in January 1968, he was quite dissatisfied with sitting in an office all day pushing papers (Howard 1999a).

Latino Ruben Lores became a LAM Assistant General Director in 1967. This move illustrated LAM’s serious intention to latinize its administration. Lores brought a “creative flexibility of thought and planning which had been important parts of Strachan’s genius of leadership” (Kenyon 1967:4). One year later, after turning Inter Varsity down three other times, David Howard agreed to be loaned to them for three years (Howard 1999a). The loan turned into a lifetime of service outside of LAM. Howard did not return to LAM until his retirement years when he served as interim president. Howard’s absence contributed to LAM’s administrative burden (LAE 1968(5):17).
By 1971 Fenton had repeatedly asked the LAM Board of Trustees not to name him to the position of LAM General Director. He felt the job had become too large for one individual, managing affairs in both the USA and Latin America. Additional factors may have been his age and the fact that he had other ministry interests he wanted to pursue. For its part, the board treated this not as a crisis of leadership, but as an organizational problem. They discussed restructuring the entire LAM (LAM Collection 236, Box 69:15).

Elizabeth Strachan Dies

After Kenneth’s death, Elizabeth Strachan had stayed in Costa Rica and made her mark as an educator. She addressed university professors and educational leaders concerning her kindergarten methodology (Saylor 1969:14). She passed away June 8, 1969 and was survived by her six adult children. The loss of both parents in the space of four years was a severe blow to the survivors (M. Strachan 1999).

Observations

The first half of Fenton’s tenure, prior to the implementation of CLAME (Comunidad Latinoamericana de Ministerios Evangélicos) (Community of Evangelical Ministries in Latin America), is a natural point to make the following observations.

Vision. Overall, Fenton continued the vision Kenneth Strachan had initiated. He focused on EID and latinizing the mission. Not all LAM missionaries, however, felt that LAM should have focused so heavily on EID. Some were jealous that it received most of the attention (Howard 1999c; Fenton 1968a:20). Other ministries were financially impacted and felt neglected with EID in the spotlight. Those who served with more independent ministries were less concerned (Worsfold 1999).
Whereas the Strachans cast strong goals for the mission, Fenton appeared unwilling to commit himself to a long range vision. Concerning the mission’s future he stated, “We are on safer ground if we deal with what we hope for in the LAM in the next ten years. These, therefore, are not official goals but rather the hopes of one man, hopes which he suspects are shared by many others in the family” (Fenton 1968b:0).

**Identity.** In 1971 LAM had around 190 missionaries. As a whole, LAM missionaries continued to see themselves as a family. The weekly English missionary prayer meetings, held in Costa Rica and Colombia, gave them a sense of camaraderie and fellowship. Around them, however, Latin America was embroiled in revolution and controversy. Some outsiders questioned the continued role of missions and the future of missionaries.

**Leadership.** While beloved as a preacher, Fenton could not replace Kenneth Strachan as a visionary leader. His desire to involve everyone, coupled with indecisiveness, slowed the responsiveness of the mission. Leaders and leadership slots created by Kenneth Strachan, were rendered largely ineffective under Fenton.

**Theology.** Rumblings in Roman Catholicism and Latin America’s Liberation Theology dominated the theological landscape. Instead of energizing the mission, theological issues consumed its time and increasingly divided its constituents.

**Latinization and Partnership (1971-1976)**

The following section describes a fundamental break in the pattern of LAM’s history. Up to this point, despite the administration’s struggles, LAM had conducted
business much as it had from its origins. But its decision in 1971 to nationalize its institutions and reorganize its structure forever altered its trajectory.

**CLAME**

In 1971, after 50 years of ministry in Latin America, LAM divested itself of all direct ministries by turning them over entirely to national leaders. This innovation resulted in the formation of the umbrella organization, Comunidad Latinoamericana de Ministerios Evangélicos (CLAME) (Community of Evangelical Ministries in Latin America). A broader view of world currents provides a sharper perspective of possible contributors or motivations for this move.

**Revitalization.** Anthony Wallace wrote about revitalization movements (Wallace 1956). In many ways, CLAME revitalized, or at least fundamentally changed, the LAM. Wallace described the first stage in revitalization as **steady state** because most of the pieces and players within the given system functioned with relative dynamic equilibrium (Wallace 1956:268). Up until recent years, LAM had enjoyed a steady state in regard to its work and the Latin American church. Despite years of opposition by the Catholic Church, evangelicals increasingly found favor among the people.

Notwithstanding the favor that mission agencies enjoyed, global shifts ultimately disrupted the steady state. Pretiz and Roberts note several events that added to the destabilization of the times. First, the USA and USSR cold war spilled over into Latin America through such countries as Cuba (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:5). Several Latin American countries found themselves in the middle of a war that was out of their control.

Second, newly liberated countries struggling for autonomy found that outside interests were still largely controlling their own economies. The United Nations’ issued
its principle of self-determination and anthropologists documented the benefits of individual cultures. A backlash to “First World ‘imperialism’ in any aspect of life in the Third World countries” became more and more apparent (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:6).

Third, changes in the Catholic Church as a result of Vatican II signaled not only new styles in the Mass and the preferential option for the poor, but a new openness to the separated brethren. Coupled with the Catholic charismatic movement, this new openness made more people interested in the gospel.

In the midst of these global shifts, changes occurred in LAM’s primary service fields of Costa Rica, Colombia, and Mexico. The national church not only grew, but matured to the point where it was entirely capable of self-directed ministry. While they were appreciative of the past, Latino leaders wanted to take their place in running national ministries as Juan Isáis documented in quasi-fictional fashion in The Other Side of the Coin (1966).

Towerling Missions. Kenneth Strachan had seen this trend. He placed the blame for strained relationships between mission organizations and the national church on the mission societies. Strachan claimed missions were slow to recognize the need for younger churches to assume positions of leadership responsibility (R. Strachan 1954:2). He described the problem using a construction metaphor where mission agencies were the scaffolds helping to support the house of the national church.

But what an imposing scaffolding—scaffold upon scaffold, girders to support girders—and how small the building over which it towers. The weakness of the “scaffold” concept of the missionary’s place in the scheme of things is that it leaves the foreigner in control of the building operation. It is only in the sphere of the life and worship of the native church itself that we have granted a measure of autonomy, but in practically all the other phases of missionary work—educational, medical, literature, radio, etc.—it is pretty much our own show, run
with little regard, if any for the judgment and voice of the national Christians themselves. (R. Strachan 1954:4)

While the fact that the national church ran her own internal affairs may have met some people’s definition of an indigenous church, Strachan was not satisfied. He believed that “some way must be found to bring the national church and its leaders into partnership in the planning and execution of” all missionary work, not merely local church ministry (R. Strachan 1954:6). In describing the situation in 1954 he wrote:

Missions have gone through two stages thus far: first, the stage when the mission was everything and the church practically non-existent; second, the stage which we are presently concluding when mission and church exist side by side; and there is a third stage, that upon which we are now entering, when the mission becomes absorbed by the church and its contribution to the evangelization of the unreached in a given area is effected through the channels and under the supervision of the national church, whose primary responsibility it is. (R. Strachan 1954:6)

CLAME attempted to address this third phase.

**Latinize.** As was mentioned earlier, Fenton wanted the mission latinized and LAM administration reorganized. Fenton wrote:

> we must become a *Latin-American* mission in a much fuller sense of the term.

> First, we need a much larger proportion of consecrated, trained Latins in our ranks—and in the highest places of leadership in the Mission. Thanks to the partnership program instituted years ago by the farsightedness of Kenneth Strachan, we already have the benefit of the service and the leadership of many choice Latins. But this is not enough: their numbers need to be greatly increased, and their counsel and direction need to prevail more fully in every aspect of the work.

> Second, we need to be linked much more closely to the churches of Latin America. If in some ways God will allow us to be a missionary arm of these churches, we shall rejoice and give Him the glory. If they will take on an increasing share of the support of our work, both in prayer and in finances, we shall be enabled to multiply our resources and our outreach. (Fenton 1968b:1)

Although LAM had already turned over its church work in Costa Rica and Colombia to national leadership in the 1940s and 1950s, most mission leadership slots
were still filled by North Americans. Yet it must be remembered that at the time LAM had brought many Latinos onboard as full-fledged missionaries, “most other mission boards were still frowning at the idea of allowing ‘nationals’ to join their organizations” (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:9). When LAM spoke of latinization it literally hoped that one day the mission would become a truly Latin mission agency.

**Innovation.** Together with global and mission/national trends, the internal desire for change created a ripe atmosphere for organizational innovation. To use Wallace’s terminology, LAM had moved from a steady state to one of increased stress which needed to be relieved through some form of organizational revitalization in order to return to a steady state (Wallace 1956:269, 275). For this to occur, LAM needed to evolve, since, as Everett Rogers notes, “both the innovation and the organization usually change in the innovation process in organizations” (E. Rogers 1995:375).

By late 1970 LAM leadership decided that serious attention needed to be given to the situation (LAM Collection 236, Box 69:15). They expanded the upcoming annual Interfield Council session to be held in January 1971. They invited “a number of Latin American evangelicals, from inside and outside the Mission” (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:14), as well as a few additional North Americans. In preparation for this session they appointed a Planning Committee which laid out “organizational alternatives and their implications” (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:14). Fenton told them,

*We shall not be afraid of innovation, but we won’t seek change for change’s sake, and we mean to recognize fully the continuing value of many relationships and of many ministries and modes of operation that have been helpful through the years.* (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:15)
Fifty delegates arrived at the expanded annual session to consider LAM’s future. LAM purposefully gave the Latinos a majority presence with 28 delegates. Fenton spoke for many when he stated,

I feel that a gradual continuation of the partnership program we have followed for many years cannot produce what we’re after. There are only a limited number of Latins who will continue to honor us with their membership in our mission unless there are basic and deep changes in our whole structure. (LAE 1971(2):2)

In light of this sentiment, the delegates formed CLAME. This new organization would take the form of a community of fellowship of autonomous ministries, in which the various departments of the mission will have freedom, under God, to develop as entities under strong Latin leadership, to work with and through the evangelical church in Latin America. (LAE 1971(2):3)

CLAME began, albeit in a phased-in manner over the course of a few months, on August 5, 1971. CLAME placed “major responsibility for the continuation and development of its diversified ministries in the hands of Latin American Christian leaders” (LAE 1971(5):20). It was a decentralized fraternal commonwealth giving autonomy to local entities, which still preserved “a common heritage and perspective” (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:18).

About 25 different ministries were placed entirely under the control of their various Latin leaders, and missionaries were “in effect loaned to the various member entities of the Community” (Kenyon 1971a:3). George Taylor, a tricultural, bi-lingual Panamanian national serving in Costa Rica, headed CLAME’s General Assembly (Kenyon 1971b:5). In addition to LAM-USA and LAM-Canada, LAM-Mexico or MILAMEX (Misión Latinoamericana de México) was formed with LAM missionaries Juan and Elizabeth Isáis serving under president José Gonzáles. Other entities included Latin America Mission Publications (LAMP), Evangelism in Depth (EID), Latin
American Biblical Seminary (Seminario Bíblico Latinoamericano) (SBL), Ministry to the Student World (Ministerio al Mundo Estudiantil) (MINAMUNDO), Colombian Ministries, and Costa Rican Ministries (LAE 1971(6):0) (See Figure 5-2).

Figure 5-2  LAM Structure During CLAME

Implementation. Everett Rogers articulates three stages in the implementation phase of an innovation. First, “redefining/restructuring occurs when the innovation is re-invented to accommodate the organization’s needs and structure more closely, and when the organization’s structure is modified to fit with the innovation” (E. Rogers 1995:394).

For LAM-USA and the other CLAME partners this meant that a great deal of discussing and negotiating occurred. The entities incorporated themselves under their various national legal systems and former LAM properties were distributed (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:29). There were problems and misunderstands to be worked through, including some Latinos’ assumption that LAM’s general fund
would become available to the ministries. These funds were humorously referred to as the “ham,” of which large “slices” hopefully would be allotted to the Community’s entities. However, most mission money, the Latins soon discovered, came ear-marked for specific projects…the “ham” quickly disappeared, and it was soon apparent that CLAME…was not going to be a fountain of resources. It was going to cost money instead, in dues and in delegates’ travel from their respective countries to the sites of the general assemblies. (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:31)

The realities of partnership, including financial struggle, became obvious to all participants. CLAME’s entities received not only privilege and authority, but responsibility as well.

One year into the transition and the remarks were still generally positive. For instance, LAM-USA’s Horace Fenton stated, “the shift from parental to full partnership status I find to be a very exciting and satisfying experience” (LAE 1972(3):8). Everett Rogers describes this stage as the clarifying phase. This “occurs as the innovation is put into more widespread use in an organization, so that the meaning of the new idea gradually becomes clearer to the organization’s members” (E. Rogers 1995:399).

Writing in the International Review of Mission in 1973, Roberts continued to clarify and articulate LAM’s understanding of CLAME. LAM concluded that its structure could be latinized with as little as 10% of its personnel being Latinos if they controlled the decision-making process” (Roberts 1973:340). Two years into the CLAME experiment it appeared to be successful. “There was no ‘Missionary, go home!’ movement” and the CLAME structure provided a “missionary bridge over the gap between Old World resources and Third World opportunities” (Roberts 1973:344-345).

In Latin America CLAME generated a variety of responses. In Colombia, for instance, some attacked the new Federation in terms of its mentality and vision. CLAME represented a new way of thinking in contrast to the dominant paradigm (U. Padilla
At the other end of the spectrum were young leaders passionate for the ministry and eager for change. Some of these were criticized and identified as Marxists and Liberationists. Even the validity of their Christianity was doubted because of their ideas and actions related to social development and youth work (U. Padilla 1995:87).

Everett Rogers’ routinization phase in organizational innovation leads to Anthony Wallace’s new steady state. “Routinization occurs when the innovation has become incorporated into the regular activities of the organization, and the innovation loses its separate identity” (E. Rogers 1995:399). For LAM-USA and the other entities this meant settling in for life under the CLAME structure. This became the new dominant paradigm for LAM’s mission work well into the 1980s, and, to a great degree, continues to influence present decisions.

**Life Under CLAME**

Obviously CLAME altered the way many missionaries related to the mission. Dayton Roberts gave a positive account of how the new structure enabled him to transition between ministries:

> I never ceased being a missionary appointee of the Latin America Mission . . . . The Mission would continue to help raise my support and channel it to me as long as I was usefully occupied as a missionary under the authority of one of the autonomous ministries which together form the Community. It was a specific place of service I lacked.  

> This is where the Community’s personnel procedures come in. To help each person fill a recognized need in one of the Community entities is the job of the personnel coordinator.  

> I submitted my name to him . . . . This information was relayed to the member entities, and, I began to receive some very interesting invitations . . . . Finally [I] signed a two-year service agreement. (LAE 1974(6):6)

Theoretically, missionaries who could not find a slot in one of the partner entities were to be sent back to the states. For missionaries already working under Latin
leadership, CLAME made little difference in their daily lives. But it dramatically impacted their fellowship with other missionaries. The Wednesday evening English missionary prayer meetings, which had been so important in maintaining morale, a family atmosphere, and a sense of being a worshipping community, were deemed unacceptable. Missionaries living in a Spanish context were to conduct themselves in Spanish and avoid meetings that Latinos might construe as subversive.

Student Ministries

Student-focused ministries burgeoned in the 1960s and 1970s. Interest in politics and revolutions created a new openness on university campuses. The Spanish ministry, MINAMUNDO, worked on campuses in Colombia and Costa Rica. Jorge Atiencia’s story illustrates the realities of student ministry during that period.

Jorge Atiencia. In 1968 Atiencia arrived in Colombia from his native Ecuador in search of life’s answers. As an 18 year old he thought, “Perhaps in adventure and travel I will find what I am looking for” (LAE 1983(4):8). Jorge had already decided that among the philosophical options available to him, Marxism was the most attractive. He adhered to the adage that religion was the opiate of the people. Enrolled at the National University, he spent his time reading “Hemingway, Camus, Kierkegaard, Sartre” and going to the movies (J. Atiencia 1972:3). However, these things only caused him to despair. He noted,

I looked around me and saw social conditions I deplored—people who were hopelessly poor, deprived and exploited. And I saw I had no arms to fight these conditions. I was just one more object on the landscape.

I sought a reason for living, and found none. I often wanted to commit suicide. But even then, there were moments of beauty. (J. Atiencia 1972:3)
One day while walking through a neighborhood, Jorge and a friend spotted two attractive girls who turned out to be Christians. They invited him to a Christian youth meeting held in a home where the love of the Christians touched him profoundly. The host even invited him to stay for dinner.

On another occasion, Atiencia passed by a church where a gringo was preaching on peace. Jorge thought to himself, “What a gringo fool!…. Preaching about peace, when the whole world is convulsed with war! What does he know about peace?” (J. Atiencia 1972:4). Providentially, Atiencia ended up beside that despised gringo on the bus to a youth meeting. Later they sat under a tree where LAM missionary Jack Voelkel offered him a carrot. Jorge recalled,

Carrots! My eyes practically popped out of my head. How could he possibly know how much carrots meant to me? In Cuenca, Ecuador, where I lived as a child, my parents had insisted I eat carrots all the time, for there was a tremendous amount of eye disease. (J. Atiencia 1972:4)

Voelkel spoke to him about Jesus Christ and a few days later he became a Christian. Jack invited Jorge to spend the month with the family while Jack’s wife, Mary Anne, was in the USA. Voelkel’s discipleship and friendship proved invaluable to Atiencia, who went into ministry.

Jorge helped found Unidad Cristiana Universitaria (United University Christians), and in 1976 returned to Colombia to work with the Voelkels under this organization. In 1981 Jorge and Gail Atiencia became LAM missionaries in Bogota, Colombia where they served with MINAMUNDO (LAE 1982(3):15). Later the Atiencias were seconded to International Fellowship of Evangelical Students (IFES), Comunidad Internacional de Estudiantes Evangélicos (CIIE) (J. & G. Atiencia 2001).
Spearhead. In 1971 Harry Burke began Spearhead with four workers, the following year he had 25 (Downey 1987:48). Burke’s experimental project combined both English and Spanish elements in student ministry. Evangelical students from the USA moved to Mexico City for two months in the summer. They took Spanish and worked in different churches throughout the city. He hoped the students would be “catalysts to increase witness and outreach” in the churches (LAE 1972(5):10).

Specifically, Burke adhered to these principles:

1) emphasize the primary task of the church, which is evangelism: 2) assign workers to that task; 3) identify with the people being ministered to; and 4) seek to challenge Christian young people to devote at least a portion of their lives to full-time service for Christ. (Downer 1987:48)

His program succeeded and “fifteen years later it was averaging more than 100 per summer” (Downey 1987:48). Several LAM career missionaries trace their first contact with LAM to Spearhead.

English Youth. In addition to his duties teaching at the seminary, LAM missionaries John and Leah Huffman coordinated an English-speaking youth group in Costa Rica. McElroy reported,

Thirty-five high school students pile into a living room each Sunday night to rap about Peace, the Holy Spirit, Witchcraft, Sex, or What is a Christian? On Thursday night, 17 descend on the Huffman apartment to study the book of Acts. (McElroy 1971:6)

The group also went on campouts to the beach for intense times of interaction. One year after McElroy’s article appeared, the Latin America Evangelist (LAE) reported that 70 attended a retreat with numerous conversions (LAE 1972(1):9).

Youth Revival. The charismatic movement made a deep impact on many youth. In Costa Rica the movement provided common ground for Catholic and Protestant young
people. The LAM-related Templo Bíblico’s youth group experienced tremendous changes. In a two year period it went from stagnation to a new level of growth. 22 Costa Ricans entered the seminary, youth meetings were overflowing, and “about 80 prayer and Bible study cells, composed of 10 to 20 young people each” were held weekly (LAE 1973(3):9-10). 60 to 70 students were also meeting at a Catholic school to learn from a USA-Franciscan named Tom Clark (LAE 1973(3):10).

LAM’s Joe Pent, and Ray and Phyllis Bedwell, discipled many youth that were converted in that time. After only two years, the Bedwells had a solid group of 40 young people with “a half dozen leaders who [could] take them to further growth in the Lord” (LAE 1973(6):4).

**Future Missionary Prospects**

In general, most mission organizations believed American students were not very interested in missions in the 1960s and 1970s. Perhaps students viewed mission agencies with the same suspicion that they viewed any other institution. A credibility gap existed between the youth world and the establishments. Roberts supposed that missionary recruitment had fallen off because missions tried to take round people from the youth culture and shove them in the square holes of traditional mission societies. Oddly enough, Roberts noted, “Youth Culture and the Third World Culture are more closely related and more similar to each other than they are to the Missionary Establishment” (Roberts 1972:7).

David Howard, who worked with Inter Varsity’s Urbana mission conferences in those years, saw the problem up close. He felt that the Baby Boomer, Vietnam-era students, protested against everything, including mission organizations. “Thus they were
not open to being cultivated within a structure and could not, therefore, be developed into leadership of organizations. That is one reason why there is a gap today” in mission leadership (Howard 1999b). He noted that LAM got free-lancers, not those who wanted to put down roots (Howard 2000).

On the other hand, some mission groups were flourishing. As was mentioned above, Spearhead attracted students for its summer program. Likewise, Youth With A Mission (YWAM), which began in 1960, enjoyed great success among students (Cunningham 1984:38). Both of these organizations have also produced long term missionaries.

Observations

The second half of Fenton’s tenure provides a stark contrast to the first. CLAME forever altered the mission.

Vision. LAM leadership’s vision of a latinized mission ensued in the commitment to divest itself of all direct ministries and to second missionaries to Latin leaders. This irrevocable action represented a radical departure from standard mission agency procedure. LAM missionaries and leaders alike were convinced that the timing was right for such a move.

Identity. In 1977 LAM had around 180 missionaries. The CLAME era forced LAM missionaries to reevaluate their identity as a missionary group. The absence of the beloved Wednesday evening meetings, suspended in deference to the Latin brethren, permanently damaged LAM’s sense of family. LAM missionary Carol Nelson wondered if after CLAME “the feeling of closeness, of being part of a bigger picture and knowing what our [colleagues] were doing, was ever regained” (C. Nelson 2001).
Leadership. Horace Fenton and the LAM administrative staff served selflessly. While they certainly prepared a plan for the CLAME structure, they stepped aside and submitted their proposals to the Latin brethren. They gave up their buildings and ministries, and then offered to aid the new leaders in fund raising and personnel needs. While some criticized them for not going far enough, as will be seen in the following section, it is hard to see what more they could have done. They humbly led and then attempted to remove themselves from prominence.

Theology. LAM was convinced of the centrality of the local church in the economy of God, and that implied a commitment to local leadership. Additionally, many of the ministries highlighted in this period were more social in nature. Behind the scenes one can discern the ongoing struggle in theological circles concerning the balance between evangelism and social action. For instance, the LAE published Orlando Costas’ evaluation of the Lausanne ’74 conference on world evangelization. Among other things, Costas wrote,

Yet, for all of its emphasis on wholeness, the Lausanne Covenant still suffered from what I have chosen to call “the syndrome of evangelistic prioritization.” That is, the persistent reference to evangelization as the primary aspect of the church’s mission. To be sure, an attempt was made to emphasize the other neglected aspects of the church’s mission, but again, only as supportive dimensions of the evangelistic enterprise. (Costas 1974:10)

From its beginning, LAM demonstrated its commitment to both dimensions of the gospel. LAM missionaries engaged in both proclamation and demonstration of the gospel. Yet, the LAE ran an article that potentially challenged one of LAM’s core commitments—the primacy of evangelism.
Mike Berg: CLAME and Beyond (1977-1983)

Five years after Horace Fenton asked to be relieved of his duties as LAM General Director, LAM appointed a new president. Mike Berg’s coming coincided with the fifth anniversary of CLAME. The section that follows documents the first half of Berg’s tenure during the CLAME era. The next chapter begins with his second half and chronicles LAM life after CLAME, including LAM’s Christ for the City program.

Mike Berg

On November 18, 1976 Clayton L. (Mike) Berg was appointed president of LAM, with Dayton Roberts as vice president. Born in Drumright, Oklahoma in 1928, Berg was first attracted to missions by a woman in his church who had given him a Spanish New Testament with the inscription, “I’ll see you in Costa Rica someday” (Berg 1997a:15). He attended Westmont College in Santa Barbara, California where he studied social science, sociology, history and literature (Berg 1997b). At Dallas Theological Seminary he met Kenneth Strachan whose “direct, serious, honest, quiet, winsome presentation of the great needs in Latin America and his vision of partnership with Latin America’s struggling church,” drew him to LAM (Berg 1997a:16).

When Berg became LAM president, he had been with the mission for 20 years. He had served first in the orphanage, then the seminary and the publishing house—Editorial Caribe. When Editorial Caribe relocated to Miami in 1968 and became Latin America Mission Publications (LAMP), Berg moved with it as its new president (LAE 1977(1):7).
CLAME’s Impact

Five years after the CLAME innovation, self-analysis occurred. Following is an abbreviated description of the effects of restructuring in a case study prepared for the Overseas Study Center by W. Dayton Roberts, who served as CLAME’s first general secretary:

Positive Achievements of the Restructuring:
1. Decisions made nearer to the point of action.
2. A massive emergence of new Latin American leadership.
3. Faster growth and expansion.
4. A new “maturity” attained by each entity.
5. The creation of a framework for better working relationships with other missionary agencies.
7. Development of a more Latin style of operation and a corresponding divestment of “mission” structure and image.

Negative Consequences of the Restructuring:
1. An erosion of the common values and “heritage” of the LAM, as a result of decentralization.
2. Increase of confrontation (as a method of solving problems) and internal “politicicking” and maneuvering.
3. Careless exercise of autonomy.
4. Some neglect of new missionaries during their language study and orientation periods.
5. Identity crisis of the parent mission [LAM]. (Roberts 1977:2-4)

Despite the negative consequences mentioned above, the overall opinion of the CLAME participants seems to have been positive in embracing the new innovation. North American missionaries, while lamenting the passing of the LAM family ethos, felt the move was right for Latin America. Latin American LAM missionaries Jorge and Gail Atiencia admired and respected LAM’s decentralization in CLAME. They appreciated LAM’s high respect for Latin Americans and the fact that LAM did not worry about making a name for itself—rather it lent personnel freely (J. & G. Atiencia 2001).
Not all who were involved in CLAME, however, felt LAM had gone far enough in its reforms. Orlando Costas took issue with Dayton Roberts’ positive portrayal of LAM and CLAME. His rebuttal is worth consideration:

But as a child of my generation and as a Latin American committed to the process of liberation I have begun to assess critically the traditional historical interpretations that we have gotten in the Latin America church and in our own CLAME set-up.

Let me outline some of the issues that I still see separating us . . . . Your seeming unwillingness to recognize the influential factors in the missiological thought of the LAM, especially those that come from the so-called “ecumenical camp” . . . . It is my contention that not only was Ken Strachan influenced by such “evangelical” thinkers as Roland Allen and Donald McGavran . . . but by more WCC [World Council of Churches] sources than what you often like to admit.

The issue of the dismantling of the LAM-Canada and LAM-USA. On the one hand, I was not saying that there should be nothing in its place. In fact, I argued that both should have been transformed into CLAME regional offices . . . . The idea that “we could not have succeeded in dismantling our existing structure until an alternative structure had established its viability and operability” is reflective of the basically reformistic mentality with which CLAME was molded . . . . Is this not a continuation of the material image of the North American bodies? Both were watching to see how the new-born baby was to develop. They did not become really part of the new . . . . In order for them to have become authentic parts of the new structure they would have had to die . . . . Thus the continued indirect and direct influence (and control) of both bodies upon the whole CLAME structure . . . . In short, CLAME is a crippled body because it is made up of old and new structures. (Charles Henry Troutman Sr. Collection 111, Box 22:1)

At the time of CLAME’s implementation, LAM was on the cutting edge of addressing mission agency/national church tensions. There were few innovations or solutions from which to choose. Notwithstanding Costas’ evaluation, at least part of LAM did die. It has never been the same since CLAME.

LAM Reorganized

Berg’s presidency signaled more changes within LAM. Up to this point, LAM functioned with General Directors, while the president was the head of the Board of Trustees. Harry Strachan had created the board to be a self-perpetuating entity through
which to channel funds and do recruiting. Composed primarily of New Yorkers, they knew that a Strachan, first Harry and then Kenneth, was the undisputed boss. Although legally the board was in charge, paternalism reigned with the Strachans occasionally overruling board directives. Berg, however, restructured the board as a democracy—a team. He also ensured that it had broader representation, including Latinos. Under this new arrangement, Berg became LAM’s first actual “president” (Roberts 1999).

Administration. LAM staff were also reorganized according to department, “and a large measure of accountability was assured with the use of objectives and review” (Berg 1997a:19). New administrative slots were created and the General Director’s old responsibilities were officially divided. The president would reside in the USA, while the vice president represented the mission in Latin America.

Relocation. Although LAM had always maintained a USA office, it finally owned up to the fact that it had begun operating out of the USA. In a significant move, LAM headquarters were relocated from New Jersey to Miami, Florida—gateway to Latin America (LAE 1977(2):19). The new location gave them greater exposure to Latin realities and accessibility to missionaries passing through for their furloughs.

Amazingly, just six years before, LAM had considered relocating its “headquarters more completely to Latin America” (LAM Collection 236, Box 70:2). They recognized that their General Director, Horace Fenton, lived in the USA and that they functioned largely like a North American mission. To facilitate the latinizing of the mission, they proposed moving closer to the action by returning control to the field—probably Costa Rica. Their study had noted three advantages to such a move:

1. A reorientation of the Mission so that Latin Americans will feel “at home” in it rather than feeling as if they have betrayed their own people by having joined a
“foreign” organization—a matter of personnel; (2) A reorientation of the Mission so that it will be a possible avenue for missionary giving on the part of Latin American and their churches; and (3) The possibility of a greater Latin American orientation to many of our ministries. (LAM Collection 236, Box 70:2)

Obviously the mission took a different route. While headquartering in Miami was superior to New Jersey, it may not have been better than actually returning to Latin America proper.

**Berg’s Vision.** Berg knew that he needed to help LAM find a new vision for itself under or beyond CLAME. Besides assisting CLAME entities in fund raising and personnel matters, the mission identified two more goals. First, LAM could “serve as a medium for enriching the life and depth of the North American Church with Latin American insights and experiences, and vice versa” (LAE 1977(1):6). They did this “through on-campus seminars, weekend sessions in local churches, and on-site seminars for North American Christian leaders in Latin America” (Berg 1997a). Second, LAM focused on Hispanics in the USA. Together, these signaled LAM’s reentry into direct ministries. However, they were North American in focus.

After attending the Pattaya, Thailand Consultation on World Evangelization in 1980, Berg’s vision expanded. He wrote,

I was deeply moved in fresh and new ways concerning the urgency of the task of evangelization in the world today. The experience at Pattaya simply reinforced LAM’s recent recommitment to give priority to the evangelization of the Latin world. (Berg 1980:3)

Significantly, Berg roomed with urbanologist Ray Bakke (Berg 1997a:18). Bakke’s focus on the great cities of the world figured prominently in LAM’s decision to begin its *Christ for the City* program.
Seminary

The seminary, historically one of LAM’s strongest assets, became one of LAM’s worst liabilities. In its desire to latinize the seminary first through more Latino professors and then through granting it full autonomy under CLAME, LAM, and the rest of the Christian community, had given up its right to direct the seminary’s theology and priorities. Coinciding with the revolutionary foment of the times, the seminary embroiled itself in Liberation Theology.

J. Andrew Kirk explained that, for liberation theologians, the most helpful social science was the “socio-economic analysis of Marxism” (Kirk 1978:7). The problem for Latino evangelicals was that Liberation Theology was both Marxist in orientation and “it began among Roman Catholics” (Kirk 1978:7). Costa Rican evangelicals who had at first been favorable to Nicaragua’s Sandanistas and their efforts to help the poor, were turned off when it was co-opted by the Marxists and the death toll rose. They had no intentions of allowing the violence across their border to spill into their country. No middle ground existed for evangelicals interested in the poor (Huffman 2000).

Conflicts arose between those wanting to maintain the pietistic, orthodox theological orientation of the seminary, and those leaning toward a broader interpretation of the Gospel. On one hand there were new professors such as Victorio Araya, “one of the faculty’s more radical colleagues,” and USA missionary Peruvian-born Reynaldo Murazzi who was totally unprepared for the revolutionary atmosphere of the seminary (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:45). Unable to coexist, Murazzi and a number of other missionaries resigned from the seminary (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:46).
On several occasions it was proposed that the seminary address the underlying theological issues by attempting to define the boundaries of Liberation Theology, i.e. “how far can an evangelical ministry go in accepting some of its tenets? Where does one begin to reject the more radical ones” (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:46)? However, such discussion were either sidetracked or never achieved consensus.

In the meantime, the seminary became a source of embarrassment to many. Whether true or not, the local San José newspaper reported “that anti-government agitators were meeting in the Seminary classrooms,” and there were “multiple rumors of ethical misconduct among faculty and students” (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:46). The Evangelical Alliance of Costa Rica, the Association of Bible Churches, and LAM all censored the seminary. In LAM’s case the seminary’s image also hampered LAM’s public relations in both the USA and Latin America as it tried to explain the issues involved (Roberts 1977:3).

The embattled seminary withdrew from CLAME in 1983 before it could be ousted (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:46) and has maintained a marginalized existence to the Costa Rican evangelical community ever since (LAE 1983(2):19). The seminary became identified with ecumenism and Liberation Theology. As Pretiz & Roberts note, it was ultimately censored by its Latino peers, not by a mission from the North (1997:47).

What had once been the “flagship” of the Latin America Mission, known and appreciated up and down the continent along with Evangelism-in-Depth, had left the fold. With it had gone much of the leadership, creativity and vision of CLAME. If there had been hope for CLAME’s recovery of initiative and energy, it had now diminished. (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:47)

John Stam, LAM missionary and former seminary professor, reports that the seminary, now a university, has improved its reputation somewhat in recent years (Stam 2000).
Huffman’s AMCA

In addition to missionary kids, Costa Rica had an increasing number of English-speaking expatriate youth, and also Costa Ricans who wanted to learn English. As was mentioned earlier, LAM missionary John Huffman worked with many of these young people. To facilitate the growing ministry, Huffman eventually formed the Asociación de Ministerios Cristianos a los Anglohablantes (AMCA) (Association of Christian Ministries to the English-Speaking) in the 1970s.

Behind the scenes, the formation of AMCA was controversial. Supposedly LAM gave up its prerogative to do direct ministry under the CLAME setup. However, some missionaries felt God wanted them to begin new ministries that were not already addressed by CLAME. For them, AMCA provided a medium for initiating new works as the old LAM had done. Huffman and the AMCA staff broke many “rules” and created opposition. At one stage when a group of Latinos opposed AMCA’s existence, Latino Victor Monterroso gave testimony to the fact that his own son had been helped by AMCA’s ministry when passing through a hard time. Others shared similar stories and thus allowed AMCA to survive (Huffman 2000). In 1982 CLAME admitted AMCA into its ranks (LAE 1982(2):19).

AMCA also served as a safety net for missionaries who fell through the CLAME cracks. Without AMCA, many missionaries without an assignment would not have been able to stay on the field. It became their “umbrella” organization, legitimizing their presence and ministry in Costa Rica (Stevens 2000). Huffman counseled, trained, pastored and facilitated these missionaries moving into new ministries (Huffman 2000).
The AMCA staff held weekly meetings much like the old LAM had done, as well as a charismatic Friday night fellowship. It began Maranatha Fellowship English Speaking Church, which grew to 200 before they closed it down at God’s direction. Some of the members were sent to the local Union Church and the Baptist Church. AMCA had around 17 different ministries including an English youth group, adult groups, counseling, university ministry, and a summer short term mission program (Huffman 2000; Huffman 1982). The Spanish youth group, Grupo PAS, PAS Jr., and the Spanish Comunidad PAS church, all grew out of AMCA (Huffman 2000). Today, Comunidad PAS is one of Costa Rica’s largest independent charismatic churches.

**Camping**

Christian camping continued to grow in popularity. Besides the ever popular Camp Roblealto, AMCA added a camp at Rio Savegre. In the early 1970s, LAM missionary Bob Sabean and John Shackelford helped launch *Christian Camping International* (CCI) in Latin America. Sabean became the director of this multi-national organization in 1986 (Sabean 2001).

**Tentmaking**

LAM experimented with alternative definitions of a missionary. In 1981 Berg announced the beginning of a program for *tentmakers*—that is, self-supporting missionaries (Berg 1981:3). Interestingly enough, David and Connie Befus were profiled as tentmakers. The Befuses had served for a brief time with LAM, but left to pursue Ph.D.s. They went back to Latin America as employees of development agencies (Befus 1981:7). In 1999 David Befus returned to LAM as president.
Seven years into his presidency, Mike Berg and the Board of Trustees concluded that LAM must intentionally focus on evangelistic outreach in Latin America’s burgeoning cities. They affirmed the “strategic importance of urban areas, . . . the priority of the church in whatever form and wherever it is found,” and the need to contextualize the gospel (Berg 1983:4). LAM prepared to reengage in direct evangelistic ministry as Christ for the City (CFC).

Observations

The first half of Mike Berg’s presidency, like Fenton’s before him, continued in the programs set by his predecessor. No longer a novelty, CLAME dominated missionary life.

Vision. When the LAM leadership appointed Berg as president, they indicated a desire to redefine LAM in light of CLAME’s realities. First, this implied continuing in the CLAME role as a service mission—supplying workers and channeling funds. Second, LAM leadership searched for a proactive, direct ministry role that would give the mission another focal point.

Identity. LAM ended this period with around 197 missionaries in 1984. For many missionaries, LAM identity was forever altered. Relationships and work contracts with member entities replaced the LAM familial ethos. Missionaries identified with their national hosts and became increasingly disconnected from the parent mission.

Leadership. Berg continued and expanded the administrative team. Jobs were divided between stateside and overseas personnel, and the board itself was reorganized. Major directives continued to flow from the top position, as it had under the General
Director setup. Despite having almost 200 *affiliate* missionaries, as they were now called, there were less people to “lead,” since most LAM missionaries were seconded to other entities that had their own agendas. Leadership focused on administering the service side of the mission and ministering stateside.

**Theology.** Theologically LAM affirmed the priesthood of all believers and the distribution of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, local Latin churches and ministries were capable of directing their own affairs, i.e. CLAME. Mission agencies simply assisted the work that God had given the local partners.

In the larger scene, LAM missionaries struggled with ecumenism and Liberation Theology. LAM affirmed the importance of social ministries in demonstrating the gospel, but refused to endorse Liberation Theology or the ecumenical definition of mission. Their position reflected the consensus of the majority of evangelicals in Latin America. In fact, they distanced themselves from the liberal-leaning seminary and reaffirmed the primacy of evangelism.

**Organizational Analysis**

This chapter covered the most turbulent portion of LAM’s organizational history. In many ways it is entirely accurate to speak LAM “B.C.” (Before CLAME) and LAM “A.C.” (After CLAME). CLAME’s impact on all facets of LAM life and culture are still felt today.
Organizational Stage

Under Fenton and Berg, LAM moved solidly through Schein’s *Midlife Growth Stage* into the *Maturity and (Potential) Decline Growth Stage*. CLAME, in particular, accelerated LAM’s evolution through *midlife* and into the critical *maturity* phase.
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Although the entry into midlife began with Kenneth Strachan, the first half of Fenton’s tenure solidified the stage (See Figure 5-3). Note Schein’s definition of midlife:

> When the founding family is no longer in an ownership or dominant position, or after at least two generations of general management, or when the organization has grown in size to the point where the sheer number of nonfamily managers overweighs the family members, we are talking about midlife. (Schein 1992:313)

Horace Fenton became the first non-Strachan to lead LAM. LAM’s organizational complexity, with multiple divisions and layers of leadership, moved it well past the point where any one person dominated.
Midlife brings its own crises. Cultural assumptions can be challenged or simply ignored. Schein notes,

formal management succession when the founder or founding family finally relinquishes control provides an opportunity to change the direction of the culture if the successor is the right kind of hybrid, representing what is needed for the organization to survive, yet being seen as acceptable “because he is one of us” and therefore also a conserver of the old culture. (Schein 1992:311)

Often members with alternative agendas take the opportunity of a leadership change to speak up and challenge the organization’s vision, identity, and direction.

Organizations like LAM, with its diffuse subcultures, are particularly prone to one of two options. First, it can celebrate its diversity and allow the various subgroups to set their own agendas, perhaps charting their own futures. This is essentially what occurred with CLAME. Everybody and every ministry went its own way. Affiliation continued with CLAME, LAM, or both, but everyone essentially functioned as free agents.

However, as Schein notes, there is a downside:

if subunits are all allowed to develop their own cultures, what is the competitive advantage of being a single organization? At this stage it is less clear what functions are served by the total culture, and the problem of managing cultural change is therefore more complex and diverse. (Schein 1992:315)

This is the precise question that LAM leaders from Fenton onward have had to face.

A second option for midlife organizations is for one of the subcultural groups to gain dominance over the organization and impose their agenda (Schein 1992:314).

Examples of this can be discerned in the debates over ecumenism and Liberation Theology, as well as the attempt to rally the mission around a new evangelistic thrust.

None of these struggles were without casualties, and none of them succeeded. For instance, the debates over the seminary alienated and ultimately marginalized some LAM missionaries who found themselves on the wrong side. The mission remained splintered.
CLAME can best be described under Schein’s, “Change Through Reorganization and Rebirth” rubric (Schein 1992:331). Similar to what might occur in a merger, reorganization moves beyond mere “incremental adaptations,” and truly transforms the organization (Schein 1992:331). Such change is traumatic, destructive and disruptive of the old value system and ways of behaving. CLAME is the singular dividing line in LAM history.

![Figure 5-4 LAM Growth Through Delegation and Crisis of Control](image)

Applying Greiner’s model to this time period, LAM would be in the *Delegation* phase (See Figure 5-4). Kenneth Strachan’s leadership in phase two, *Direction*, created an *Autonomy Crisis* that precipitated phase three. Greiner notes,

> Although the new directive techniques channel employee energy more efficiently into growth, they eventually become inappropriate for controlling a larger, more diverse and complex organization. Lower-level employees find themselves...
restricted by a cumbersome and centralized hierarchy...[and] a crisis develops from demands for greater autonomy.  (Greiner 1972:42)

In LAM’s situation, it appears that the demands for greater autonomy came from changes in the operating environment. Nationalistic movements in Latin America, LAM’s desire to become more Latin, and aging, cumbersome ministry institutions, all combined to precipitate the autonomy crisis.

Figure 5-5  LAM Midlife to Maturity and Decline/Crisis Overlay

CLAME effectively delegated LAM’s former ministries and institutions to their appropriate parties. Personnel, land, and funds were parsed out. Totally decentralized, LAM managed and supported CLAME-related ministries, instead of leading into new initiatives.
The *Delegation* phase creates the conditions for the next crisis—*Control*. In this phase, top leadership realizes that they have lost control of the organization and that individual subunits are pursuing their own directions (Greiner 1972:43) (See Figure 5-5). 

**Organizational Effectiveness**

Organizational effectiveness changed dramatically in this period. Continued attempts to evaluate LAM’s effectiveness requires a redefinition of the organization in light of its reorganization under CLAME. LAM’s new reality as a seconding or service organization mitigated its ability to adapt and innovate as a centralized unit. While each individual entity could evolve and respond to changing opportunities, LAM had voluntarily hamstrung itself.

**Vision.** When EID wound down, LAM exchanged a proactive evangelistic vision for a latinization vision. The desire to empower and serve the national church became LAM’s new vision. Given the global and national trends that have been mentioned, a performance gap was created in the organization. Rogers defines this as the “discrepancy between an organization’s expectations and its actual performance” (E. Rogers 1995:393). He goes on to remark that such a performance gap can “trigger the innovation process” (E. Rogers 1995:393) which is what happened in LAM’s case. CLAME transformed LAM from an evangelistic and social ministry mission, into a service mission. In practical terms, LAM revoked its prerogative to initiate new direct ministries in Latin America. It surrendered its personnel and agenda.

Obviously, this is a different vision than the one the Strachans birthed. Paul Pretiz recalls that when Kenneth Strachan invited him to join the mission it had stipulations. For Strachan, “the mission of the Mission” came before the mission of any
entity (Pretiz 2000). This implied that anyone joining LAM would be willing “to serve where it might be more strategically useful” (Pretiz 2000). Thus, missionaries in those days would relocate within the country, or even between countries, when needed. This ethic of *strategic mobility* was lost.

As will be seen in the next chapter, once these things were laid down, they became virtually impossible to pick up again. Certainly LAM leaders developed new agendas, but, since they had farmed everybody out to more or less autonomous entities, who would implement them? CLAME was a timely and appropriate move for the Latin church. In large measure, however, LAM lost its ability to function effectively as a visionary mission organization capable of responding to emerging trends and needs. Instead, it is predominantly a missionary placement agency, which many national ministries and missionaries appreciate.

Denison’s *adaptability hypothesis* is helpful at this point. Denison asserts that without the ability to change in response to external and internal needs, “an organization cannot be effective” (Denison 1997:12). Organizationally, LAM greatly reduced its ability to adapt and innovate when it released all of its personnel to the local partner entities. It became difficult to implement changes on a broad scale.

Another lesson to be gleaned from LAM’s latinization experiment is that the end results of change often lie beyond the control of those initiating change—whether they be North American or Latino. Neither LAM nor the majority of the Latinos involved in CLAME envisioned the degree of difficulty that they would have with the seminary. While appropriate, nationalizing ministry is neither romantic nor predictable. Indeed, while most things may be *better* in the hands of nationals, it would be idealistic not to
admit that some things will be worse. Thus, there are definite tradeoffs. Without a map to guide it, LAM was an early pioneer in nationalization and partnership.

Identity. Interestingly enough, this major organizational shift occurred during LAM’s 50th anniversary. The incidental timing of this event allowed LAM leadership to market itself as a sort of link between the past and the future. Marketing, in this case, is the “process of communicating ideas rather than the movement of goods and services” (Van Willigen 1993:140-141). In the same LAE issue that announced the creation of CLAME, articles were written about both the past and the future. LAM leaders attempted to create a climate of continuity between the known past and the unknown future. LAM’s example affirms that “it is in the interpretation of . . . information that the real art of leadership lies” (Bennis & Nanus 1997:93).

It must be mentioned again, while giving up LAM’s agenda was good for CLAME, it was harmful to LAM’s future. LAM largely lost its mystique in such areas as “the centrality of evangelism, the progressive posture, the transdenominationalism, the ‘tight ship’ administration, the selection only of highly qualified personnel, the family spirit and innovative style” (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:65). LAM identity suffered as can be seen in the following remarks from an anonymous LAM missionary source:

“Another unaddressed problem,” he said, “was how to shift from a people-driven structure to a less personal organization.

“From Harry and Susan Strachan on down,” he explained, “the LAM was characterized, consciously or unconsciously, by a personal leadership style that elicited the love and allegiance of the missionaries.”

After years of working in a “people-driven” organization, the missionary (now called “an affiliate”) is suddenly thrust into an impersonal structure of ministries (called “entities”), and is caught in the gears of CLAME machinery that distances him from the spiritual leaders he has been following. (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:69)
This distancing from leadership hampered the missionaries’ ability to feel a part of the overall organization. Organizational involvement, and thus effectiveness, is tied to the level of ownership and responsibility that members feel toward the organization (Denison 1997:7). Thus, although involved in their local entities, LAM missionaries were somewhat removed from involvement in LAM itself at this historical juncture.

The elimination of the Wednesday night missionary prayer gatherings nixed one of the mission’s primary identity-building tools. More importantly, the sense of the church-in-mission was removed. There was no longer a context for the worshipping missionary community to join in mystical communion with one another and their Lord. Although the Voelkels and Huffmans continued with a Friday night version, it was charismatic in nature and did not build the same sense of unity for LAM (Pretiz 2000). LAM became more heterogeneous and less homogenous (Stam 2000).

Leadership. Futurist Joel Arthur Barker notes,

New paradigms put everyone practicing the old paradigm at great risk. The higher one’s position, the greater the risk. The better you are at your paradigm, the more you have invested in it, the more you have to lose by changing paradigms. (Barker 1992:69)

LAM leadership’s willingness to experiment with the new CLAME paradigm cost it much in the succeeding decades. CLAME effectively eliminated most of the leadership slots that Kenneth Strachan had created—at least as Strachan had intended. Top level, mid-level, and division heads, were either removed or redefined under CLAME.

The effect of this reorganization was the eradication of future LAM leaders. Few positions, processes or opportunities were available to train younger leaders as Kenneth Strachan had done. People simply worked within their own entity without getting a sense of the larger Latin American picture and the potential strategic role that mission
organizations could play (Pretiz 2000). In fact, since Mike Berg, LAM has been unable
to appoint a mission president from within its own ranks.

Dayton Roberts laments the elimination of the Interfield Council. Pretiz records,

This was the voice of the field in the mission’s planning, something that looked
even more broadly than the division directors’ vision, and made major decisions.
There is a constant danger that a mission simply becomes a U.S. oriented
organization, with a board that has no input from the field, from the churches and
ministries in Latin America, in setting long range plans. (Pretiz 2000)

LAM’s relocation of headquarters from San José, Costa Rica to the USA signaled an end
to leadership’s ability to lead from the front lines. The removal of the Interfield Council
simply added to the growing gap between the administration and the field. A fissure that
persists to the present.

**Theology.** LAM dialogued with ecumenicists, liberation theologians, Roman
Catholics, and Pentecostals. It did not shy away from the controversies of its time. In
fact, LAM missionaries hold a variety of positions on these issues. Yet, when decisions
had to be made, as in the case of the seminary, LAM renewed its commitment to
evangelicalism. In so doing, LAM affirmed its dedication not only to orthodox
Christianity, but to the majority opinion of Costa Rican evangelicals—many of whom
were sad to see the seminary go, but glad that it had been censored.

Denison determined that “high consistency does not appear to predict high
performance in the future” (1997:178). Organizations must be willing to flex in the face
of external environmental changes. LAM demonstrated that rather than being static, it
was capable of engaging in theological discourses that challenged fundamental beliefs.
In the end, LAM concluded, along with the majority of Latino evangelicals that it served,
that its core beliefs were still an appropriate basis upon which to build future effective ministries.
Chapter 6


The latinizing of all Latin America Mission (LAM) ministries in 1971 is the watershed event in LAM organizational history. The resultant umbrella organization, Comunidad Latinoamericana de Ministerios Evangélicos (CLAME), Community of Evangelical Ministries in Latin America, dominated LAM life for the next decade. Even after CLAME was dissolved, LAM lived with its irrevocable decision of latinization. This chapter examines LAM life and ministry following CLAME.

Christ For the City: Reentering Direct Ministry (1984-1989)

While adhering to the principles of partnership and latinization that characterized CLAME, LAM leadership recognized the need to redefine LAM. Not content to merely maintain their past institutions, LAM president Mike Berg reengaged the mission in direct ministry.

CLAME Dismantled

“In the 1984 assembly, 13 years after its establishment, CLAME’s international structure was dissolved” (Pretiz & Roberts 1997:51). CLAME proved to be an intermediary structure that had run its course. As years passed, the various entities found less use for CLAME, so it was laid to rest (LAE 1984(2):28). The majority of the ministries composing CLAME, however, continue functioning and relating to one another.
CFC Stage One: Berg and Pretiz (1984-1987)

In 1979 the LAM Board of Trustees “came up with a focus statement that the mission be more directly involved in evangelization . . . thinking [particularly] of the great cities” (Berg 1988a:7). The next summer, while attending the Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization, LAM president Mike Berg roomed with urbanologist Ray Bakke who opened his “eyes wider to urban needs” (Berg 1988a:7). A plan began to foment.

By 1983 Berg and the LAM board sensed the time was right for focusing on “reaching unreached Latin peoples’ with the Gospel of Jesus Christ in urban areas” (Berg 1983:4). They defined their vision with three key words: (1) City spoke of the strategic nature of urban areas; (2) Churches referred to their ongoing commitment to “cooperation, partnership and ‘networking’ with national churches and other Christian organizations;” and (3) Evangelistic Outreach in both word and deed (Berg 1983:4). They envisioned accomplishing this by sending combined teams of North Americans and Latin Americans into cities for three to five years. While there, teams would do “evangelism, discipling, community development, literacy, medicine and counseling, . . . neighborhood Bible studies and church planting” (Berg 1983:4). Additionally, LAM leadership hoped a “central evangelistic ministry of the LAM itself would recover a sense of unity and purpose” as EID had done for the mission in previous times (Pretiz 2000:3).

In 1984 LAM held its Board of Trustee meeting in Mexico City where it conducted an Urban Challenge Seminar. David Hubbard and Ray Bakke were the guest speakers. LAM announced its new program, Christ For the City (CFC), would begin in Medellín, Colombia, Caracas, Venezuela, and Miami, Florida. It would network
churches, conduct research, and send teams to cooperate with local churches in need-meeting ministries, evangelism, discipling, and church planting (Berg 1984:3).

Berg named longtime LAM missionary Paul Pretiz as CFC’s first coordinator. Pretiz conducted extensive research on the status of the Latin American church and its needs. Organizationally, however, CFC progressed slowly. In January 1986, Paul and Ruth Pretiz moved to Mexico City establishing a CFC office. Berg and Pretiz hoped to use Mexico City as a center for training missionaries in culture and language (LAE 1986(1):18). Berg and Pretiz had decided that to properly orient new LAM people (and especially CFC people) [they] should not expose them to comfy Costa Rica but to immerse them right away in Mexico City, take language studies there, [and] learn to cope in a big city. (Pretiz 2000:4)

By mid-1986, Pretiz reported church planting efforts had begun in Caracas and Medellín (Pretiz 1986:12). CFC also sponsored additional survey work in Mexico City (Pretiz 1986:14).

Recruiting existing LAM missionaries to serve with CFC proved unsuccessful. Pretiz felt this indicated they either didn’t want to relocate or they had already found another niche for a satisfying ministry (Pretiz 2000:3). Thus, new missionaries were needed. In reality, launching CFC turned out to be “like starting a new mission” (Pretiz 2000:4).

Although the Latin America Evangelist (LAE) magazine consistently promoted CFC, it remained more conceptual than real. CFC’s goals and activities evolved in response to local needs. For instance, CFC assisted in leadership training in Caracas and coordinated pastors for united evangelistic outreach in Medellín (Pretiz 2000:4). Research, however, continued as CFC’s primary activity. Paul Pretiz completed his three
year commitment to CFC in Mexico City and asked to be relieved in 1989 (Pretiz 2000:4).

At the same time, disagreements over Liberation Theology had escalated, dividing churches, the LAM-related seminary, and, to a degree, the mission itself. Some of those involved in the controversy hoped to use CFC as a platform for creating an evangelical version of Liberation Theology. A heated debate ensued. The majority of evangelicals in Costa Rica, however, were wary of Liberation Theology, identifying it with Marxism (Huffman 2000). Mike Berg offered CFC’s helm to LAM missionary John Huffman who had helped represent the evangelical opposition in the seminary’s Liberation Theology debate (Huffman 2000).

CFC Stage Two: Berg and Huffman (1988-1989)

In 1988, John Huffman became CFC’s director. Berg mandated John to unite LAM around CFC, giving it a post-CLAME sense of identity (Huffman 2000). As will be seen below, Huffman had many of the resources necessary for accomplishing CFC’s organizational mandates. When he began, CFC had projects in Medellín, Caracas, Mexico City and Miami.

Huffman believed CFC should function in four areas: (1) focused prayer groups, (2) “evangelism, discipleship and church-planting through existing churches,” (3) catalyzing activities through parachurch organizations, and (4) “reaching out to the urban poor” (LAE 1988(1):20). While the last three formed part of the original CFC vision, the first represented a significant new dimension.

Charismatic. Prior to accepting the challenge of directing and developing CFC, Huffman had displayed a number of impressive accomplishments. Specifically, he had
proven expertise in five areas that could benefit CFC. First, Huffman embraced the charismatic movement and believed targeted spiritual warfare could prepare the way for effective gospel outreach.

The charismatic movement had influenced Latin American Catholics as well as Protestants, leaving many churches and parachurch organizations forever altered. While some churches resisted the movement, most embraced it in one form or another. For its part, LAM continued to work with those churches that became charismatic, even if many LAM missionaries had personal reservations about the movement. As history continues to reveal, the majority of church growth in Latin America is of the Pentecostal or Neo-Charismatic variety. Huffman’s unreserved endorsement of charisma endeared him to many Latinos and LAM missionaries, but not all. As Pretiz puts it, “things were ripe, apparently, for the emphasis on the charisma, spiritual warfare, etc. that he promoted” (Pretiz 2000:4).

Huffman’s charismatic orientation affected him in at least two ways that were significant to CFC’s development. First, Huffman saw the charismatic work of the Spirit of God as an alternative to Liberation Theology. If he had not seen that the Spirit healed the sick and poor, he may have been more open to Liberation Theology’s solution for societal ills (Huffman 2000). Second, he applied charismatic gifts to the task of urban evangelism in a model he called *Participatory Missionary Prayer* (Huffman 1992). In this model teams on-the-field as well as teams based in the USA engaged in spiritual warfare and discerning prayer. These teams prayed over maps representing the regions where evangelistic activities would be conducted. This opened the way for unbelievers to
“adequately hear the Gospel, receive forgiveness and a place among those sanctified by faith in Jesus Christ” (Huffman 1992:5).

Leadership Development. The second quality Huffman brought to CFC was his ability to develop leaders. Whether working with youth or adults, he had a knack for training people and helping them find their proper niche for ministry. Through the Asociación de Ministerios Cristianos a los Anglohablantes (AMCA) (Association of Christian Ministries to the English-Speaking), which he had started, many missionaries and Latinos found a place of service in one of the many ministries (Huffman 2000).

Pastoral. Third, since CFC was developing a network of Latin pastors, it was vital that its leader have pastoral experience in order to have credibility. Huffman displayed this third attribute on many occasions. He and his wife Leah had developed the AMCA youth group to approximately 100 students. He had pastored and saw the growth of the English-speaking Maranatha Fellowship Church up to 200. John had led a Friday night charismatic fellowship and served as a pastor at Comunidad PAS (Perdonados para Amar y Servir) (Pardoned to Love and Serve) church. Trained in theology, Huffman had taught at Seminario Bíblico Latinoamericano (SBL) and Escuela de Estudios Pastorales (ESEPA). Interestingly enough, one of the first questions Latino pastors often asked Huffman was, “Have you ever pastored a church?” His ability to say, “Yes!” opened many doors for ministry (Huffman 2000).

Short Term Teams. At a time when the short term team approach to missions and the Latin Missions Movement was just beginning, Huffman had already experimented with various models. Huffman’s AMCA had hosted and formed many short term mission
teams. This fourth piece of the CFC leadership puzzle became a key in promoting and involving personnel in the project.

Church Planting. Fifth, practical and strategic church planting expertise was vital for CFC to achieve its church planting objectives. Again, Huffman had a proven track record for establishing new ministries. Besides developing the AMCA youth group into a parachurch ministry, he had personally helped begin Maranatha Fellowship and the Comunidad PAS church. By the time Berg named Huffman CFC director, AMCA had already “begun 15 to 16 ministries and 7 or 8 churches” (LAE 1988(1):20).

Getting Things Accomplished. CFC excelled under Huffman’s leadership. Due to Huffman’s extensive network of churches, individuals, and parachurch ministries in Costa Rica, he pulled together an impressive array of resources in a short time. During his first year as director, Comunidad PAS church and ESEPA seminary put together a team of Costa Ricans for a short term mission trip to Mexico City. The team of 16 Latino missionaries presented “music, testimonies, pantomimes, and a short sermon with an invitation” in open-air meetings (Heimberger 1988:13).

In Colombia the same year, “short-termers from northern Colombia” assisted in CFC’s church planting effort in Medellín (LAE 1988(4):2). Following them, a team of Costa Ricans helped begin 19 home Bible studies in Medellín (LAE 1988(4):2). CFC personnel also worked in Miami, San José, and Caracas.

Huffman used a mixture of short term teams, uniting pastors, pastor prayer retreats, evangelism, and church planting to achieve CFC objectives, all of these undergirded with an emphasis on prayer. By January, 1989 Costa Rica had sent its third team to Mexico City (LAE 1989(2):9). Additionally, AMCA’s Duane “Chip” Anderson

CFC applied its church planting model in its own “backyard” of San José, Costa Rica. Huffman encouraged Sara Bautista and Susan Grosser to begin a CFC church plant that incorporated both social ministries and evangelism. The new church, located in a squatter area, served as a laboratory for “new CFC missionaries going through Spanish-language school and mission orientation in Costa Rica” (Chamberlain 1989:6). Today this church is thriving and a sister church is being planted in a neighboring squatter zone.

LAM enjoyed a surge in missionary candidates as a result of CFC’s program for “recruiting North American and Latin workers who [would] give three to five years of service in Latin urban areas” (LAE 1989(2):19). This, however, was a change for LAM who was accustomed to having more fully-trained missionaries (Pretiz 2000:4). In some ways, CFC’s highly visible promotion and relative success laid the seeds for dissension within the larger LAM. Conflicts over ministry style, priorities and personalities began to surface—even at the administrative level (Howard 2000).

Ongoing Ministries

For the majority of LAM missionaries, however, life went on as normal. CFC, as a special administrative thrust, did not involve most of the rank-and-file. Missionaries served under Latin leaders in literature, camping, radio, medicine, orphanage work, agriculture, pastoring, teaching, and training. In fact, after CLAME, most missionaries identified more with their ministry entity than with the seconding mission, LAM, and its plans.
Castle of the King

One of the newer ministries involved LAM missionaries Ray and Phyllis Bedwell. Along with pastor Roger Wolcott, the Bedwells were part of a team responsible for launching and pastoring a large charismatic church in Monterrey, Mexico. The church, Castilla del Rey (Castle of the King), met in a castle-like structure erected by a rich philanthropist. When they outgrew the 17-room, six story structure, they erected a sanctuary seating 700. Ministering primarily to a middle and upper class population, the Castle was “the church growth story around Monterrey, Mexico” (LAE 1984(2):7).

Ray and Phyllis served primarily in discipleship and missions training. They lived in the castle, hosting a residential training program for young people. The three year program included living together as a family, structured times of instruction, working on the grounds, and conducting mission outreach (LAE 1984(2):5). In 1991 LAM missionaries Jeff and Barbi David helped establish the Castle’s seminary, Centro de Estudios Bíblicos de Monterrey (CEBIM) (David 2001; CEBIM 1992).

ESEPA

With the loss of the LAM-founded Seminario Bíblico Latinoamericano (SBL) from the evangelical cause (See Chapter 5), the LAM-related Costa Rican denomination, Asociación de Iglesias Bíblicas Costarricences (AIBC) needed another training center. In cooperation with LAM missionaries Alberto Barrientos, Bill Brown, John Huffman, John Macadam and John Kessler, the AIBC opened its Escuela de Estudios Pastorales (ESEPA) in 1983 (Green 1987:18). Six years later it attained seminary status with an enrollment of 184 students, representing 27 different denominations (Jezequel 1989:18). In 1999 the seminary trained 500 students, 200 at its San José, Costa Rica campus, and
300 at extension sites (MacHarg 1999:11). As of 2000, the AIBC had 134 churches and 8,772 members (Holland 2000).

**Latin Missions Movement**

No longer merely receiving missionaries, Latin Americans are taking their place in mission. As missionary interest in the North American churches plateaus or declines, the phenomenon of the Latin Missions Movement (LMM) is increasing. LAM missionaries partnered with a variety of Latin organizations facilitating the LMM. The *Congreso Misionero Iberoamericano* (COMIBAM), Colombia’s *Unidad Cristiana Universitaria* (UCU) (LAE 1987(4):6), and Costa Rica’s *Federación Misionera Evangélica Costarricense* (FEDEMEC) (Zeledón 1986:18; LAE 1987(4):9) all became part of the LMM.

AMCA, which had been founded by John Huffman, took a unique approach to the LMM. Under the direction of LAM missionary Jim Heimberger, AMCA initiated Project Antioch. The project intended to plant more middle class churches like Comunidad PAS, which AMCA had started, in order to finance Latin missionaries. Comunidad PAS had committed half of its offerings to “missions and outreach” (Heimberger 1987:10). While the project eventually faded, AMCA and Comunidad PAS did receive and send out several short term mission teams composed of both North Americans and Latin Americans, involved in CFC outreach.

**An Era Ends**

On June 10, 1987 Grace Strachan Roberts died. With her passing LAM lost the final member of the mission’s founding family. Like her mother Susan before her, Grace worked behind the scenes, serving needs and mobilizing others for service.
She helped start Good Will Caravans, a Christian relief and development agency, and Colegio Monterrey, a Christian day school. She also was a leader in the Alfalit literacy program. (Maust 1987:15)

Additionally, W. Dayton Roberts, Grace’s husband, retired in April 1989 “ending almost a half century of missionary service” (LAE 1987(4):14). Roberts had been the guiding hand behind many of LAM’s most successful ventures.

LAM lost another link to its past when LAM missionary Kathy Clark became the last to serve in LAM’s Costa Rica office. Clark relocated from LAM’s San José office to CFC’s Mexico City office. “For the first time since Mission founders Harry and Susan Strachan moved there in 1921” LAM was without a staffed office in Costa Rica (LAE 1987(2):23). The relocation of LAM headquarters begun under LAM president Horace Fenton was now complete. Although most of its missionary force was still located in Costa Rica, LAM leadership severed its administrative ties there and was totally headquartered in the USA.

Finally, LAM’s lack of new mission leadership became obvious when LAM president Mike Berg indicated his desire to step down from office (Berg 1988b:4). While Kenneth Strachan had recruited and trained a plethora of mission leaders, his successors had not. With no obvious leaders to choose from, the mission, for the first time in its history, was compelled to search outside of itself for a president.

Observations

After years of seconding missionaries to other entities, CFC brought LAM back into direct ministry. The following observations should be noted.

Vision. Berg wanted to renew the LAM around a central evangelistic focus as the Strachans had done before him. While Mike Berg and Paul Pretiz originated the vision
for urban evangelism and church planting, they were unable to cast it in such a fashion that many other missionaries made it their own. With his long list of church contacts and personal experience, John Huffman was the one who gave life to the vision.

**Identity.** By 1990 LAM had approximately 209 missionaries, 12 of whom served with CFC (Landrey 2000a). Generally, LAM identity remained splintered, resulting from the CLAME period. Most missionaries had developed a closer affinity to the organizations under which they served, than to LAM, the seconding agency. Exceptions to this were ministries with larger concentrations of missionaries, such as ESEPA, AMCA, Roblealto, and, increasingly, CFC. Berg had hoped to create a new LAM identity through CFC. Working under this mandate, Huffman, as he had done with AMCA, created a sense of organizational identity around CFC. However, it remained to be seen whether this new CFC identity could rally LAM’s identity or if it would simply be seen as a new entity.

**Leadership.** CFC represented the most significant leadership shift occurring during these years in LAM. Berg had passed the baton to Pretiz who struggled to gain a following. Some progress was made, but the vision remained ethereal. With Huffman’s appointment to CFC, rapid development took place. A dual-track leadership emerged in the LAM. On the one hand the LAM president administrated the seconding process, while on the other hand the CFC director led the new initiative.

The search for a new LAM president revealed the absence of an adequate leadership development track. CLAME and LAM’s subsequent reorganization had removed many of Kenneth Strachan’s organizational leadership levels. Organizationally, LAM had fewer people requiring direct leadership and no mechanism to recruit, train and
deploy new leaders. LAM was left with a diminishing number of leaders whom Strachan
had himself trained. As these missionary leaders retired, there were few to replace them.

**Theology.** Theological developments at this stage were not reflective of the entire
LAM. While LAM missionaries worked in an increasingly charismatic continent, most
were not charismatics. Huffman’s CFC formed a notable exception to this generalization.
Huffman emphasized spiritual warfare and the use of the spiritual gifts.

**J. Paul Landrey and John Huffman: CFC Comes of Age (1990-1994)**

Mike Berg’s departure signaled a new era for LAM. For the first time in its
nearly 70 years of existence, an outsider became president of the mission. In many ways,
however, LAM now had two leaders. CFC’s success in recruiting and expanding its
ministries gave John Huffman as much prominence as the new LAM president J. Paul
Landrey.

**J. Paul Landrey**

Paul and Carol Landrey had served as South American missionaries with
Overseas Crusades (OC), teaching, writing, and administering, from 1965 to 1980.
Following this, Paul founded and directed World Vision’s United States Ministry
Division until 1986 (Marshall 1990:4). From 1986 to 1990 he pastored the large Grace
Community Church of Tyler, Texas (Landrey 2000a).

Landrey arrived with the mandate to, “help the LAM become an arrow to the
cities of the Latin world” (Landrey 2000a), primarily under the rubric of CFC (Marshall
1990:20). He understood that the LAM Board of Trustees “were aware that the LAM
would have to change if it were to meet the challenges presented by the Latin urban realities”—a direction that fit well with Landrey’s own strengths (Landrey 2000a).

**LAMETEPEC**

Although weekly, monthly, and annual mission meetings were common in LAM’s earlier years, the mission had become fragmented since CLAME. From December 9 to 16, 1989 LAM held its first all-mission family gathering in Metepec, Mexico—dubbed LAM Metepec, or just LAMETEPEC. Over 300 missionaries, families, and board members composed this historic gathering that was focused on LAM’s future (LAE 1990(2):13). Landrey was introduced as the new LAM president.

**Mission/USA Church Relations**

Recognizing the increased desire of USA churches to personally participate in missions, LAM formed a U.S. Ministries department in 1994. The staff of the new department majored “on building close relationships between LAM and local churches—emphasizing what LAM can do for the churches, not just what it can receive” (LAE 1994(3):15). Thirty years earlier LAM’s view of partnership with the USA church meant, “you [USA Christians] working with us [LAM] for the gospel advance in Latin America” (LAE 1962(3):22). Now the tables were turning.

**Recruitment**

In response to changing needs at home and abroad, LAM altered its missionary admission requirements. Whereas traditionally, LAM missionaries had been well-trained career professionals, a three to five year category was created for short term volunteers. This new program aimed “to speed the flow of badly needed workers to Latin urban areas. It also [appealed] to those who [weren’t] ready to make a commitment to career

CFC Stage Three: Landrey and Huffman (1990-1995)

CFC extended its programs, personnel, spending and outreach sites. After seeing “almost 1000 new baptized believers” through CFC efforts in Medellín, Colombia, they expanded to two further Colombian cities: Cartagena and Barranquilla (LAE 1990(3):19). The following year the Colombian denomination Asociación de Iglesias Evangélicas del Caribe (AIEC), which LAM helped start, reported tremendous growth in Medellín, Cartagena and Barranquilla as a result of CFC efforts. In “five years, membership in AIEC churches almost doubled—from 11,626 baptized members in 1985 to roughly 20,000 in 1990” (LAE 1991(2):12). Development took place so rapidly in Colombia that more workers and funds were needed, “plus wisdom in knowing how and where to deploy them” (CFC 1991:1). As of 1999, the AIEC had around 400 churches with approximately 60,000 baptized believers and un-baptized attendees combined (AIEC 1999). CFC work in the other countries was less successful.

Interestingly enough, although CFC was a direct ministry of LAM, and thus covered in LAM’s Latin America Evangelist (LAE) magazine, LAM also produced a newsletter just for CFC. Besides promoting CFC happenings, this newsletter engaged in direct fundraising (CFC 1993a:4).

LAM-CFC also produced a video on CFC entitled, The Ten Percent Solution (CFC 1993b). It laid out the vision,

That 10 percent of the people in every world-class city in the Latin world have a meaningful relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ and be united in the joyous task of preaching grace and doing justice in the power of the Holy Spirit. (LAE 1993(2):9)
CFC’s basic elements were described as inter-denominational outreach, mobilizing churches for witness, spiritual warfare, leadership development, church planting, compassionate care, and the sending of short term teams and Latin missionaries (LAE 1993(2):9-10). The video reported that in its ten year history CFC had formed more than a dozen churches; it had also sponsored evangelism and prayer seminars for 12,000 attendees; it had actively participated in seven different ministries to street children; it had placed workers at five theological institutions; it had sent out 200 short term missionaries—mainly Costa Ricans; it was helping people find Christ and purpose while working across denominational lines; and it had deployed 110 career and short term workers, almost half of whom were Latin American (CFC 1993b). CFC received much of the mission magazine’s coverage, the majority of new missionary recruits, and an increasing share of LAM’s finances. CFC director John Huffman, however, insisted that CFC needed even more funds to expand its ministries. It appeared more like a self-standing mission than simply an extension of LAM.

Problems arose at LAM headquarters. Conflict developed between LAM president Paul Landrey and the Board of Trustees (Pretiz 2000:5). Fiscal pressure and a developing rift in the missionary body created a mounting demand for change. The tense situation exploded at a 1994 LAM Board of Trustees meeting held in Costa Rica with the missionaries. As a result, it was clear that Huffman wanted to separate CFC from LAM (Howard 2000). The Board of Trustees decided to “hive off” CFC, as it had done with other ministries under CLAME (Landrey 2000a).

By May 1995 Landrey had resigned as LAM president to become president of CFC (LAE 1995(1):3). Likewise, Huffman left his position as a LAM vice president to
become International Vice President of CFC. In the wake of the organizational separation, many LAM missionaries faced crucial career decisions concerning which mission they would serve under.

For their part, the leaders of both LAM and CFC attempted to present the division as similar to any other ministry that LAM had historically spun off (LAE 1995(1):3). In fact, the LAM Board of Trustees Chairman, Paul E. Pierson, saw CFC as a cutting edge ministry and became a member of the new CFC board (Pretiz 2000:5). Although CFC had been given its autonomy, it would continue to work closely with LAM. Missionaries were told they could continue functioning under LAM’s umbrella and be seconded to CFC, or they could transfer completely to CFC. After the separation was complete, CFC became Christ For the City International (CFCI), an independent USA-based mission agency (LAE 1995(2):3).

Observations

Although brief, Landrey’s time with LAM proved tumultuous. In a sense, two distinct organizational sub-cultures could be discerned, the old LAM and the new CFC, which vied with one another for supremacy. Unable to manage the situation, LAM leadership opted to set CFC loose.

Vision. After years of focusing on “servicing” missionaries loaned to CLAME entities, LAM embarked on a new strategy committed “to focus its energies on the cities of Latin America” (Landrey 1992a:4). They moved beyond the maintenance mode of “being exclusively ‘in the missionary business’ to also being ‘in the urban mission business’” (Landrey 1992a:4). As one board member said to Paul Landrey, “We are to be facilitators of the future, not just custodians of the past” (Landrey 1992b:17).
Although this was LAM leadership’s mandate, it was apparently unable to generate enough long-term support from key missionaries and trustees to offset the forces of the passive status quo majority or the active forces of resistance from those who were more intimately involved in the conflict (Lewin 1947:26). With one third of the new missionary recruits, the dominating new CFC culture threatened the old LAM culture (Anderson 2001a). Mistakes on both sides derailed the refocusing effort, creating division instead of organizational renewal.

For its part, CFC’s organizational vision was only strengthened and improved. Most of LAM’s new missionary recruits arrived because of CFC, or Huffman, in particular. He championed the CFC vision and carried out CFC’s organizational objectives.

Identity. At the end of Landrey’s tenure, LAM had about 240 missionaries, 60 of whom served with CFC (Landrey 2000a). The situation with Landrey and Huffman created tremendous dissension within the mission. Some LAM missionaries left the mission entirely or at least removed themselves from the Miami headquarters. Others gladly followed the new organization when it was established on its own. From Landrey’s perspective, LAM’s strong family identity/culture made it “difficult to flex with some of the changes it was called to make. There were valiant efforts…but not without struggle” (Landrey 2000a). For their part, many LAM missionaries felt that Landrey and Huffman were responsible for the crisis.

Leadership. In the long run it became obvious that neither Huffman nor Landrey had the ability to unite the entire LAM around their leadership. Despite the many people they endeared to themselves, others were staunchly opposed and lost confidence in their
leadership. Both leaders made mistakes, causing the LAM Board of Trustees to question the wisdom of their continued leadership in LAM (Landrey 2000a; Howard 2000).

Theology. With its emphasis on charismatic gifts and spiritual warfare, CFC attracted people who were comfortable with these expressions. Given the Latin American churches’ Pentecostal leaning, these emphases facilitated CFC’s organizational effectiveness. They were well matched to the continent’s theological climate.


Due to the vacuum created by Landrey’s exodus in May 1995, former LAM missionary David Howard was called upon to fill the position of interim president of LAM (LAE 1995(1):3). Under his direction the CFC separation was completed and LAM, once again, looked to the future.

David Howard

David Howard had come full circle. He had joined LAM in 1953 after being recruited by Kenneth Strachan. He served in a variety of positions, including LAM Assistant General Director, until leaving in 1968 for Inter-Varsity. Having attended the first Inter-Varsity missions conference (now called Urbana) in Toronto in 1946, he then directed Urbana ’73 and Urbana ’76. After that he worked “as international director of the World Evangelical Fellowship from 1982 to 1992” (LAE 1996(1):10). Most recently he had served as Senior Vice President of Cook Communications Ministries International, who loaned him to LAM (LAE 1995(2):3).
The CFC/LAM situation created havoc in the lives of many missionaries. While both agencies had originally agreed to allow their missionaries to continue with either LAM, CFCI, or both, missionaries soon felt the pressure to decide which agency they would ultimately serve under. This tension produced many hard feelings persisting to the present day. CFCI claimed a beginning missionary pool of “121 individuals (63 North American and 58 Latin American missionaries) working in nine different countries in more than twenty strategic population centers of the world” (CFCI 1999:3).

In 1996 CFCI held a retreat with its missionaries to share its vision and to lay out future plans. At that time it defined itself as

a multi-cultural fellowship of God’s people who share common values, theology and ministry philosophy and are committed to ‘open church’ multiplication in strategic population centers, beginning in the Latin world. (CFCI 1996)

An Open Church was one that promoted evangelism, cross-cultural missions, care for those at risk, prayer for the city, prayer with other churches, family values, youth and children, leadership enablement, worship, and open communication (CFCI 1996). The open church, in contrast to a closed church, was concerned with societal needs beyond its own four walls.

In January 1997 Duane (Chip) Anderson became the International Director of CFCI’s Short Term Ministries. This was a continuation of the ministry that he and Huffman had developed under AMCA, forming a major component of the CFC ministry package. Surprisingly, in June 1997 Huffman resigned from CFCI to take up responsibilities in the USA with the Baptist General Conference (CFCI 1999:4).
CFCI’s 2000 report saw a renewed mission statement reading, “To multiply churches . . . which in turn . . . send multinational teams into the least evangelized cities of the world” (CFCI 2000a:1). Leadership change also occurred in 2000 as Paul Landrey resigned and Duane Anderson became CFCI president (Landrey 2000b:1). The mission statement was then updated to read,

To multiply ministries that will present people the opportunity to develop a personal relationship with Jesus Christ and send out multi-national teams into the least evangelized cities of the world. (CFCI 2000b:1)

The replacement of the word *ministries* for *churches*, more closely approximated CFCI’s actual experiences. It was more effective at initiating ministries than planting churches. Today the vision statement can be put: “that there be no place without a witness, no church without a vision and no person without hope” (Anderson 2001b).

Post-CFC Identity

LAM president David Howard inherited a Miami Springs Office (MSO) reeling from change and dissention. Positions needed to be filled and situations addressed. Howard’s calm, fatherly manner aided the mission’s grieving and healing process. Coinciding with LAM’s 75th anniversary, Howard took many occasions in public and in the LAE magazine to remind the mission of its past heroes and culture.

Perhaps Howard’s most important organizational task lay in helping LAM look toward the future. Howard stated,

We will need to reevaluate and possibly redefine the mission statement of LAM. Christ for the City had been LAM’s major thrust in the last decade. Now that Christ for the City is independent, LAM has to redefine who we are. (LAE 1996(1):10)
Task Force 1. To assist him in this task, Howard convened a weekend retreat called Task Force 1 held March 22 to 24, 1996. The nine participants in this event included

LAM Board member Butch Dickerson and missionaries Jorge Atiencia, Roxanne Grego, Tracey Pieters and Paul Pretiz; General Council member Jerry O’Leary, university student worker Ruth Eldrenkamp; Spencer Bower of Christian Service Fellowship; Hall Cocanower as facilitator, and Howard. (LAE 1996(2):18).

The task force recommended a number of items, but most were not implemented (Howard 2000). It did indicate, however, the willingness to openly deal with urgent organizational problems.

A New Logo. Howard felt that a new organizational logo was in order. He told the graphic designer, “I’d like something expressing forward movement, since the Mission is moving ahead and looking toward the future” (LAE 1996(2):18). LAM missionary Mariola Chylek created the logo that LAM now uses.

A New Mission Statement. In consultation with the missionary family, Howard generated a new mission statement:

The Latin America Mission is an international community of men and women who, motivated by their love for the Lord Jesus Christ and in obedience to His commands, encourage, assist and participate with the Latin church in the task of building the church of Jesus Christ in the Latin world and beyond. (LAE 1997(1):11)

This statement, which opened the possibility for assisting the Latin church to minister in other parts of the world, is still in use today.

A New Focus. Sensing the need to fill the void created by CFC’s absence, Howard suggested the following three areas of focus: “1) ministry to children at high risk (street children); 2) assisting the missions movement from Latin America to the rest of the world; and 3) leadership training” (LAE 1997(1):11). While individual
missionaries have committed themselves to one or another of these foci, none served as rallying points for the whole mission.

Looking Backward and Forward. Howard recognized that LAM faced a long term leadership crisis. The leaders trained by Kenneth Strachan were approaching retirement with their days of leadership nearly past, and there were few to take their places (Howard 1997a:3). In 1997 alone, twelve missionaries representing 500 years of missionary service retired (LAE 1998(1):20). Younger leaders were desperately needed, but LAM lacked the organizational structure to encourage them.

Task Force 2. On August 27-30, 1997 Howard convened a second, larger task force composed of 15 men and women to discuss LAM’s future. Field missionaries included Chip Anderson (Costa Rica and CFC), Randy Smith (Costa Rica), Jorge Atiencia (Colombia), Elizabeth Sendek (Colombia), Laura Smith (Venezuela), and Sally Ramirez (Mexico). Stateside missionaries were represented by Jeff Bantz (HQ), Robert Foster (HQ), Kevin Jezequel (HQ), Tim Halls (Liaison), and David Howard (LAM President). Other participants included Jerry O’Leary (General Council), Steve Ujvarosy (Board of Trustees), Kelly Lyon (Local Pastor), and James Engel (Facilitator).

Task Force 2 (TF2) was mandated “to study the future of the LAM in light of the rapid changes taking place in the world of missions and with special focus on the need for developing younger leadership in LAM” (Howard 1997b). The task force recommended action steps in four areas. First, the members of the Board of Trustees were encouraged to commit themselves to the mission as wholeheartedly as its missionaries. Practically, this meant that the board should increase communication with the missionaries and materially participate in LAM’s future. They were asked to build a mission culture
through partnerships with missionaries, rather than propagate a hierarchically-driven process (Anderson 1997).

Second, suggestions were directed toward changes at LAM’s Miami Spring Office (MSO) headquarters. MSO staff needed to feel a part of the larger mission. To facilitate this, it was suggested the mission family be educated as to MSO’s significance in relation to field ministries. Periodic trips to the field would also give MSO personnel a sense of connectedness. Finally, field missionaries were encouraged to identify younger leaders capable of serving in the MSO (Anderson 1997).

Third, TF2 participants recommended that LAM assist in forming Latin American leaders. Through training, networking, and pastoring, LAM could empower up-and-coming Latin leaders in their respective ministries (Anderson 1997).

Fourth, it appeared imperative that LAM address member care issues. Many LAM missionaries felt disconnected and unattended. Care was sporadic or unavailable. LAM was encouraged to recruit appropriate personnel to address this need and to finance the venture (Anderson 1997).

Progress has been made in some of these areas. The working atmosphere in the MSO has been upgraded and delivery systems optimized. TF2 participant Tim Halls is specifically involved in Latin leadership development and some improvement occurred in member care. However, these changes require time and ongoing direction. Problems developed over decades are not transformed overnight.

Searching for a Successor

Citing age as a factor, David Howard intended his presidency to be temporary. The board spent considerable time searching for an appropriate successor, both inside and
outside the mission. Some who were capable of leading were unwilling to serve, perhaps because of LAM’s loss of direction and the CFC situation. The search committee investigated 30 suggestions and came up with no interested parties (Howard 2000). Incidentally, this also occurred when searching for a replacement for LAM president Horace Fenton in 1970; no one wanted to fill the position with the problems that were being faced at that time (LAM Collection 236, Box 69:15).

LAM consulted David Befus, who had worked with World Vision’s Micro Credit Program, to interpret the results of the two task forces. Befus, who served with LAM for two years in the mid-1970s, made the following observation,

Though CLAME disappeared as an organization, the outreach of the LAM has been limited by vision. If the core understanding of the LAM’s purpose for being is to serve the existing structures of governance, the entities created by the mission in previous times, it cannot respond to God’s call to look for competent people with a burden for ministry for the 21st century. (Befus 1998:2)

The board appreciated Befus’ advice and insights, inviting him to become LAM’s new president in 1999.

Observations

Certainly Howard presided over one of the most turbulent periods in LAM history. As confirmed in several confidential conversations and interviews, the CFC/LAM separation tore at the very fabric of the mission, leaving hurt feelings, dissention, and broken relationships in its wake.

Vision. Realistically, Howard’s interim presidency was a containment measure. The mission needed to survive the transition and then grapple with the future. Focusing inward, Howard worked with the MSO staff instilling calmness, healing relationships, restoring credibility, and raising morale. Measures were taken to address some of the
pastoral needs of field missionaries as well. Looking outward and forward, Howard created an interim vision for the future. His focus on *Children at Risk* gave LAM administration something to talk about and recruit toward. Additionally, he did the mission a great service in pointing out the lack of mechanisms for raising up young leaders. As a leader whose experience with LAM bridged both his younger years in ministry and his older, his insights carried weight.

**Identity.** When David Howard stepped in, LAM had approximately 197 missionaries (Meyers 2001). Three distinct identities could be discerned. First, those associated with CFC were torn in their allegiance (R. Smith 1999). Although described for public relations purposes as a “spin off” similar to CLAME entities, the CFC/LAM split was more like a divorce for those involved. Along with noble talk of two missions walking in tandem, there were hurt feelings, personnel disputes, and financial matters to manage.

Second, MSO staff were in tremendous turmoil (Task Force II 1997). Some left or resigned, and others who stayed were dissatisfied. Much effort was expended in bringing about a modicum of healing and morale. It became increasingly obvious that MSO required fresh staff to replace older staffers who were about to retire, and to relieve burdens from the overloaded.

Third, the majority of LAM missionaries continued in their current ministry assignments aware of, but perhaps largely unconcerned with LAM’s larger crises of organizational vision, leadership, and identity (Howard 1997b; Anderson 1997). Since CLAME, LAM administration had inherited a mission composed mainly of “free-lance missionaries” (Isley 2001). Many of these missionaries seem content to let LAM serve as
their tax-exempt money channel and leave the other organizational issues to LAM administration; content, that is, as long as it doesn’t interfere with their own ministry.

**Leadership.** Howard exercised pastoral, fatherly direction. His status as elder missionary statesman served him well in smoothing flared tempers and dealing wisely with delicate situations. His leadership, although interim, hearkened back to Kenneth Strachan’s day. Unfortunately, being temporary, he could not implement any long term reforms. Thus, in some ways, the mission treaded water while searching for a permanent successor.

**Theology.** Theologically, the past was weaved into the future. The “God of our fathers” motif—the same God who directed the Strachans and LAM martyr Ernie Fowler—would surely guide LAM’s future. Implicit theological assumptions were used to create hope for the future beyond the temporary struggles.

**Organizational Analysis**

Although much positive ministry was accomplished in this period, for many LAM missionaries it ended on a note of sadness. LAM stood at the crossroads once again grappling with its own post-CLAME identity.

**Organizational Stage**

LAM is solidly in Schein’s *Maturity and Decline* stage (See Figure 6-1). It’s history of achievements under Harry and Susan Strachan, or Kenneth Strachan, are not guarantees of future triumphs. Schein notes,

> The past history of the organization’s growth and development is not necessarily a good guide to what will succeed in the future because the environment may have changed and, more important, internal changes may have altered its unique strengths and weaknesses. (Schein 1992:314)
CFC has been compared to Kenneth Strachan’s Evangelism in Depth (EID). Both were contingent on receptive external environments for success. Their methodology and message had to be consistent with then current Latin American realities. In this sense, both CFC and EID were well suited to their historical and geographical contexts.

Internally, however, LAM was not the same mission under which Kenneth Strachan launched EID. Although some ministries and missionaries were jealous about the attention that EID received in its day (Pretiz, Berg & Berg 1999), it was compounded after CLAME. CLAME produced internal cultural changes in LAM. No longer did the missionary’s primary loyalty lie with the mission organization, rather with the local
entity. Latinization, a positive strength, became a negative weakness in respect to organizational loyalty. While LAM was built on the shoulders of entrepreneurial missionaries, this same quality converted into a liability as missionary and ministry alike became *free agents*. Innovation, so important to LAM’s success and early growth, was harnessed for the furtherance of myriad subcultures and sub-ministries. Without a commitment to the larger organization, former strengths contributed to a widening gulf between missionaries, ministries, and administration. The mission could not respond strategically to new Latin American initiatives because its workforce had been largely given away.

When starting CFC, assumptions were made about the organization’s past that were no longer true. Most missionaries were content in their ministry positions and were not interested in joining the new venture. Indeed, CLAME ensured that LAM could not require its personnel to cooperate in such ventures as in the old days. The organization lacked the ability to oblige, or, at times, even inspire, volunteerism. Hence, CFC floundered during its first years of existence, being more possibility than reality.

Schein suggests that change in mature organizations can be accomplished through the creation of *Parallel Learning Systems*. Under this schema “the managerial subculture usually becomes the agent of change and the initial target of change, but the ultimate client system is the organization as a whole in that the interests of all the stakeholders must be considered” (Schein 1992:316). One could say that Berg and Pretiz attempted to create a *parallel learning system* in CFC. LAM leadership hoped CFC would revitalize LAM giving it a new post-CLAME identity. However, Berg and Pretiz were largely ineffective in launching CFC. CFC required contacts and skills that eluded them. Berg,
who had lived in Miami for several years while working with Latin America Mission Publications (LAMP) before becoming LAM president, may have lost needed field contacts. It was not until CFC was offered to Huffman that the right entrepreneurial style of leadership was attained.

**Evangelism in Depth (EID).** It is instructive to determine the extent to which CFC accomplished its organizational mandates as articulated by the LAM Board of Trustees and LAM president Mike Berg. CFC was touted as a reversion to LAM’s evangelistic roots. In the spirit of Harry Strachan’s continent-wide campaigns and Kenneth Strachan’s protracted EID strategy, CFC attempted to impact Latin America’s urban centers at a profound level. To determine the degree to which it accomplished its evangelistic objectives, one must evaluate CFC in three stages.

First, in its infancy under Berg and Pretiz, one would be hard pressed to claim evangelistic success. CFC’s contributions at that time were primarily in the field of research, but even those findings had to be implemented before they could bear fruit.

Stage two, the Huffman and Landrey era, was certainly more successful by anyone’s standards. Thousands of people could be identified who made decisions for Christ. However, when it was over, some of the same critiques leveled at EID in its day, could probably be made about CFC, especially in terms of lasting results. (See Chapter 4 for an analysis of EID).

CFC is now in its third stage with Duane “Chip” Anderson. It is a strong organization that has come to grips with its real strengths. These are the development of new ministries and working with short term teams. In many ways, rather than being
strictly evangelistic, Christ For the City International (CFCI) became a mobilizing mission.

Looking at both CFC and EID, it seems fair to say LAM never came to grips with what, as many claim, leads to lasting evangelistic results. C. Peter Wagner makes the bold assertion, “The single most effective evangelistic methodology under heaven is planting new churches” (Wagner 1990:11). Likewise, David J. Hesselgrave notes, “Proportionally, too much emphasis has been placed upon multiplying converts—and not nearly enough emphasis has been placed on multiplying congregations” (Hesselgrave 1980:32). This has certainly been the case with LAM’s evangelistic programs. It focused almost exclusively on evangelism, albeit through existing churches, and has never made church planting its central evangelistic tool. While some LAM missionaries have begun churches, it has not been the major focus of any high level program.

Initially, CFC seemed to be an exception to LAM’s avoidance of church planting. Under CFC’s auspices several churches started using a variety of creative means. Yet, over time, it became evident that church planting was not CFC’s major focus. Thus, as mentioned above, CFCI’s mission statement changed from multiplying churches to multiplying ministries.

LAM has not learned the balance between initiating new churches and working through existing ones. In terms of evangelistic effectiveness, preservation of converts, and the perfecting and equipping of the saints, nothing is more effective than multiplying new congregations. Although “it’s far easier to plant a new church than to renew a dying one” (Malphurs 1998:16), LAM continues focusing on existing churches in need of renewal.
Latinization (CLAME). CFC inherited the CLAME legacy of working closely with the national church. This can be seen at two levels. First, the nationals who invited CFC to their city largely determined CFC’s agenda and activities. Rather than adhere to any one model, CFC, particularly under Huffman, freely evolved as God led and the needs dictated (Pretiz 2000:4).

Second, eventually almost half of CFC’s missionaries were Latinos. Viewed as a mission, CFC was more ethnically integrated than LAM. While Latin missionaries were expected to raise their own support, their financial and educational levels were based on standards that Latin evangelicals felt were appropriate. In contrast to LAM proper, CFC displayed greater flexibility in regards to support levels and work contracts with both North Americans and Latinos. While “straight” LAM missionaries needed to have a written invitation from a specific national entity before going to language school, CFC missionaries simply needed CFC’s invitation. The particulars of what CFC missionaries did were often worked out after language instruction when they were more familiar with the ministry options available. Reflecting a post-CLAME mentality, CFC moved beyond the traditional LAM practices and LAM-related entities of the CLAME era.

Organizational Refocusing. Berg and the LAM board launched CFC hoping it would be a “reversion to the original objectives of the Mission and the ‘impossible dream’ of its founders” (Roberts 1992:195). LAM’s historic emphasis on evangelism, and the tremendous needs of burgeoning cities, made it ripe for a program like CFC. Pretiz recalls that LAM leadership hoped that an “evangelistic church planting program” would help LAM “recover a sense of unity and purpose, just as in the days of EID” when all the other ministries somehow related to or supported EID (Pretiz 2000:3). Likewise,
Huffman reports that he was mandated to unite and reinvent LAM around CFC (Huffman 2000).

On the one hand, CFC’s growth and ministry impact succeeded expectations. For many new recruits, CFC was the only impression they had of LAM. Their experience of LAM would have been quite distinct from those who were seconded to more traditional LAM related entities. CFC missionaries tended to be less well trained, short term, and perhaps more flexible than other LAM missionaries (Pretiz 2000:4).

On the other hand, CFC achieved far less than hoped. Although its long-term impact on LAM remains to be seen, it appears LAM is right back where it started prior to the CFC experiment. In its wake CFC left much good work and exposed numerous people to missions, but it also took its toll. LAM struggled with divisiveness, loss of organizational morale, fiscal struggles, and failure. The organization attempted a post-CLAME direct ministry and, while successful in many ways, it was wounded in the process.

It is unclear whether CFC or any ministry could have united and revisioned LAM as the leaders wished. It certainly could not have been accomplished without the eventual broad-based support of LAM missionaries and stakeholders. Likewise, it could not succeed when the leadership and their decisions became suspect. Both of these factors eventually served to undermine any hope of centralizing LAM around a common vision.

Greiner’s Phase. According to Greiner’s model, LAM would best fit in phase four—Coordination (See Figure 6-2). The previous phase, Delegation, characterized CLAME and ended in the Control Crisis. The crisis ensues when top managers realize
they have lost control of the organization and that field managers run their own operations (Greiner 1972:43). Freedom and autonomy on the field breeds a narrow, parochial attitude whereby subunits protect their own turf, even to the detriment of the organization (Greiner 1972:43). Most LAM missionaries and ministries function separately, as encouraged under CLAME. Even CFC, while intended to rally the whole LAM, was perceived and governed as an autonomous entity.

Figure 6-2 LAM Growth Through Coordination and Crisis of Red Tape

The *Coordination* phase is “characterized by the use of formal systems for achieving greater coordination and by top executives taking responsibility for the initiation and administration of these new systems” (Greiner 1972:43). LAM continues
in this phase to the present day. Berg, Landrey, Howard, and Befus have all attempted to bring LAM around to a common identity. They have increased staff personnel located at headquarters and attempted organization-wide emphases. Additionally, “certain technical functions, such as data processing, [were] centralized at headquarters, while daily operating decisions [remained] decentralized” (Greiner 1972:43).

Figure 6-3  LAM Maturity and Decline/Crisis Overlay

*Coordination* leads to the *Red-Tape Crisis*. The organization becomes top-heavy and a gulf develops between administration, leadership, and the field. Confidence in leadership ebbs as “procedures take precedence over problem solving, and innovation is
dampened” (Greiner 1972:43). Resentment builds between those on the front lines and headquarter staff not acquainted with field contexts. Likewise, headquarter personnel dislike uncooperative and uninformed field operatives. “In short, the organization has become too large and complex to be managed through formal programs and rigid systems” (Greiner 1972:43) (See Figure 6-3).

Organizational Effectiveness

Hamstrung by CLAME, LAM attempted to reengage in direct ministry. CFC, while successful to a degree, displayed how ineffective the organization had become at mobilizing its personnel. New recruits were brought in creating, in effect, a parallel mission.

Vision. Denison notes that changes in the organizational culture prompted by changes in the external environment “were most often driven by a crisis of mission and strategy and the need to adapt, rather than by any intention to change the internal organization itself” (Denison 1997:189). Likewise, LAM too was forced to respond and adapt to a post-CLAME environment. Yet, the desire to create a new central thrust or vision for LAM remains elusive. Neither CFC, Children at Risk, nor any other new initiative has captured the imagination of the majority of LAM missionaries. Instead, LAM most successfully touts its ideal of partnership with its existing entities and, more recently, in positioning itself as a service mission.

Identity. CFC missionaries developed a healthy self-image in serving with CFC. Former LAM/CFC missionary Otto Kladensky remarks that CFC embodied the best of the LAM tradition including its emphasis on evangelism, serving the poor, and pastoral care, all “taken to a new level of operation and to forgotten horizons of service”
Huffman’s CFC, like Huffman’s AMCA, hearkened back to LAM of old. CFC missionaries had a strong sense of family identity, regular meetings, corporate worship, progressive and innovative ministries, and a clear sense of direction.

Most LAM missionaries locate their identities in the partner entities they serve (See Appendix A). Many see themselves closely identified with the Latin church and plight. They are content to work under Latin leadership and make the partner’s goals their own. LAM, for some, is regarded only as a USA tax-exempt channel through which donors can contribute. Thus, while these missionaries are heavily involved with the local partner, their lack of interest in the larger organization means that their knowledge and skill is unavailable for organizational renewal and effectiveness (Denison 1997:195).

**Leadership.** CFC exhibited little chance of succeeding until the catalytic John Huffman assumed control. Huffman possessed many leadership qualities enabling him to direct CFC for a period. However, neither Paul Pretiz nor John Huffman were elected LAM president. Organizational turnarounds cannot be delegated. Rather, they originate from the organization’s highest leaders who then see the transformation through to completion (Schein 1992:330). When Harry Strachan conducted his continental evangelistic campaigns and Kenneth Strachan launched Evangelism in Depth, they both directly participated and led their respective ministries. Although they involved a number of other missionaries in the movements in various leadership capacities, they were the undisputed visionary leaders. This was not the case with CFC. Delegation without authority and position short-circuited the renovation process.

**Theology.** The most significant theological development centered around LAM’s increased openness to spiritual warfare concepts. Denison asserts that “defining the
positive aspects” of competing subcultures is one way to manage and shape ideological consistency over time (Denison 1997:195). Newer missionaries, perhaps more open to charismatic issues and thus more theologically akin to their Latino counterparts, may have helped to generate a theological shift within LAM. While Huffman made spiritual warfare a part of CFC’s evangelistic strategy, interest extended beyond CFC. Both the July-September 1994 and the October-December 1999 issue of the *Latin America Evangelist* magazine were devoted to spiritual warfare issues. LAM’s openness to this phenomenon is encouraging since this is a topic of great interest to many Latin American evangelicals and Pentecostals.
Chapter 7

The Contemporary Context—Pertinent Trends

Many things have changed since the Latin America Mission (LAM) began in 1921 with Harry and Susan Strachan. While some organizational performance goals remain the same, many new opportunities have arisen. This chapter presents a brief overview of pertinent North American and Latin American trends related to LAM. This composite picture of the contemporary scene will inform the series of recommendations in chapter eight.

LAM Contemporary Context (1999-Present)

Although an analysis of the current LAM administration’s tenure falls outside of the parameters of this study, an overall synopsis of where the mission stands may be helpful. What follows is a brief composite of LAM today.

FamilyFest

June 20 to 26, 1999 LAM held its second all-mission gathering, called FamilyFest, 10 years after the first, called LAMETEPEC (held in Metepec, Mexico). Beyond transitioning from outgoing LAM president David Howard to incoming David Befus, the event was designed to give LAM a sense of family identity and direction. Attendance was mandatory.

In contrast to the first gathering held in Metepec, Mexico, the second took place at a Holiday Inn in Cocoa Beach, Florida. Some felt this was indicative of the mission’s USA orientation, particularly since there was little contextualization (R. Smith 1999; Atiencia 2001). In contrast to Kenneth Strachan’s days when Spanish was mandatory in
official LAM meetings, most sessions were conducted in English. Latino participants uncomfortable with English wore headphones and listened to a Spanish translator. The headphones seemed to isolate these participants whose response to the speaker’s points lagged behind several seconds (R. Smith 1999).

The Strachan legacy could still be felt in LAM. David Howard not only spoke about Kenneth Strachan in a presentation, but one of Kenneth’s daughters, Marie, was present. Also, the Miami Springs Office (MSO) member care director, Kevin Jezequel, remarked that MSO wanted to care for the field missionaries like Kenneth cared for them in his day (R. Smith 1999).

An obvious undertone of concern for the future dominated many conversations. Continuing Christ For the City (CFC) struggles, unrest at MSO, and an unknown new leader remained serious issues for some missionaries. By the end of the week many people had a heightened sense of family identity and organizational direction.

**LAM Status**

The current administration began with approximately 206 affiliated missionaries (Meyers 2001). Overall most appear satisfied with LAM’s status and future. Some experience LAM like a family (Emory 2001; Biggs 2000), while others prefer to be more on their own.

Several views have been expressed as to how missionaries see LAM’s role in their missionary careers. Suzanne Emory regards LAM leadership’s task as helping the mission to keep going “by looking for financial resources as well as to help each missionary accomplish what they feel the Lord has called them to do” (Emory 2001). Rebekah Meyerend writes,
The role of leadership is to encourage and assist the missionaries and [nationals] to meet their objectives. They should be ready to come alongside and serve in whatever way they can. It is important to listen to the missionaries, spend time with them and help them to network with others working in the same or similar areas. (Meyerend 2001)

The Tone family appreciates the balance LAM leaders have between caring for and overseeing missionaries, and giving missionaries the freedom to “explore new territory” (Tone 2001). Also, they feel that LAM’s emphasis on the importance of the missionary family is a real plus (Tone 2001). Similarly, Laura Smith feels LAM’s openness to women in teaching and leading is important (L. Smith 2000).

LAM is a collection of capable professional people (Kerr 1999). As LAM missionary Edwin Kerr pointed out at FamilyFest, LAM is like an army of generals (R. Smith 1999). Many field missionaries prefer to govern their own affairs and are content working under local entities. Some would be happy to simply have LAM continue channeling their monthly support check and not interfere with their work. Others hope that LAM would increase the services it offers its missionaries.

These varied expectations of LAM clarify part of the reason for the widening gulf between MSO and field missionaries. Although MSO personnel are just as much a part of the mission as any other missionary, they themselves have defined their role as servicing the field missionaries (R. Smith 1999). “A ‘we-them’ attitude between the MSO and the missionaries on the field” (C. Nelson 2001) has developed in recent years and poses a significant challenge for the new administration.

Beyond the MSO/Field issue, David Befus has continued sorting out the LAM/Christ for the City International (CFCI) situation (Befus 2000a). Missionaries were now obliged to choose between LAM and CFCI. And not only has the separation of the
two missions created personnel problems, the absence of a program like CFCI “has left a vacuum in terms of solid initiatives that draw new missionaries in the LAM family” (David 2001).

Organizational Stage

An analysis of LAM’s current administration lies outside the scope of this present study. Organizationally it continues in Schein’s *Maturity and Potential Decline* stage (Schein 1992:321) (See Figure 7-1). It is a full-grown institution dealing with both internal changes and variations in the external operating environment. Likewise, LAM is still in Greiner’s *Growth Through Coordination* phase, facing a *Crisis of Red Tape*
Proposals offered in the following chapter will suggest how to move through the *Red Tape* crisis into the *Growth Through Collaboration* phase.

**Global Trends**

LAM does not exist in a vacuum. Changes at the global, local, and field level all impact the organization. This section highlights several global trends which present opportunities for mission agencies to be renewed for continued missional relevance.

Change is taking place not only at an accelerated rate today, but it is occurring on a scale never before imagined. Technology, communication, travel, politics, religion, environmental issues, music, and a multitude of other areas of life are being impacted on a global scale. Sociological and cultural patterns are rapidly evolving not only in developing countries, but in the West as well.

**Globalism**

The age of globalism has arrived. No longer is it adequate to think in only local terms without also considering the potential global implications. Snyder writes, “globalization is both the reality and the consciousness that the context of life has stretched from one’s own city or nation to include the whole earth” (Snyder 1995:24). Decisions made in one corner of the earth can greatly impact another area. This truth can be seen in multitudes of examples, i.e. dips in Asian financial markets set European markets in a tizzy and pollution from Chernobyl affects air quality half a world away. People realize more than ever that they live shared lives on a common planet.

Some trace the modern era of globalization to the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 (Friedman 2000:xvi) and claim that this defines what it means to be human for millions
of the Earth’s inhabitants. Politically, the globe has evolved from a bipolar *First* and *Second* world setup, to a *multipolared* world where power is shared among many competitors (Schreiter 1997:5-6). For good or ill, the USA finds itself at the apex of globalism and its technological and cultural exports are the major shapers of the emerging global culture. Virtue, opportunity, but also filth, are pumped through a common conduit to a receptive world.

Naisbitt and Aburdene predicted that a result of globalism’s increasing influence would be the emergence of a global lifestyle that still maintains a cultural nationalism (Naisbitt & Aburdene 1990:118). Thus, while outwardly people may appear more homogeneous, yet inwardly they will “cling to deeper values—religion, language, art, and literature” (Naisbitt & Aburdene 1990:120). Schreiter notes,

> It is increasingly evident that local cultures receive the elements of the hyperculture and reinterpret them in some measure…. In other instances, the products of the hyperculture foster a certain cosmopolitanism, a sense of participating in something larger, grander, and more powerful than our immediate situation. (Schreiter 1997:10).

The language of this global lifestyle will likely be English (Naisbitt & Aburdene 1990:139) as can already be recognized in the global youth pop culture.

Many have noted global changes in the area of religion. Toffler wrote that there is a “resurgence of religio-politics” (Toffler 1990:373). In many countries “secularism is in retreat” but the “new, high-tech democracies have renovated neither their outdated mass democratic political structures nor the philosophical assumptions that underlie them” (Toffler 1990:376). Likewise, Naisbitt and Aburdene noted this “return to faith” as indicative of a “refusal to define life only in terms of science and technology” (Naisbitt & Aburdene 1990:297).
Berger claims that these resurgent religions were the ones which refused to embrace modernity “as defined by progressive intellectuals” (Berger 1999:6). People are discontent living without some kind of spiritual basis, even if they can’t agree on a single metanarrative (Sire 1997:174). Humanity’s innate spirituality can be seen in the recent Parliament of World’s Religions declaration that there is a “common set of core values” to be found in the religions of the world sufficient to “form the basis of a global ethic” (Küng & Kuschel 1993:14). Schreiter describes this global interest in religious discussions as evidence of a theological flow.

Global theological flows, then, are theological discourses that, while not uniform or systemic, represent a series of linked, mutually intelligible discourses that address the contradictions or failures of global systems. They are theological discourses, that is, they speak out of the realm of religious beliefs and practices. They are not uniform or systemic, because of their commitment to specific cultural and social settings. Yet they are intelligible to discourses in other cultural and social settings that are experiencing the same failure of global systems and who are raising the same kind of protest. (Schreiter 1997:16)

Schreiter sees such discourses occurring around the themes of liberation, feminism, ecology, and human rights (Schreiter 1997:16).

**Pluralism**

While cultures and religions are continually evolving, the pace of change is now accelerated. With the advent of rapid transportation and instant communication, ideas that once took months or years to disseminate can now be shared 24 hours a day seven days a week over the Internet. Individuals and societies around the world are bombarded with a plethora of options. Religious alternatives that a few years ago would never have been considered are now given a hearing.

Whereas past generations of religious people dealt with secularism, today’s faithful may be challenged even more by religious pluralism. “Pluralism maintains that
salvation is available in and through all traditions in which salvation is a goal” (Plantinga 1999:5). Pluralism flourishes under three dominant paradigms. First, globalism, as described above, brings the religions of the world within reach of the common person. At no other time in history has it been so easy to explore and adopt alternate religious systems. The scale and relative ease with which one may convert was relatively unknown in a world whose history has been characterized by intolerance for divergent religious views. In countries where some form of religious freedom is allowed, people today can experiment with previously forbidden religions without dire societal repercussions.

Second, pluralism thrives in a postmodern atmosphere that concludes that absolute truth cannot be known. Since there is no such thing as a right way to believe, people are free to pick and choose from the religious smorgasbord—even creating one’s own private blend. Although spirituality may be in vogue, this is not synonymous with adopting an institutional religion. Christianity, for many Postmoderns, is not a serious spiritual option.

Third, pluralism dovetails with cultures embracing moral relativism. As traditional mores are challenged and overcome with little resistance or consequence, other standards become suspect. Free sex, drugs, and anti-institutional messages not only liberate their participants from predetermined cultural mores, they also create space for challenging societal assumptions at the worldview level. When everything is up for grabs, religion itself becomes suspect. This is especially true regarding religion in fact, since religious institutions have typically been the moral anchors for cultures.
**The North American Context**

Beyond global shifts, local trends affect a mission organization’s ability to recruit, train and deploy new missionaries. Without understanding the needs of future workers, mission agencies can only rehearse the glories of their past. Since most of LAM’s missionaries derive from North America, it is important to highlight the following evolution of this context.

**Generational Shifts**

Closely allied with broad global changes are significant generational shifts occurring among young people. The terms Boomers, Busters, Millennialists, Gen Xers, and Postmoderns all refer to the relatively younger portion of the population. They represent the current and future working pool from which USA missionaries and supporters are drawn. Gen Xers in particular represent a serious challenge to mission structures designed by the Builder generation, those whose formative years were in the 1920s to the 1940s (McIntosh 1995:69).

Most Boomers, those whose formative years were in the 1950s to the 1970s, are either well into their career track or even preparing for retirement (McIntosh 1995:125). As such, they represent a sizeable portion of the USA population which has already made their vocational choices. While they may participate in short-term mission teams, support career missionaries, or even opt for a second career in missions, they are not going to converge on mission organizations in great numbers. Thus, it is even more incumbent on mission agencies to understand the Gen X and Millennialist generation mindsets.
Gen Xers, also known as Postmoderns or Busters, can be defined as those born between 1961 and 1981, while Millennialists are those born since 1982 (Howe & Strauss 1993:12-13). Howe and Strauss note that Busters live in a time of “chaotic individualism; social fragmentation; cultural openness;…[and] a consumption-based economy” (Howe & Strauss 1993:216). Their values, behavior, and aspirations are at times radically different from those who have gone before them.

Busters seem to be quite different from Boomers. Both Busters and Millennialists are profoundly affected by globalization, pluralism, and human brokenness. These young people live in a time when “the underlying belief system of the modern era [has] lost its credibility” (Miller 1996:11). Barna claims that those who fall under the Gen X rubric can be characterized by six statements: “they are serious about life…they are stressed out…they are self-reliant…they are skeptical…they are highly spiritual…[and] they are survivors” (Barna 1995 18-20).

Postmoderns have a different view of the family. Having experienced the horrors of divorce and rampant abortion, many instead focus on relationships and delay having a family (Miller 1996:122). This is not to say, however, that they delay having sex. Barna reports sex is no longer seen as “a driving influence in the decision to marry” (Barna 1995:67). For some, even the definition of what constitutes a family has changed. Family consists “of roommates, gang members or neighborhood children who are brothers and sisters for each other” (Mahedy & Bernardi 1994:96). Postmoderns are relational and claim that “the people who have the most influence on their values are their friends and peers” (Celek & Zander 1996:84). Howe and Strauss forecast that when they hit midlife this 13th generation (Gen Xers) will “reaffirm rituals of family and
neighborhood bonding, and re-erect barriers to cushion communities from unwanted social upheaval” (Howe & Strauss 1993:221).

Local Church Shifts

Change is also occurring within the Western church. Factors no doubt related to globalism and generational attitude shifts are producing Western Christians who feel differently about the lostness of humanity and the role of missions. Obviously, major changes in local churches ultimately impact mission organizations.

Theological Emphases. Missiologists and mission agencies alike respond to the challenges posed by global, generational, and ecclesiastical currents. For instance, missiological thinking has revisited the church’s motivation and place in the process of mission. Paul Hiebert writes, “missionary action is first and foremost the work of God himself. And if any one church loses interest in that task, God will find other hands to do the work” (Hiebert 1985:295). David Bosch expands the concept of missio Dei claiming that mission is part of God’s very essence. The Father sent the Son, and then the Father and the Son sent the Spirit, and finally the Father, Son, and Spirit send “the church into the world” (Bosch 1991:390). Local churches and mission agencies must realize that rather than being the initiators of the mission of God, they are both participants in God’s global enterprise. Mission is first and foremost the activity of God.

Another significant theological emphasis concerns the shift occurring in the debate between evangelism and social ministries. Quickly passing are the days when it was acceptable simply to address the gospel to the needs of the soul (evangelism) while ignoring the body and society, or simply focusing on the temporal (physical/social ministries), while ignoring eternal issues. Kirk wrote that this dichotomy was “at the root
of the contemporary Church’s failure to bring together the activities of making disciples and of changing society in the direction of God’s will” (1983:57). In responding to the Wheaton ‘83 Consultation on the *Church in Response to Human Need* Vishal Mangalwadi wrote, “Jesus went to the root of human misery and dealt with it directly” (1987:193). He stated that in the Bible the “beggars beg not because they are blind but because the society in which they live is itself blind to their needs” (Mangalwadi 1987:193).

Many mission organizations are becoming more responsive to the gospel’s balanced approach to mission. For instance, Bruce Bradshaw believes the biblical concept of *shalom* bridges “the gap between development and evangelism” (B. Bradshaw 1993:18). Shalom connotes a biblical vision of well-being where there is no partitioning of the body, soul, and spirit into an unnatural hierarchy. Determining what are the appropriate levels of involvement in social or political action, however, remain a source of contention.

Broadening this concern even further, Tom Sine argues “the Bible teaches that God is interested in the transformation not only of our individual lives but also of our communities, including how we relate to one another” (Sine 1999:228). Elizabeth Tebbe agrees and writes, “within the context of postmodernism, it is more important than ever not to champion an individualistic message” that would further fragment the gospel and people (Tebbe 1999:2). Padilla concurs and sees the purpose of the church as “that of contributing from below toward the formation of a community of disciples of Christ who are ‘the salt of the earth’ and ‘the light of the world’” (C. Padilla 1999:110). Thus, it is not enough to promote an individualistic gospel concerned only with personal salvation.
Missions in the future will show greater concern for the holistic life of both individuals and communities.

**Active Participation.** One of the most striking changes is the transformation of the local church from a passive mission participant supporting missionaries through mission agencies, to local churches directly involved in missions. “The center of gravity in missions has moved from the agency to the local church” (McKaughan, O’Brien & O’Brien 1998:27). While on one level this is a positive trend, reflecting greater participation in world mission, on another level it can be seen as undermining long term cross-cultural ministry. Most mission agencies are reeling with the implications of this fundamental shift. Their power base as mission professionals is seriously threatened by the local churches’ current “can-do” attitude. This paradigm shift is creating suspicion and frustration between local churches and mission agencies.

Beyond the frustration and power grabbing that may occur, some mission agencies may feel that their very existence is being undermined. Various churches, the mega-churches in particular, act as if they are fully equipped to staff and manage their own in-house mission agencies, thus totally bypassing the traditional organizations.

The globalization of trade, the use of communication technology, ease of travel and the short-term experience all combine to undermine the intermediary role of the agency between the mission field and the local church. (McKaughan, O’Brien & O’Brien 1998:28)

Thus, for many churches, greater global access has translated into the privatization of missions. Whereas many faith missions have traditionally represented numerous churches from a variety of denominations, today’s trend is perhaps more reflective of American individualism where cooperation between groups is minimized.
**Short Term Missions.** With the increased availability of rapid low-cost travel made possible by technological advances in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, more people can travel the world. Besides travel for business and vacation purposes, many people, particularly young students, participate in short-term mission trips. This phenomenon has already profoundly impacted mission agencies, and it is only beginning. Short term mission trips are tremendous opportunities for laity to experience life in another country, to be challenged by global needs, and to play a part in Christ’s *Great Commission*.

On the other hand, it appears that short-term missions can led to a familiarity that breeds contempt. “Short-term missions is one of the demythologizing forces that has removed mission from its exalted status in the home church” (McKaughan, O’Brien & O’Brien 1998:45). The cloak of mystery is being removed from the mission enterprise as more people peer behind the curtain. Unfortunately, while such short trips could translate into greater missions involvement, they can also be linked to draining resources away from career missionaries and long term focuses. The burgeoning short term mission movement is outstripping the ability of mission educators to provide a proper balance and critique of this powerful new opportunity and tool for kingdom advancement.

**Finances.** Ecclesiastical changes are threatening the financial stability of mission agencies and missionaries. Tom Sine believes that if current trends hold, “the church in the West and many mission organizations are likely to have difficulty even sustaining their present levels of mission investment over the next two decades” (Sine 1999:218). James Engel notes that with the passing of the “romance of mission” some organizations struggle to even survive (Engel 1996:2-3). He predicts “mission agencies as they now
exist will be jeopardized by dwindling financial support at home and closing ministry doors worldwide” unless serious changes are made (Engel 1996:22).

**Latin American Context**

The Latin America Mission’s field of service is Latin America. What follows is a synopsis of the continent’s past and present condition, focusing particularly on Costa Rica. After this, several pertinent trends will be noted that illustrate LAM’s present opportunities on the continent.

**Reviewing the Past**

Bakewell notes that Spain and Portugal embarked on their conquest of the Americas fresh from their crusades against Islam (Bakewell 1997:42). They went not only with a “genuine evangelizing intent with regard to the new lands,” but also for commercial gain (Dussel 1992:43). Those who resisted the European invasion were considered “infidels and idolaters, and thus, according to prevailing theology, were enemies of the Crown. And so war was declared on them, and as prisoners of war they were made slaves” (Parker 1996:4). “The original justification offered to the native populations (and later to the African slaves) for their conquest and vanquishment was, precisely, that the Christian God had sent the Spaniards to them” (Espín 1995:22).

The Catholic evangelists’ view of Christ was strongly influenced by their Iberian past and was more closely akin to the older, medieval version than the Catholicism that was a product of Trent (Espín 1995:20). Mackay pointed out that proudly and passionately the evangelists exalted the Virgin Mary as a symbol of youthfulness and
purity, while Christ was reduced to a weak and tragic victim (Mackay 1933:14, 96). This perspective on Jesus and Mary remains dominant today.

**Roman Catholicism**

The Catholic Church continues to be an active force in Latin America, extending its influence into all arenas of life. In fact, according to Klaiber, since Vatican II and the 1968 Medellín bishops’ conference, it has enjoyed a restored legitimacy “as defender of the Indians and other marginalized groups” (Klaiber 1998:263). Indeed, among many Catholics there had been a renewal of interest in their faith due to the Liberation Theology movement. Gustavo Gutiérrez noted, “the poor are actively entering into Latin American history . . . . This struggle for their rights is located within a quest for the kingdom of God and its justice” (Gutiérrez 1984:11). While some claim Liberation Theology “is not so successful a competitor as might be expected” (Martin 1990:290) for the hearts and minds of the poor, it continues to be an important source of inspiration for many.

Vatican II opened the door to the possibility of other religious expressions. It acknowledged that other religions proposed ways to answer the questions of life and that they could contain truth and holiness (Second Vatican Council 1999:306). This not only meant that Protestants could be viewed as separated brethren, but that even non-Christian religions contained something of value. Whether or not the rank-and-file Latino paid much attention to these pronouncements, many embraced non-Catholic religions. Catholicism’s monopoly is severely challenged in many countries.
**Pentecostalism**

In more recent decades the Protestant Church made great headway into the lives of Latin Americans. As was documented in *Latin American Church Growth*, Pentecostals led the way (Read, Monterroso & Johnson 1969:58). In fact, grass-roots Pentecostal churches are changing the way Protestants are viewed as they reflect “Latin Americans’ sense of community” (Berg & Pretiz 1996a:144). Such churches accept a supernatural worldview, address the concerns of their poorer constituents, and preach the simple message that Christ alone saves (Berg & Pretiz 1992:118-120). Pentecostals organize stable, expanding structures, many times based on household units, and provide a model for existing under an oppressive social order (Stoll 1990:318-319).

The Catholic Church has not remained untouched by Pentecostalism. The Catholic Charismatic movement exposed many Catholics to the Bible and the work of the Holy Spirit. While this movement has ebbed, it legitimized spirituality outside of mainline Catholicism.

**Societal Stress**

As was mentioned above, globalism, postmodernism, and moral relativism all work to make religious pluralism more palatable on a global scale. In Latin America, as elsewhere, students are exposed to the Internet, cable TV, and radio. These media unleash new spiritual possibilities. New forces are shaping the worldviews of young people, forces with which their parents never had to deal. While Catholicism remains the default religious position, now the youth, the mobile, and upper class Latinos, are increasing receptive and tolerant of other religions.
In addition to growing corruption, urbanization, and desperation, Latin American university lecturer Jorge Atiencia sees two further disturbing trends. First, neo-liberalism has created a privatized economy wherein the educational system is “geared toward production” (Task Force II 1997). With Marxism’s failure to create a utopia, “neo-liberalism has largely filled the void” (LAE 1997(1):18). Second, information is being controlled to gain power over others. This control results in a “huge disparity between rich and poor” and a blurring of cultural distinctives (Task Force II 1997). Thus, the Latin church faces enormous challenges as to how to engage the powers and problems of production, education, and capital with the message of the gospel.

Costa Rican Context

Costa Rica continues to be LAM’s primary field of service, hosting approximately half its mission force. Demographically, Costa Rica has a population of over 3,710,500 (Central Intelligence Agency 2000:3) with an area of 19,530 square miles, which is about the size of Vermont and New Hampshire combined (Samson & Aukshunas 1994:2). The population is 94% white, including mestizos, 3% black, 1% Amerindian, 1% Chinese, and 1% other (Central Intelligence Agency 2000:3). The majority of the population live in the Central Valley where the country’s capital, San José, is located (Samson & Aukshunas 1994:2). Costa Rica is a democracy with a high literacy rate and no standing army (Samson & Aukshunas 1994:1). Spanish is the official language.

Catholicism’s arrival in Costa Rica was somewhat less traumatic than in many other Latin ports. Very little force was exercised in the conversion of the natives and the land itself did not prove to be as rich in gold as the conquerors had hoped. Thus, it attracted less attention and less overall oppression.
One of the most important aspects of Costa Rican Catholic history, which still influences the contemporary context, concerns a miracle attributed to the Virgin Mary. This apparition of Mary is known affectionately as *Nuestra Señora de los Ángeles*—Our Lady of the Angels. According to the story, Mary appeared to a little Indian girl in the form of a Negro doll on August 2, 1635 (Basilica—Our Lady of the Angels). Some saw this as an indication from God that whether one was white or black, all were children of the same God (Segura 1983:129). Others viewed it as poor people appropriating their own manner of worshipping Mary rather than the form set forth by the Spaniards (Berryman 1996:150).

Today, Costa Ricans are “proud of their tolerance in religion as in other areas, and look down on anything smacking of fanaticism” (Biesanz, Biesanz & Biesanz 1982:137). Although many observe religious practices, Costa Ricans are generally “lukewarm Catholics” (H. Nelson 1983:116). When Ticos, as Costa Ricans call themselves, observe aspects of their religious heritage, it is normally associated with one of the rites of passage, or with a national holiday. For instance, marriages in Costa Rica are only recognized as legal if they are performed by the Catholic Church or by a civil servant. “Non-Catholics who wish to be married by their own clergy must also be wed in a civil ceremony” (Biesanz, Biesanz & Biesanz 1982:141).

Baptism is another significant life passage that draws people into the Catholic Church. In Latin America as a whole, and in Costa Rica in particular, over 90% of the people are baptized as babies within the church (Parker 1996:94).

What serves as an important symbol in official Catholicism, namely communion, is really unimportant at the folk or common level. Nelson points out that few regularly
Few Costa Ricans other than elderly people and young girls confess or take communion more than once a year, the minimum demanded by the Church, and many men who consider themselves good Catholics never do. Fear of being scolded appears to account for much of the aversion to confession. And many men say confession would be hypocritical, because they would inevitably commit the same sins again before long. “It’s better to get your sins forgiven once and for all just before the umbrella folds up [on one’s deathbed],” one man remarked. (Biesanz, Biesanz & Biesanz 1982:146)

It is said that many men enter the church at baptism, their wedding day, and the day of their burial (Biesanz, Biesanz & Biesanz 1982:146). The wake is seen by people not so much as an affirmation of the afterlife, but rather as a “reaffirmation of the group’s ties with life and life’s constant dialectic of death/life” (Parker 1996:102). This sort of folk Catholicism can be seen as a sort of glue that helps to hold society together from the beginning to the end.

In terms of actual devotion, which may indeed take place outside of the church edifice, there continues to be significant interest in Mary in particular, and the other saints in general. The typical Tico prays to his or her favorite saint whom they believe to be particularly effectual for the given need. They may carry a picture or a statue of the saint in their taxi cab or place it in their bedroom or living room to bring them luck. However, it is the Virgin herself who still receives the majority of popular devotion in Costa Rica.

While the Holy Week parades are still seen in Costa Rica, they have lost some of their historic devotion. “Less than a half-century ago, much was made of solemn processions. Businesses were closed in the latter half of the week, and cars and buses were not driven from midday Wednesday until Saturday morning” (H. Nelson 1983:117). Indeed, in those days there was even the threat of violence if you did not observe proper
protocol and respect during the event. Nowadays, however, the week is seen by many as an opportunity to take a vacation. “For many Ticos, Holy Week is now one long binge. Many urbanites go to the beaches or travel abroad . . . . Many older Ticos lament this change, saying Holy Week is almost a carnival now, with drinking and dancing in homes and at beach resorts” (Biesanz, Biesanz & Biesanz 1982:146).

A segment of the Costa Rican population believes that some people have psychic, magical or supernatural powers that may be used for good or evil (Biesanz, Biesanz & Biesanz 1982:152). There seems to be a mixture of curanderos (persons who cure) whose methods would derive from the indigenous population’s legacy, and brujos (witches) who incorporate other occult lore. Interestingly enough, the modern, wealthy Costa Rican city of Escazú is known as the City of Witches.

Bernales points out that there has been a rediscovery of the Bible and its message of liberation in the Costa Rican Catholic Church (1987:188). In fact, the mass, new songs, and the preaching are not only being conducted in the vernacular, but are expressing a greater awareness of the plight of the common person. Even the theatrical medium of drama is being utilized in an attempt to communicate Christian values and a religious perspective of the community’s modern problems (Bernales 1987:126-127)

Besides conducting services, the Catholic Church continues to have a strong influence in education, particularly in its private schools. Through these institutions it is able to communicate a more orthodox message, free from “contaminación popular” (Williams 1989:165). While these schools tend to be economically elite, they do represent an attempt at presenting a Christian education that will have long-term effects.
The Charismatic Renewal impacted Catholics and Protestants alike. For a time it was not unusual for charismatic Catholics to pray together with their Protestant counterparts (See Chapter 5). Although the embers of this movement seem to have cooled at present, it still represents a potential source of renewal for the future.

In 1871 Costa Rica’s constitution explicitly guaranteed religious toleration in an attempt “to attract immigrants from Europe and the United States, many of whom were Protestants” (Williams 1989:99). According to Wilton Nelson, the first Protestants in Costa Rica made little impact as they minded their own business and met in churches designed “as houses of worship for non-Roman Catholic foreigners” (W. Nelson 1962:85). These tended to be interdenominational since there were relatively few Protestants in the country at the time. Some of the earlier missions established in Costa Rica were the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Central American Mission (CAM). The evangelical presence in the country did not rise dramatically, however, until after LAM’s arrival in 1921 (W. Nelson 1962:172).

In recent decades the evangelical church in Costa Rica has become stronger. Biesanz claims, “the rapid change and growing insecurity of recent years may account for the rise in middle-class conversions” (Biesanz, Biesanz & Biesanz 1999:246). Despite its growth, however, the evangelical church has also experienced many desertions (Gómez 1996:133).

Although eighty to ninety percent of Costa Ricans are Catholic, “almost no one gets riled about his or her religion and faith” (Infocostarica 2000:1). Evangelical denominations include the Full Gospel Church, Assembly of God, Christian and Missionary Alliance, Foursquare Church, Bible Church, Pentecostal Holiness, Central
America Mission Church, Methodist, Pentecostal Church of God, National Evangelical Church, Christian Church, Christian Pentecostal Movement, Nazarene Church, Foursquare Church, Baptist Convention of Costa Rica, Baptist Bible Church, National Union of Baptist Churches, and the Mennonite Church (Anderson 1999:43; Holland 2000). Around 67% of the country’s Protestants are Pentecostal or Charismatic (Gómez 1996:16).

Again, whether Catholic or evangelical, most Costa Ricans do not take their faith very seriously. This reality creates a climate wherein the greatest challenges are religious nominalism, folk Catholicism, and increasing pluralism.

Organizational Impact

The various trends and realities described above impact mission organizations. Some may be positive or neutral, while others present negative challenges to be faced.

Competing Worldviews

Globalism and pluralism affect mission organizations. External to the organization, these variations signal changes in the context of mission activity. People among whom missionaries labor view life differently from how they viewed it in the past. They are exposed to alternative worldviews and lifestyles. This exposure can either generate interest in the Christian message, or it can reduce response when Christianity is too closely identified with negative aspects of Western-spawned ideologies.

Within mission agencies competing worldviews impinge on current and potential missionaries themselves. The workforce is not immune to the forces of gadgetry, pluralism, sex, drugs and greed. Multiple allegiances compete for the attention of would-
be missionaries. They, too, are caught by the bewildering onslaught of choices made possible by the age of interconnectivity. Nor are present and potential missionaries impervious to the destructive effects of divorce, abuse, and individualism afforded by redefined cultural constraints.

**Working Environment**

The Busters’ view of relationships has implications for the manner in which they work. They prefer to work on teams where no one member of their “peer group is elevated above the others to the top” (Celek & Zander 1996:34-35). Likewise, Busters have a different motivation for work. Rather than simply working for money, they view work as “an avenue through which they grow and develop in professional knowledge and as human beings” (Miller 1996:122). Mission organizations must recognize these motivations in order to successfully attract and sustain healthy Buster missionaries.

A new employee profile is emerging. Increasingly, employees work in the arena of knowledge and are so adept that management becomes “dependent on their employees for knowledge” (Toffler 1990:210). Industry’s need for information forces a “redistribution of knowledge (and power) made necessary by new market conditions and by the new technologies themselves” (Toffler 1990:215). The new worker expects an interactive working environment, mobility, and connectivity (Toffler 1990:360-362). Rifkin called this the “Age of Access” and has stated that “intelligent machines—in the form of software and ‘wetware’—increasingly replace human labor in agriculture, manufacturing, and service sectors” (Rifkin 2000:8-9). As members of the emerging global culture, young people in particular place new demands and expectations on the organizations with which they work.
Younger people will most fully embody the emerging worldview, while older workers will simply deal with the reality of flux without wholeheartedly embracing it as their own paradigm. Nevertheless, it is the current mission leadership’s responsibility to understand the mentality of this potential workforce if they expect to have missionaries in the future.

Leadership Implications

Change is often a scary proposition for people, particularly for those who are older and thus more fully invested in the old system. Yet, the future of any organization lies in its ability to respond to change by either incorporating younger employees into the old system, or in transitioning the organization to be more responsive to younger leaders. Given the fundamental nature of change that is occurring today, many secular corporations have concluded that the latter is the better response.

Barker believes “the future is where our greatest leverage is” (Barker 1992:15). Since the “new paradigms put everyone practicing the old paradigm at great risk,” organizations must practice the keys of anticipation, innovation, and excellence (Barker 1992:11). It is no longer adequate to maintain the status quo, compelling new employees to adapt to outmoded models. In times of change mission executives must stop managing their organizations as if they were operating within a stable paradigm and begin leading into the new future (Barker 1992:164).

Mobilizing Missionaries

Mobilizing new missionaries is one of a mission organization’s primary tasks. Boomers, Busters and Millennialists will comprise the emerging mission force. Stewart and Valdez report that while long term USA missionary numbers have remained fairly
stable, short term missionary numbers have increased dramatically (Stewart & Valdez 1997:74). These younger missionaries have their own style, as illustrated at the Urbana ‘90 conference featuring “worship and prayer moved with expressive, charismatic flavor” (Sidey 1991:53). They are concerned with such global themes as “hunger, economic and political justice, environmental stewardship, and racial reconciliation” (Sidey 1991:53). Younger missionaries have a built-in global mindset and openness to the Spirit of God.

Potential missionaries are often exposed to mission themes at conferences like Urbana, Sunday school, or, increasingly, through participating on a short term mission team. Short term mission experiences give individuals an opportunity to “taste and see” (Atkins 1991:3) what they might be getting into. Traditionally mission agencies assumed that the primary role of such teams would be to accomplish a project while on the field. The new view of short-term teams explicitly focuses on educating team members, rather than worrying about tasks completed (Atkins 1991:3). The education process ideally takes place before, during, and after the trip to maximize the opportunity for deeper understanding of missions and involvement in them.

Beyond the trend to use short term mission trips for education and discipleship purposes, two contending opinions about missionary work in general should be considered. First, missions as process, the perspective held by most mission agencies, sees missions as a long-term commitment by trained individuals committed to language, culture and relationships (Dougherty 1998:3). The missions as project view sees missions in terms of a task to be completed through short-term projects. These projects often have a supernatural tenor about them and are the preferred mode of “independent charismatic churches and meta/mega churches” (Dougherty 1998:3). Despite their
personal preferences, mission leaders should maximize modern mobilization interests, meeting people where they are.

While the number of people attending Urbana and participating on short-term mission teams is increasing, there is a “decreasing percentage of students” who actually follow through on their mission exposure and become missionaries themselves (Reynolds 1999:13). There is a bottleneck between getting young people interested in mission work and actually placing them on the field.

Mobilization is a series of stages. Reynolds refers to Caleb’s seven stages of mobilization: “exposure, growth, gaining vision, general commitment, waiting and guidance, specific commitment, [and] active role in service” (Reynolds 1999:15). The bottleneck occurs sometime after a general commitment to missions is made. Following through on this commitment is frequently frustrated by accumulated debt, and often by marriage (Reynolds 1999:15). Thus, mission organizations must not only inspire mission commitment, but facilitate implementation of that desire.

Latin Missions Movement

Mobilization is not solely a North American issue; increasingly Latin Americans are entering missions. The Congreso Misionero Iberoamericano (COMIBAM) handbook reports 3,921 cross-cultural Ibero-American missionaries serving with 284 mission organizations (Limpic 1997:175). Fifty-one percent had been on the field more than three years and 71% were married (Limpic 1997:175). Sixty-four percent served within Ibero-America and 11% ministered in the 10/40 window (Limpic 1997:175).

Brazil hosts the largest number of missionaries, most of these being Brazilian missionaries serving cross-culturally in their own country (Limpic 1997:176). From a
1989 level of 880 missionaries, Brazil’s mission force grew to 2278 in 2000 (Limpic 2000:MB504). Fifty-two percent had served for only three years or less (Limpic 2000:MB502). Latin American mission agencies face attrition, funding, and mobilization problems, similar to those faced by their North American counterparts.

**Missionary Attrition**

Cross-cultural work is highly stressful. Under these taxing conditions even minor flaws are magnified. Background issues tend to surface leading to further individual and familial breakdown (Lindquist 1997:244). It is no wonder that agencies are seeing increased missionary attrition, since mission work is sought out primarily by young people (Ekström 1997:184). Even secular companies, however, see “approximately 30% of managers from the US return home early from an overseas assignment” (Taylor 1997:6). The primary causes are related to “personal and family stress” (Taylor 1997:6).

Mission organizations must address preventable attrition. The World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF) has studied North American missionary attrition. Their analysis reveals that some attrition might be “avoided by better initial screening or selection in the first place, or by more appropriate equipping or training, or by more effective shepherding during missionary service” (Taylor 1997:xvii). The next chapter will propose measures to deal with these concerns.

Some attrition may be a reflection of changing work expectations in the West.

The day in which people would apprentice themselves for years to learn a trade has ended. People today graduate from college and seminary with a sense of immediate competency. Young people today have expectations of several major career moves. Therefore, they don’t consider extensive time garnering experience to be necessary for advancements. They look at acquiring new and different experiences as a broadening process which adds to their resume and skill set. (McKaughan 1997:19)
These newer career aspirations challenge the traditional definitions of career missionaries. Mission organizations need to make allowance for such views. For instance,

If boomer missionaries are to be retained, mission societies need to give attention to careful placement, professional development, good job fit, roles for wives appropriate to their gifts, participative leadership, and provision of a platform for personal and professional development. Missions also need to provide emotional support and pastoral care for boomers. (Donovan & Myers 1997:44)

Busters, who tend to be less self-confident than Boomers, have other needs in a mission organization. “Because of their group orientation, busters work best in teams and can not be expected to cope with isolated places without adequate support from their peers” (Donovan & Myers 1997:45). In general,

Busters work well under authoritarian leaders, treating them with respect and obedience. Boomers see themselves as professionals and expect to be treated as such, including being consulted in their areas of expertise. (Donovan & Myers 1997:46)

The agency of the future will alter its Builder generation orientation in order to accommodate Boomers, Busters, and Millennialists. Since, “as in the whole world, it is mainly young people who search for cross-cultural ministries” (Ekström 1997:184), organizations must adapt to their needs.

Rapid transportation and communication options contribute to changing definitions of a missionary.

There is the possibility that the decreased distance between the ministry at home and the ministry overseas makes it much easier to go back and forth. Geographic distance is no longer a significant barrier between nations or peoples. (McKaughan 1997:19)

Organizational effectiveness in the future will be proportional to flexibility in dealing with short term and itinerant missionaries.
The WEF study determined that size matters. Larger mission agencies had less attrition. Perhaps size matters because larger missions give a greater sense of security to their missionaries and are better able to care for them (Blöcher & Lewis 1997:119). It appears “a ‘critical mass’ (number of missionaries) is necessary to keep workers on the field . . . . Yet beyond a size of 200 missionaries, [they] did not find further benefit to size” (Blöcher & Lewis 1997:119). Taylor notes, “larger societies have greater room for ‘lateral movement,’ that is, if a missionary does not work out in one field, there is room to change assignments” (Taylor 1997:354). Thus, as in corporate businesses, mission agencies may need to achieve an optimum size through mergers and partnerships in order to maximize their potential.

Communication was pointed to as “the single most significant support item in helping lower preventable attrition” (Blöcher & Lewis 1997:111). However, support services, while important, were unable to “keep people in service, unless it [had] been preceded by careful candidate screening as well as pre-field training and possibly other factors” (Blöcher & Lewis 1997:111). These WEF study findings will be incorporated into various proposals in the following chapter.

Financial Partnership

Money impacts mission organizations, and in general, missions giving is down (Sine 1999:218; Engle 1996:22). The problem of funding points to the fact that “missions is not a solo act. Churches and agencies that network together accomplish more” (Sharp 2000:80). Only when the local church believes it has a “direct responsibility for mission” will it be faithful to the New Testament commission and calling (Dawson 1997:463). In fact, congregations “ought not to surrender [their]
primacy in mission to parachurch structures,” but rather should use the agency’s expertise in networking and as “an outsourcing instrument for congregational mission” (Skreslet 1999:4-5). This implies that mission organizations must “anticipate transformations in the organized enabling of the mission of the church” (Ward 1999:152). There is a need for both modalities and sodalities working together in global mission (Winter 1999). Partnership and cooperation between local churches and mission agencies must be translated into functional structures and relationships.

**Latin American Opportunities**

Mission organizations like the Latin America Mission receive a steady stream of invitations to assist in local Latin American endeavors. As both a *service* mission and an *evangelistic* mission, these requests help determine missional direction and strategy.

Miguel Angel De Marco, LAM’s ministries coordinator, receives three major types of petitions from Latin American entities. First, LAM is asked for money to help in various local projects (De Marco 2001). Historically, LAM has been the conduit for funds to a variety of institutions and ministries. Normally, LAM personnel worked with these same ministries. LAM, however, is only a medium sized organization and lacks the deep financial resources of some missional giants. Second, Latin American ministries ask LAM for help in leadership development (De Marco 2001). There are tremendous opportunities for leadership training in both the administrative and pastoral spheres. Third, LAM is petitioned for general resources (De Marco 2001). Personnel and materials are always needed, particularly in young, financially-strapped organizations.

These three categories of requests are expanded and posted on LAM’s website in the form of specific job opportunities. The jobs are grouped under the headings:
Outreach/Evangelism Ministries, Children at Risk, Education, Chaplain, Camping Ministries, Theological Education, Leadership Training, Administration and General Services, Christian Literature, Economic Development and Agricultural, Construction, Health, Social Work, Hispanic Mission Mobilization, and Church Planting (LAM 2001). Countries desiring personnel in these areas include Costa Rica, Mexico, Colombia, Brazil, Spain, Honduras, Argentina, El Salvador, Ecuador, Peru, and USA.

LAM’s Timothy Halls served with the Latin Missions Movement’s COMIBAM organization, putting him in contact with many of the continent’s top leaders. In consulting with Latin American church leaders, Halls heard these six priorities:

- Develop models of how the Gospel can be “fleshed out” in daily living.
- Strengthen and equip leaders for local churches.
- Create new parachurch organizations to meet specialized needs.
- Promote Biblical and theological reflection lived out in everyday Latin American life.
- Find how to send missionaries from Latin America to the world’s unreached peoples.
- Establish vital churches in the continent’s burgeoning cities. (Halls 1996:6-7)

Given LAM’s history, leadership development, promoting the Latin Missions Movement, and some form of evangelistic church planting, present strategic opportunities. In fact, Costa Rica’s Evangelical Alliance has set a goal of one church group for every 1000 people in the country by the year 2010 (Costa Rican Track Amsterdam 2000). Costa Rica is also well equipped to prepare Latin American missionaries (C. Padilla 2000).

**Summary**

This chapter painted broad strokes of the kinds of trends mission organizations encounter in this age of global, local, and organizational change. This sampling of contemporary challenges indicates the degree of transformation mission agencies will
likely need in order to respond effectively to the contemporary context. For many agencies the change is not simply *incremental*, but rather *transformational*. McKaughan points out that whereas organizations may merely *survive* by depending “on the recycled visions of the past,” what is needed is “a fresh calling from the future. Past its prime, the U.S. missions community stands in need of total reconceptualization” (McKaughan, O’Brien & O’Brien 1998:16). It is better to approach today’s challenges strategically and decisively, than to rest in organizational passivity and deception. Change is a way of life.

The following chapter generates a series of proposals for LAM. These suggestions are based on an integration of LAM’s historical competencies, LAM’s organizational culture, changes in the external environment (both North and South American), and contemporary opportunities. Responding proactively enhances the likelihood of continued organizational effectiveness and productivity.
Chapter 8

Rethinking Mission Agencies—Proposals for LAM

The degree to which any mission agency intentionally rethinks, reinvents, or revisions itself for the 21st century is the degree to which organizational effectiveness will be achieved. Beyond chronicling the Latin America Mission’s (LAM) personalities and events, chapters three through six have brought LAM’s primary competencies to the surface, as well as its organizational culture, identity, vision, leadership, and theology. These insights need to be interfaced with contemporary realities and opportunities. Projected on the basis of the observations gleaned from LAM’s 80 years of history, this chapter sets forth a series of proposals for LAM at the present stage of its organizational development.

The chapter is divided into four areas. Section one covers observations for moving LAM into its next organizational phase. Section two sets forth the concept of multileveled vision as a means of maintaining organizational vision in a seconding mission agency. Section three looks at how to mobilize this organization through internal modifications. Section four considers a series of ministry challenges appropriate to LAM’s culture and competences, and the needs of the external environment.

Organizational Transitioning

Change is a part of life, but normally this occurs slowly. LAM’s latinization experiment, Comunidad LatinoAmericana de Ministerios Evangélicos (CLAME) (Community of Evangelical Ministries in Latin America), was an exception to this rule (See Chapter 5). Practically overnight much of the culture and focus of the mission
changed. On the other hand, Christ For the City (CFC), LAM’s most recent attempt at organization-wide change, resulted in a new mission organization instead of a refocused mission (See Chapter 6).

As Task Force 2 suggested and this studied confirmed, LAM stands in need of some measure of organizational transformation (Howard 1997b; Anderson 1997). Despite CFC, LAM has still not come to grips with its post-CLAME reality. Today’s challenges, however, are too great to let slip past (See Chapter 7). Harry and Susan Strachan began LAM with a clear destiny in mind, and LAM inherited their passion (See Chapter 3). Although LAM is maintaining the course laid out for it, there is much capped potential ready to be released.

Speaking to the next generation of missionaries Taylor writes, “Most of you will have to work within existing structures, even as you plan your long-term strategy to change those very structures” (Taylor 1997:345). In that spirit, the following recommendations are designed to capitalize on LAM’s past in light of contemporary and future opportunities.

Greiner’s Phase Shifting

Greiner’s fifth phase, Growth Through Collaboration, appears an ideal strategy for a mature organization like LAM mediating among its personnel representing the Boomer, Buster, and Millennialist generations (See Figure 8-1). To move from LAM’s current stage, Growth Through Coordination and its potential Red Tape Crisis, will require “strong interpersonal collaboration” that moves away from “formal systems and procedures” (Greiner 1972:43). Instead, “Phase 5 emphasizes greater spontaneity in management action through teams and the skillful confrontation of interpersonal
differences. Social control and self-discipline take over from formal control.” (Greiner 1972:43). Given the number of skilled professionals in LAM’s ranks, collaboration seems a wise choice.

Figure 8-1  LAM Future Growth Through Collaboration

This flexible stage has the following characteristics (Greiner 1972:43-44):

- The focus is on solving problems quickly through team action.
- Teams are combined across functions for task-group activity.
- Headquarters staff experts are reduced in number, reassigned, and combined in interdisciplinary teams to consult with, not to direct, field units.
- A matrix-type structure is frequently used to assemble the right teams for the appropriate problems.
- Previous formal systems are simplified and combined into single multipurpose systems.
- Conferences of key managers are held frequently to focus on major problem issues.
Educational programs are utilized to train managers in behavioral skills for achieving better teamwork and conflict resolution.

- Real-time information systems are integrated into daily decision making.
- Economic rewards are geared more to team performance than to individual achievement.
- Experiments in new practices are encouraged throughout the organization.

Several of these characteristics are implemented in this chapter’s proposals. They represent a departure from the status quo, but are not inconsistent with LAM’s past culture and administrative style, particularly under Kenneth Strachan.

Greiner himself was unsure what crisis and phase came next. He suspected that the burden of team work and the pressures of innovation would require periodic employee rest and reflection breaks (Greiner 1972:44). A holistic approach to ministry and mission life should be built into the LAM system now to forestall this future crisis.

Denison’s Organizational Effectiveness Composite Model

This study made use of the theories under-girding Denison’s composite model of organizational effectiveness (Denison 1997) as an overarching filter for the data collected (See Figure 8-2). For the purposes of the study at hand, organizational theories were reconfigured under the rubrics: vision, identity, leadership, and, to a lesser degree, theology. Vision incorporated the theories Denison called mission, identity his involvement hypothesis, and theology part of his consistency category. This study’s leadership rubric derived from Schein (1992). Denison’s adaptability hypothesis was referenced occasionally throughout this study, but was not treated as a major research component.

Involvement. Involvement theory correlates active participation of employees with organizational success. While this may occur spontaneously, it is better “to build structures that require participation and involvement” (Denison 1997:180). This is
particularly true in LAM where so many missionaries appear to be self-contained *free agents*.

Figure 8-2 Culture & Effectiveness Model

Involvement assumes workers have something positive to contribute to the organizational project, i.e. McGregor’s *Theory Y* (McGregor 1960:125). Functioning in an environment of supportive relationships, member motivation increases and the resultant cooperative behavior is “focused on achieving organizational goals” (Likert 1967:47). As participants feel secure and affirmed, organizational effectiveness is enhanced (McGregor 1960:130).

Whereas LAM possessed a strong family identity in its early decades, mission life since CLAME (1971) has been fragmented. While members are involved in their own
particular ministries, the majority have not been involved in the organization’s direct
ministries. In Kenneth Strachan’s days, most mission personnel and resources were
brought to bear, even if indirectly, on *Evangelism in Depth* (EID) (See Chapter 4). In
CFC’s case, most of the missionary participants were new to the organization (See
Chapter 6). Relatively few other LAM missionaries were involved in CFC. LAM’s
future effectiveness involves recreating an organizational identity valuing high
participation in both the organization’s vision and the local partner’s vision.

**Consistency.** Denison’s *consistency hypothesis* affirms “that a shared system of
beliefs, values, and symbols, widely understood by an organization’s members, has a
positive impact on their ability to reach consensus and carry out coordinated actions”
(Denison 1997:8).

Shared values, rather than administrative control, are the true source of
coordinated behavior and social control. This internalized type of system appears
to be a far more efficient and flexible method than any system of external social
control, but requires the creation of meaningful roles and the commitment of
individuals to them. (Denison 1997:180)

Effective organizations determine what is core, and are flexible in all other areas
needed to achieve the vision. “Although the core ideology and drive for progress usually
trace their roots to specific individuals, a highly visionary company *institutionalizes*
them—weaving them into the very fabric of the organization” (Collins & Porras
1994:86). In LAM’s case, the Strachans created the core values (See Chapter 3). LAM
has consistently stood for intentional evangelism, social ministries, and empowering
nationals. Collins and Porras note, “By being clear about what is core (and therefore
relatively fixed), a company can more easily seek variation and movement in all that is
not core” (Collins & Porras 1994:86).
While *ideology* describes a secular organization’s overarching value system, *theology* is more descriptive of organizations permeated with religious beliefs (Schein 1992:89). Theology figured prominently in LAM’s early motivation and vision. The imminent premillennial return of Christ dominated the *mission* of the mission for its first 25 years. For years afterwards the doctrine was assumed, if not stated, until it was ultimately, quietly, removed from the list of mandatory beliefs. Nevertheless, other theological emphases surfaced throughout LAM’s history that both reinforced and directed its missional objectives. The importance of a motivating theology cannot be overemphasized in maintaining a biblical perspective and in the development of a sustainable organizational mission for a Christian mission agency.

From LAM’s founding the *Latin America Evangelist* (LAE) magazine was repeatedly used to reinforce the mission’s core values and to retell its most important stories. “In an organizational sense, these stories, myths, and legends appear to be very important, because they convey the organization’s shared values, or culture” (Peters & Waterman 1982:75). Transitioning LAM toward increased effectiveness involves connecting contemporary challenges to dearly held organizational myths and values. The future is not disconnected from the past. Additionally, since LAM is a *Christian* organization, it has the advantage, and responsibility, of rooting organizational values in the rich soil of the Bible’s major theological themes.

**Mission.** “Mission links a relatively abstract definition of meaning and purpose with a far more concrete sense of direction as a business” (Denison 1997:183). Mission is based on a set of core, nonnegotiable values, which are then implemented in specific actions. “Intentions are all fine and good, but it the translation of these intentions into
concrete items—mechanisms with teeth—that can make the difference between a visionary company or forever remaining a wannabe” (Collins & Porras 1994:87). The most aggressive of these visions could be described as BHAGs, “Big Hairy Audacious Goals” (Collins & Porras 1994:93). “A BHAG engages people—it reaches out and grabs them in the gut. It is tangible, energizing, highly focused. People “get it” right away; it takes little or no explanation” (Collins & Porras 1994:94).

Whereas LAM’s vision has typically included elements of evangelism, latinization, theological education, partnership, and responsiveness to local needs, these have been emphasized in varying manners throughout its history. Harry Strachan focused on continental evangelism, while Susan Strachan developed local evangelistic outreaches, church planting, training, and medical work (See Chapter 3). Kenneth Strachan took up his father’s evangelistic mantel, but spent more time involving the local evangelical churches in outreach (See Chapter 4). CLAME represented LAM’s intentional vision to latinize both the mission and to partner more closely with national entities (See Chapter 5). Finally, CFC was LAM’s most recent attempt to implement its evangelistic priorities and was tied even more closely to the local church and its needs (See Chapter 6). For many missionaries throughout LAM’s history, these various manifestations of organizational vision have captivated their imagination and directed their career paths.

**Adaptability.** Although Denison’s adaptability rubric was not treated as a separate research area, it did inform this study. Adaptability refers to an organization’s capacity to adjust and reorganize internally, as well as to respond proactively to external environmental changes (Denison 1997:182). LAM has displayed remarkable adaptability
in its vision and leadership. CLAME, of course, is LAM’s shining example of adapting to a changing Latin American environment. However, adaptability can be seen in myriad ways from Harry Strachan’s use of a horse-drawn bookmobile to the establishment of a chicken hatchery to offset costs at the orphanage *Hogar Bíblico*. LAM, particularly in its formative years, displayed remarkable flexibility.

**Leadership.** Although many of Denison’s conclusions informed this study’s leadership rubric, Schein was its principle theorist (Schein 1992). Leadership can been seen in clarifying organizational values, beliefs, and theology, as in Denison’s *consistency* hypothesis. Leaders create and manage the organizational culture (Schein 1992:5) into which others can then become *involved*. They cast the *vision* for the mission, and should be the chief catalysts for change and *adaptation*.

Peters and Waterman underlined the importance of founding leaders creating strong beliefs, values, and ultimately, organizational culture.

What we found was that associated with almost every excellent company was a strong leader (or two) who seemed to have had a lot to do with making the company excellent in the first place. Many of these companies . . . seem to have taken on their basic character under the tutelage of a very special person. Moreover, they did it at a fairly early stage of their development . . . . The excellent companies seem to have developed cultures that have incorporated the values and practices of the great leaders and thus those shared values can be seen to survive for decades after the passing of the original guru. (Peters & Waterman 1982:26)

LAM’s founders, Harry and Susan Strachan had strong theological commitments, particularly to the soon return of Jesus Christ (See Chapter 3), and forged a strong culture and value system that has stayed with LAM. While others have brought different nuances to LAM’s values and culture, none have been as impacting as the founders and their son Kenneth.
Likewise, leadership continuity strongly affects an organization’s ability to maintain an effective vision. Collins and Porras’ visionary companies “had better management development and succession planning . . . . They thereby ensured greater continuity in leadership talent grown from within than the comparison companies” (Collins & Porras 1994:174). “The key is to develop and promote insiders who are highly capable of stimulating healthy change and progress, while preserving the core” (Collins & Porras 1994:183). Whereas this was one of LAM’s greatest assets from Harry Strachan to Mike Berg, it has become one of its greatest liabilities (See Chapters 5 and 6). Not since Kenneth Strachan’s days has the mission had an intentional focus on developing younger leaders within the organization (See Chapter 4). Consequently, with the retirement of the missionaries Kenneth trained, few are available to take their places. Instead, new workers, particularly under CFC, and new leaders, such as Landrey and Befus, needed to be imported from outside the mission, largely unfamiliar with its historical core values and culture (See Chapter 6). While they bring many strengths to the organization, they represent a break in the continuity of homegrown leadership. They missed out on being raised in the mission’s *identity incubator*, learning its culture, stories, myths, and core values within the context of a worshipping missionary community. Early LAM missionaries received this instruction from constant interaction with on-site leaders and through frequent mission get-togethers. For its future health, LAM should not only intentionally incorporate new missionaries into its culture/family through corporate worship, rites, ceremonies, and meetings, but also create positions and opportunities for younger missionaries to develop leadership skills over a period of years.
Schein’s Organizational Culture

As LAM continues in Schein’s Maturity and Decline stage it faces two choices (See Figure 8-3). First, it can exert just enough energy to maintain the organization in order to prevent or delay decline. Or, it can expend a lot of energy retooling for effectual ministry in the new millennium and capitalizing on its maturity.

Figure 8-3  LAM Present and Future Growth Stage

This chapter’s proposals incorporate Schein’s concept of Change Through Turnarounds. Turnaround involves a number of change techniques, but begins with unfreezing the organization. Once “the organization comes to recognize that some of its past ways of thinking, feeling, and doing things are indeed obsolete,” change becomes possible (Schein 1992:329). The actual changes point the organization toward either a strong or fuzzy vision of what the future could be (Schein 1992:330). Embedding new
ideas in young organizations is easy. Mature organizations require long term attention and management until all organizational subcultures are permeated with the new vision (Schein 1992:330-331). The organization is then frozen once again.

Pansegrouw’s Transformational Leadership

Planned organizational change will not be implemented without strong leadership. Pansegrouw identifies seven commitments which leaders must have to bring about organizational transformation. First, they must be personally and visibly committed to the change process (Pansegrouw 1996:521). Leaders must plan on being available for a number of years to give time to see changes implemented in a mature organization like LAM. They are responsible for keeping the vision in front of the members, especially when times are difficult.

Second, leadership must communicate the “impossibility of maintaining the status quo” (Pansegrouw 1996:522). Good is not good enough. LAM has a proud heritage and a strong culture to draw upon. There is no good reason why the mission should not be in the vanguard of missiological thinking, planning, and execution. It is impossible to settle for a situation in which LAM lacks the ability to initiate new ministries, to deploy its personnel to needy areas, and to maintain a familial identity. These are part of its ethos, its culture. To ultimately sacrifice these qualities instead of reappropriating them for the future is unacceptable.

Third, leadership must paint a picture of the future that is clear, enthusiastic, and inspiring (Pansegrouw 1996:523). LAM should quit licking the wounds of the past and turn its face to the future. Opportunities abound for a strong, historical mission like LAM. It has tremendous assets and deep rapport with many of Latin America’s top
leaders. The continent’s needs have never been greater. The same theological beliefs and assumptions that motivated the founders can be harnessed for new faith and vision today.

Fourth, leadership must sell the new vision to a critical mass of members and stakeholders in a timely manner (Pansegrouw 1996:523). Ultimately, a significant percentage of the organization must endorse changes for change to occur. Not everyone, however, needs to agree. Indeed, in a mission like LAM that fosters autonomy, it would be unreasonable to expect everyone to cooperate. Enough key players, however, must be convinced for the transition to hold.

The CFC experiment demonstrated that the endorsement must come from a critical mass of LAM stakeholders. Although CFC eventually grew to constitute one third of LAM’s missionaries, most were new members (See Chapter 6). An insufficient quantity of older stakeholders were involved in the change. Hence, when CFC became autonomous, it was relatively easy for the newer missionaries to leave with the new organization.

Fifth, leadership must acknowledge, honor, and otherwise deal with resistance to the turnaround (Pansegrouw 1996:524). Perhaps this was one of the greatest shortcomings of the CFC experiment. Ultimately, those who opposed CFC were alienated and marginalized. Emotions ran high, and rather than dealing with questions in a respectful manner, those who had concerns were at times verbally abused (Howard 2000). Leaders can’t lead if they don’t maintain good rapport with their followers.

Mission work is ultimately about people. Accornero, whose dissertation used LAM as a case study, offers relevant insight on this point:
It is a very difficult task to create mission structures that can intentionally cross cultural barriers, throughout the world. These structures must first be centered in Jesus Christ though intentional action, lifestyle, and goals within their corporate culture before they can talk about that lifestyle to people who do not know Jesus. The first responsibility of mission managers is to be stewards of God’s love within the mission organization as choices are made on how to distribute resources, develop personnel, create opportunities for service, and set goals for a particular calling. If the mission is to be a learning, growing, Christ-centered operation, a new narrative must be written that encircles the organization in stewardship—a framework of patience and kindness; without envy, boasting, rudeness, irritation, resentment, or domination—a framework of hope through intentional community. (Accornero 1998:182)

In a mission organization, there should be no such thing as a plan being regarded so important that it tramples on people’s rights and feelings. While 100% endorsement is unreasonable, leadership is still bound to humbly address heartfelt concerns in a Christ-like manner. Then, having properly considered the objections, leadership should adapt and move forward.

Sixth, appropriate organizational structure, systems, and resources must be made available to implement the new vision (Pansegrouw 1996:524). This will be one of the hardest tasks for leadership and members alike. Yet, systemic change “is the most powerful approach to changing human organizations. It requires the direct manipulation of organizational variables” (Katz & Kahn 1966:451). If people are truly convinced that the status quo is inadequate, they should be willing to enact new systems. Bringing in the new also involves replacing the old. Organizations should systematically slough off obsolete tasks, responsibilities, and practices in order to free up human resources for new strategic initiatives (Drucker 1974:791).

Seventh, leaders must celebrate the victories and communicate the status of change (Pansegrouw 1996:524). In this high-tech age there is no excuse not to be in regular communication with the constituency. Email, printed newsletters, telephone
calls, etc., can all be used to keep members informed. Without adequate communication, people lose their enthusiasm for the vision. Silence is interpreted as disapproval, stagnation, or worse. LAM did a good job keeping missionaries informed of the general status of CFC, but many important underlying issues were allowed to fester un-addressed.

Figure 8-4 Situational Leadership for Transformation Model
Beyond these seven general steps, Pansegrouw reworked Hersey and Blanchard’s *Situational Leadership* model (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson 1996) for the purposes of organizational transformation (See Figure 8-4). Of the four organizational readiness stages offered, most LAM missionaries appear to be in stage three: “Perceptive but divided and ambivalent” (Pansegrouw 1996:535). LAM is largely a collection of professionals who are highly committed to their national entity, but are often, apparently, uninterested in organization-level affairs (Task Force II 1997). Given this situation, missionaries would be encouraged to “participate in decisions and implementation” (Pansegrouw 1996:535). This would facilitate commitment to the reorganization process.

Leadership activities correlate with organizational readiness. In LAM’s case, leaders would “engage in moderate to high amounts of inspiring actions and below-average amounts of structuring actions” (Pansegrouw 1996:535). Proposals of how to implement a vision in a seconding agency will be considered below.

Ultimately LAM needs to maintain a *Learning Culture* enabling it to innovate and respond effectively (Pansegrouw 1996:529). One element of a *Learning Culture*, particularly in a service institution, is a *Quality Culture*. A quality culture is driven by the needs of those it serves “and is one of teamwork, particularly cross-functional teamwork” (Pansegrouw 1996:539). A healthy organization is whole within and without, treating both members and clientele with respect.

**Multileveled Vision**

Whether one is speaking of an individual or of an organization, each one needs a vision calling it forward or it will stagnate and decline. As mentioned above, one of
leadership’s primary tasks is establishing and communicating a clear organizational vision. This study has documented that the times of LAM’s greatest innovations, activity, and effectiveness were also times when there was an understood vision, goal, and theological motivation. From Harry Strachan’s continental evangelistic campaigns to Susan Strachan’s Templo Bíblico church (See Chapter 3), from Kenneth Strachan’s Evangelism in Depth (See Chapter 4) to Horace Fenton’s CLAME (See Chapter 5), LAM has had convictions and dreams that motivated it toward organizational effectiveness.

But, despite the successes of Christ For the City (See Chapter 6), LAM’s Task Force 2 verified that the organizational vision has dimmed. LAM requires an appropriate vision to capitalize on the new opportunities of the 21st century.

**Multileveled**

Since LAM is essentially a two-tiered organization with many missionaries seconded to field-based partners (See Appendix A), vision must occur at both levels. The first and foremost task for the leadership of LAM is to communicate the organization’s overarching, multileveled vision.

In speaking of the local church, Carl George describes the concept of a meta-church as one which can create “a recognizable organizational framework, a social architecture without inherent expansion limits” (George 1992:57). This is done by building a large church on a base of small cells. Similarly, this study proposes that a meta or multileveled vision can serve a mission organization no matter how large it becomes.
The multileveled vision would consist not only of one’s mission statement, but also a set of core values. In LAM’s case the vision has been reduced to the following statement:

LAM is an international community of men and women who, motivated by their love for the Lord Jesus Christ and in obedience to His commands, encourage, assist and participate with the Latin Church in the task of building the Church of Jesus Christ in the Latin world and beyond. (LAE 2000-2001(4):3)

The task of leadership is to unpack what is implied in this statement, integrating it with LAM’s core values (as evidenced in past activities) and the needs of the contemporary Latin church. People must be able to comprehend the vision and see how it affects them.

The second level at which vision is exercised is on the local plane where the missionary works. Since most LAM missionaries are seconded to other partner ministries throughout Latin America (thus forming a second tier) these missionaries also must understand and work for the vision that is being articulated at the local level.

Given these two levels of leadership and vision, LAM faces a choice. The organization can either abdicate its own vision and adopt whatever goals the local partner ministry possesses, or it can work out cooperative agreements that maintain the integrity of both the local vision and LAM’s multileveled vision. In other words, the multileveled vision must be malleable enough to accommodate local interpretations and expressions, and yet substantive enough to provide real guidelines within which people can work, plan, strategize, and otherwise live.

The local church or “modality” parallel would be the cell-based church. While there is an overarching vision for the church as a whole, there is still room for individual expressions of that vision through the cell groups. Seconding mission agencies function in a similar manner. They must balance an overarching organizational vision which sees
needs at the continental or global level, with the vision as expressed by local congregations and ministries.

Without a multileveled vision the organization would be simply a missionary placement agency. In this case the local vision would be all that is important. The organization would be unable to initiate or respond to new ministry requests because it would have no personnel or resources immediately at its disposal. What initially may seem like an indigenized mission agency responding only to local needs, may, in reality, be a stagnated organization unable to take action when new ministries opportunities arise. Its resources may be largely tied up in good, but potentially less strategic local institutions and ministries that have could be carried out by neighboring churches and individuals. The ability to free up human resources and deploy them in a strategic manner is critical for organizational effectiveness.

With its practice of seconding people to other ministries, the above scenario is a real hazard for LAM. Without a strongly articulated multileveled vision, LAM can lose, and perhaps has already lost, much of its historical identity. Thus, part of LAM’s recovery and revitalization will come as leadership reasserts LAM’s overarching organization vision and mandate, calling partner entities and missionaries alike to commit to the renewed vision.

Although this has not been LAM’s problem, the opposite error could occur. Some mission agencies have only their ministry vision and don’t seem to care what the local visions and needs are. It is to be hoped that such paternalism is becoming a thing of the past. Mission agencies exist to serve both the home constituents and the national churches. Again, this is where the concept of a multileveled vision helps preserve the
agendas and identities of the sodality (mission agency) and the modalities (home churches, national churches and national ministries) (Winter 1999:220).

**Multileveled Vision Core Values**

To LAM’s mission statement cited above the following organizational distinctives should be noted (LAE 2000-2001(4):15):

LAM is Evangelical and Interdenominational in position—holding to the following core values as distinctives in our ministry ethos:

- Biblical—Founded on a common statement of faith.
- Upright—Applying biblical principles to maintain administrative integrity following proper missiological principles and insisting on moral integrity.
- Holistic—Focused on ministry to the whole person in his/her whole life.
- Empowering—Equipping the Church and ministry partners, and training leaders.
- Partnership Oriented—Based on a shared vision and commitment to others in ministry.
- Inclusive—Ministering with all sectors of Evangelical Christianity.
- Innovative—Taking risks to respond to God’s call to ministry in other’s lives.

One task of leadership is to unpack the implications of the mission statement and the core values. Ideally this process should result in fresh avenues of ministry for the 21st century. Given LAM’s desire to serve alongside the Latin church, cues as to how the vision could unfold are derived from the Latin context. Both Task Force 2 and the mission-wide *FamilyFest* Conference generated a substantial list of opportunities for mission involvement. The aim now is to select those areas in which LAM has expertise and willing personnel, and those which share commonality with the multileveled vision. These new objectives would then be clearly communicated to the constituency.

**Multileveled Vision Advantages**

A multileveled vision frees the mission to initiate new ministries. As innovative ministries are begun with the multileveled vision approach, five advantages surface.
First, the actual applications can and should vary over time, as new opportunities arise and old focuses become obsolete. A multileveled vision allows space for both the creation and termination of programs. No one claims that a specific application of the vision will be appropriate for all time.

Second, generating tangible projects or ministries give LAM recruiters goals for which to recruit. Recruiters may attract new missionaries not wanting to serve existing institutions with their potential problems and also existing missionaries wanting a change. Creating new ministries keeps both the vision and the missionaries fresh. In fact, as will be discussed below, fresh options are key to maintaining personnel over the course of a career.

Third, new local expressions of the vision allow the mission to experiment with emerging missiological insights. Changes that come hard to existing churches and ministries can occur more naturally in a new setting. “New paradigms put everyone practicing the old paradigm at great risk” (Barker 1992:69). By creating new contexts and new ministries, the risks associated with changing or challenging existing programs diminish.

Fourth, a multileveled vision allows the mission to be more responsive to its partners’ needs. With this as a priority, the mission would schedule regular times of interaction with various Latin leaders and missionaries. The goal of these discussions is to determine the most pressing local needs that match LAM’s competencies. Communication lines would be maintained over the duration of the ministry, with regularly scheduled times of evaluation.
A fifth advantage of a multileveled vision is momentum. Most churches and mission agencies are faced with far more possibilities of worthy ministries that fall under their vision statement than they could ever possible implement. Given this reality, it may not be so important what an organization does (within the parameters of the overarching multileveled vision), as that it does something. In other words, vision itself is a powerful motivator. The sense of momentum which vision creates, the sense of going somewhere, is lacking in many organizations.

The nature of momentum in a world of entropy is that energy must always be pumped back into the system to keep it moving. It is far easier maintaining momentum than overcoming the inertia of a static body. Thus, part of the task of leadership is ensuring that the vision attains a critical mass of acceptance among its constituents. Once this occurs, the diffusion of the vision becomes self-sustaining (E. Rogers 1995:313) until it eventually runs its course and becomes routinized. Prior to that point another innovation, another application of the multileveled vision, should be introduced to the organization.

Multileveled Vision Leaders

Galloway claims that “the primary job of a senior pastor is to cast the vision for the entire church” (Galloway 1995:116). Likewise, the number one priority for mission leadership is to continually articulate and communicate the mission’s vision.

Not only must leaders state the vision, they must live it out themselves. Kouzes and Posner have found that

In assessing the believability of sources of communication—whether newscasters, salespeople, managers, physicians, politicians, or priests—researchers typically evaluate people on three criteria: their perceived trustworthiness, their dynamism, and their expertise. Those who are rated more highly on these dimensions are
considered to be more credible sources of information . . . . The First Law of Leadership: If we don’t believe in the messenger, we won’t believe the message. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:26).

Mission leadership must be perceived as credible to the organization’s members before those missionaries will buy into the vision. In a mission like LAM, full of professional, entrepreneurial missionaries, people must be convinced that the vision and the leader are worth following.

Leaders not only attract people to themselves, but ultimately to a task. Galloway writes that “the way a visionary leader gains followers is by calling people to Kingdom causes that have worthy goals and eternal results built into them” (Galloway 1999:57). They invite people to walk alongside them in a journey of faith.

They envision the future, creating an ideal and unique image of what the community, agency, or organization can become. Through their strong appeal and quiet persuasion, leaders enlist others in the dream. They breathe life into the shared vision and get people to see the exciting future possibilities. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:318)

Mission agency leaders must call missionaries to an exciting, innovative future that will make an eternal difference.

**Casting the Multileveled Vision**

Casting the multileveled vision involves the four areas of *audience segmentation*, *tailoring*, *methodology* and *maintenance*. Following applied anthropology’s social marketing strategies (Van Willigen 1993:141), LAM would first identify its target audience—those people who have some interest in the work of the mission. Task Force 2 identified the following stakeholders: Latin American churches, missionaries, Board of Trustees, donors, partner ministries, local churches, future donors, the unevangelized, and other ministries working in Latin America (Task Force II 1997:16). When one realizes
the number of different groups having a potential stake in LAM, the power of a multileveled vision becomes obvious. Indeed, it is only for simplicity’s sake that one could claim LAM is two-tiered, for in reality it is multi-layered.

Second, not all layers/stakeholders are interested in every aspect of LAM’s multileveled vision, so the vision is tailored. The flexibility of a multileveled vision allows LAM leadership to communicate the mission statement and core values to all parties and still tailor the specific applications and implications of those statements to local contexts. A pliable multileveled vision encourages local innovation and application.

Third, appropriate methodologies and channels of communication are selected. For instance, the LAM president and workers in the Miami Springs Office (MSO) may see each other on a weekly basis to have their understanding of the vision reinforced. On the other hand, the president may see the entire missionary membership together only once every ten years. Obviously this great disparity must be overcome through the use of the various channels of communication, such as the following.

Major communiqués should be communicated through on-site leaders, not through the *Latin America Evangelist* (LAE) magazine, or even through email (See Figures 8-5 and 8-6). For this face-to-face communication to take place, LAM must reform its internal leadership structure, an area to be discussed below. Every missionary and stakeholder in LAM must be in direct relationship to a leader whose job, at least in part, is keeping the vision alive. The creation of a multi-layered leadership structure would enable direct, immediate feedback and reinforcement of the multileveled vision and its specific on-site implications. The various partner ministries and missionary units
in a given country should schedule regular times of meeting or consultation where the vision can be further clarified.

The other modes of communication are less personal but still vital. Regular email updates should be flowing between and within LAM’s layers on a weekly or monthly basis. LAE and video content should be carefully designed, particularly when aimed at donors and future missionary recruits. The communication goal is a seamless, although nuanced, vision presented to missionaries, mission friends and partners.

Social marketing’s fourth contribution to vision casting involves maintaining lines of communication. Redundant communication through a variety of media helps to maintain enthusiasm and current multileveled vision applications. As needs change, the process of monitoring and evaluation allows new nuances and programs to be promoted. Again, every activity and communication is measured against the overarching multileveled vision, mission statement and core values. If conflicting messages are sent out, stakeholders become anxious and credibility is undercut. More importantly, the organization strays from what it claims is its guiding vision and purpose for existing.

**Multileveled Vision Challenge**

A service-based mission agency, like LAM, would do well to implement a multileveled vision approach as part of an overall revisioning strategy. While it is not the only consideration, it may be the most important. One might conceptualize a multileveled vision as the jigsaw puzzle board and border within which the puzzle pieces fit. Leadership sees the completed puzzle in the picture on the front of the puzzle box. Likewise, a mission agency’s overarching multileveled vision maintains the macro-level organizational vision and sets the parameters for the micro-level entity visions.
Mobilization

The discussions at Task Force II demonstrated a willingness to challenge major organizational issues potentially inhibiting LAM’s work. Taking into account LAM’s historical strengths, culture, contemporary challenges, and current structure, the following profile maximizes organizational assets for excellence in the coming decades.

Organizational Philosophy of Ministry

The previous chapter documented a number of significant contemporary trends which affect LAM’s organizational effectiveness. In light of these challenges, LAM would do well to consider the following ideological priorities.

Gen X Focus. With the retirement of LAM missionaries recruited in the 1940s and 1950s, LAM must aim at a new generation of workers. McIntosh notes,

Immediately following World War II missionaries were recruited and sent to foreign fields in large numbers. Most were in their twenties and thirties and today are retiring and returning home . . . . It is apparent that most Boomers are not attracted to serve as career missionaries nor do they financially support foreign missions as their parents did. While exact methodologies mission agencies will use in the future are not yet developed, clearly they must be designed to attract and meet the needs of people of younger generations. (McIntosh 1995:19)

If it’s true that few Boomers are interested in missionary careers, then LAM should focus on Busters and Millennialists. To make this generation the mission’s mobilization priority would demand certain organizational changes. Gen X, however, is ripe for participating in the kind of ministry community that LAM could generate. Indeed, a family identity was one of the LAM’s hallmarks until CLAME in 1971 (See Chapters 3, 4, and 5).
Leadership for a New Generation. Strong leadership is key to organizational effectiveness. Strong leadership, however, is not the same as authoritarian leadership. Christian leaders use as their model, Jesus Christ, who once asked his disciples, “who is greater, the one who is at the table or the one who serves? Is it not the one who is at the table? But I am among you as one who serves” (Luke 22:27 NIV). Christian leaders, operating out of a set of biblical core values, should exercise servant leadership (Malphurs 1996; Maxwell 1993; Clinton 1988).

Leaders who achieve this biblical balance will be invaluable in the ensuing decades. They will confidently lead missions into new and perhaps unknown territory. Leaders search for opportunities to change the status quo. They look for innovative ways to improve the organization. They experiment and take risks. And since risk taking involves mistakes and failure, leaders accept the inevitable disappointments as learning opportunities. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:318)

As the historical chapters documented, LAM has had many innovative leaders and missionaries. Now, drawing upon its historical commitment to raising up innovative leadership, LAM must once again ensure that it is the kind of mission in which future leaders can flourish. Positions and opportunities should be created to form new leaders, as Kenneth Strachan once did (See Chapter 4). LAM leaders should be allowed to inspire, facilitate, and direct the course of the mission. They should lead and not simply manage. When leaders are hampered by uncooperative members or policies, frustration drives them to more responsive organizations.

Team Ministry. Given the vital importance of leadership and the emerging generational and cultural values in the present egalitarian society, along with New Testament norms for ministry, team leadership and team ministry are powerful tools.
The desire to have ministry teams emerged strongly at Task Force 2, particularly from the younger representatives (Task Force II 1997). Iverson contends, “more work can come to fruition by the labors of several people coordinated and working together, than by the same number of people working alone, or separately” (Iverson 1984:48). The effective mission agencies of the future will have a strong team ministry component. Such ministry communities build on the strengths and giftedness of individuals, providing accountability and protection (Venugopal 1997; Maxwell 1995; Stabbert 1982).

As described in chapter four, Kenneth Strachan reorganized LAM around a team of leaders in 1958. To move toward team leadership today would be a reaffirmation of the past. Team ministry does not replace the need for strong leadership, rather it demands a strong team coach. Such leaders foster collaboration and build spirited teams. They actively involve others. Leaders understand that mutual respect is what sustains extraordinary efforts; they strive to create an atmosphere of trust and human dignity. They strengthen others by sharing information and providing choice. They give their own power away, making each person feel capable and powerful. (Kouzes & Posner 1995:318)

In a very real sense it would be easier to be a dictator making all decisions than to cooperate and collaborate with others on a ministry team. Even a superficial perusal of the New Testament should convince the reader that teams were the biblical norm.

Consider Acts 15:22:

Then the apostles and elders, with the whole church, decided to choose some of their own men and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. They chose Judas (called Barsabbas) and Silas, two men who were leaders among the brothers.” (Acts 15:22 NIV)

They were practicing team ministry.

LAM’s own mission statement begins with, “LAM is an international community of men and women” (LAE 2000-2001(4):3). The creation of a community implies team
ministry at all levels of the mission’s activity and leadership. This needs to become the norm and not the exception in LAM’s future.

Latin Partners. Mission no longer occurs in one direction and partnership is the new order of the day (Robert 2000; Ward 1999). As quoted above, LAM is an international community of laborers working with the Latin Church (LAE 2000-2001(4):3). The organization is committed to not only ministering to Latinos, but ultimately to partnering with them in ministry. LAM has historically desired to become more Latin in its focus and composition, as evidenced in CLAME (See Chapter 5). Task Force 2 affirmed this desire (Task Force II 1997).

Summary. Gen X focus, servant leadership, team ministry, and Latin partnerships are important ideological priorities for LAM at this historical juncture. Implementing these priorities, however, has structural and systemic implications. The following proposals are designed to facilitate the integration of these new emphases with LAM’s current organizational reality.

Structural Implications

While others could be no doubt be suggested, the following two structural proposals are designed to augment LAM’s organizational effectiveness in the coming decades.

Multi-Layered Leadership. Based on the ideological priority of team ministry, LAM should change, or more properly, revert, to a multi-layered leadership structure (See Figures 8-5 and 8-6). This structural change primarily impacts the LAM side of the mission/partner relationship since LAM would not demand that its partners adopt such internal changes for themselves. Recall that a multileveled vision allows flexibility for
variations in applications at the local level. In order to be consistent with the proposed philosophy of mission, however, the LAM side of the equation would need to implement changes.

These changes would impact LAM at two levels. First, LAM should revert back to a modification of Kenneth Strachan’s layered leadership. Multi-layered leadership allows decisions to be made closer to the actual implementers of those decisions. It multiples innovation and creativity since more people are thinking strategically.

Kang’s insights from World Evangelical Fellowship’s (WEF) attrition study are helpful on this point:

The primary principle guiding supervisory selection is that it should be field-oriented. That is, supervisors should be missionaries themselves . . . . Although supervision should be done by experienced missionaries, not all experienced field missionaries should supervise. Certain additional qualifications are needed. There must be ability in leadership, counseling, problem solving, handling interpersonal conflicts, relational skills, and evaluation . . . . But administration and pastoral care do not mix very well, because the person to whom missionaries tell their problems is also the one who performs evaluations. (Kang 1997:253-254)

Thus, careful attention must be given to who administrates and who counsels.

Multi-layered leadership provides opportunities for emerging leaders to develop their skills at levels having less impact (See Figure 8-6). Over time the most proficient of these leaders would assume higher levels of responsibility and influence as the needs of the organization and their abilities warranted (See Figure 8-5). Such levels may proceed from local ministry groups (i.e. professors, nurses, evangelists, etc.), to managing missionaries and ministries in a city. From there the most capable might direct a major geographic region or coordinate between regions at an international level. In other words, it would provide a long-term solution to the problem of leadership development.
Figure 8-5 Multi-Layered Team Leadership Macro View
Figure 8-6  Multi-Layered Team Leadership Micro View
The layered organization could be a combination of individuals serving as Field Directors and Team Leaders, and also groups of people formed into Bases, Field Councils, Teams, and Pods (See Figures 8-5 and 8-6). Either way they would serve mainly to communicate the multileveled vision and exercise leadership over their respective spheres of influence.

A second impact point would be the creation of ministry teams where appropriate. Granted, many missionaries are working under partners where this structural change would be difficult to implement, but for others it would work. Missionaries could be formed into multi-generational, multi-gendered, and multi-ethnic teams based either on their areas of ministry or their geographic field of service. These local teams would serve a variety of functions related to both field-based ministries and member care. They may be particularly appropriate for younger Gen X missionaries (See Chapter 7). Perhaps more importantly, they could function as worshipping missionary communities, like LAM’s Wednesday evening prayer meetings in Costa Rica did for many years, giving the participants a greater sense of connectedness with Christ’s mystical church.

Multi-layered leadership and ministry teams are a variation on site-based management. Peters and Waterman note,

Regardless of industry or apparent scale needs, virtually all of the companies we talked to placed high value on pushing authority far down the line, and on preserving and maximizing practical autonomy of large numbers of people. Those things cannot occur without a fairly simple underlying form . . . . It appears to us that there is only one crucial concomitant to the excellent company’s simple structural form: lean staff, especially at the corporate level. (Peters & Waterman 1982:31-311)

The multi-layered approach, combined with team-based ministries, would diffuse both authority and responsibility throughout the mission, while still providing clearly
established chains of command necessary for corporate identity and responsiveness. This collaborative approach characterizes Greiner’s fifth organizational phase (Greiner 1978) described above and seems an appropriate match to LAM’s strengths.

**Field-Based Mission Agency.** Just as missionaries are called to an incarnational lifestyle of identification with the people, so also are mission agencies. LAM is committed to the Latin world. In light of the contemporary revolutions in communication and travel, the agency ought to reconsider the physical setting of its headquarters. The Latin America Mission began in Latin America and, until relatively recent years, was based in Latin America. LAM founders Harry and Susan Strachan felt God led them to headquarter in Costa Rica:

> It was there in Curacao, however, as they waited on the Lord in prayer, that independently to each came the conviction that the base of operation for the campaign movement they hoped soon to launch should be San José, in the mountains of tiny Costa Rica. (Roberts 1996:67)

Thirty years ago, when CLAME was beginning, LAM seriously considered relocating its headquarters from the USA back to Latin America. In particular, it would have placed “coordination, communication and strategic planning” back on the field (LAM Collection 236, Box 70:2). LAM did not, however make that move. Instead it consolidated more authority in the USA.

What began in Latin America, for and with the people of Latin America, became a mission enterprise controlled by an American board at least, it would seem, in the eyes of the American Board members themselves. Board members express clearly that the board represents North American money and interest, not the Latin American ministry. Those interests and money must remain under the control of North Americans for accountability. (Accornero 1998:158)

It is time for LAM to trust its founders’ instincts and return to its Latin American roots, for the following reasons: first, the mission statement claims LAM exists for the
sake of the Latin church. Despite the fact that Miami, Florida, where headquarters are currently located, has a huge Latino population, LAM’s first commitment is to the Latin American continent. The relocation of mission headquarters to a Latin country would signal an intentionality which LAM presently lacks.

Second, like many USA-based mission agencies LAM could be perceived by Latinos as sallying forth to do its job and then retreating to the security of the USA. Moving headquarters to Latin America would say, “We are at home here.” “We stand in solidarity with your needs and way of life.” “We are one of you.”

Third, if LAM is serious about latinizing the mission then it needs to be where Latinos live and feel most comfortable. A move to Latin America would signal a desire for future ethnic change in missionary constituency, donors, and leadership. As speculated in 1971, it would be “a reorientation of the Mission so that Latin Americans will feel ‘at home’ in it rather than feeling as if they have betrayed their own people by having joined a ‘foreign’ organization” (LAM Collection 236, Box 70:2). LAM would become more Latino.

Fourth, like Harry and Susan Strachan assumed, mission leadership is more responsive to the needs of the field when they live there on a daily basis. J. Hudson Taylor, founder of the China Inland Mission, located his mission’s headquarters in China rather than England to be “as close as possible to the scene of action, rather than having the work directed by remote control” from some Western city (Kane 1994:201). Perhaps more importantly, Latinos would be approaching LAM on their own turf, instead of having to assume the weaker position by coming to the USA. LAM would be in closer touch with Latin America.
Fifth, as at LAM’s beginning, the mission could function as a worshipping missionary community. Regular times of corporate worship and fellowship would affirm the organization’s identity as essentially a church in mission. It would be an example of the little church (ecclesiola) within the larger (ecclesia) body of Christ (Snyder 1997b:53) actively witnessing and worshipping on-site.

While the reasons thus far cited constitute the primary motivations for relocating headquarters, there would be other secondary benefits that warrant attention. First, it would raise the level of morale for those working in administration. The lack of morale at MSO and the desire to occasionally visit the field were two needs documented at Task Force II (Task Force II 1997:5). The closer the administrative staff is to the action and the people they are serving, the more they will feel a part of the ministry. This is vitally important in light of the difficulties faced in recruiting people to work in the home office. A field-based office would allow the office personnel the opportunity to participate in ministry activities outside of the office on a regular basis (recall David Howard’s experience in chapter five).

Second, support raising for administrative workers would be easier since potential donors will perceive them as foreign missionaries. USA-based missionaries have a notoriously difficult time meeting their budgets (LAM 2000b:16). Indeed, this is why LAM has had to supplement the administrative staff salaries at MSO.

Third, leaders could be more easily recruited to serve at headquarters if it were on the field. Historically, most effective missionaries have had little interest in giving up their ministry in a foreign land to return home to a desk job. A field-based mission agency would help ease this transition by providing some of the best of both worlds.
Fourth, having HQ in a location like San José, Costa Rica would allow greater voluntary participation on the part of expatriate retirees and missionary spouses and children. With over half its mission force located in Costa Rica, it is likely that volunteer laborers could plug into vital roles without disrupting the work of other ministries.

Fifth, recruiting and orienting would be facilitated. Bringing new missionary candidates to an orientation at a headquarters located in Latin America would provide them with a greater understanding of field realities. They could understand LAM’s commitment to incarnational, receptor-oriented ministry (Whiteman 1983:437), even at the administrative level, and see the commitment it has to the Latin church’s agenda. New candidates would be joining a *Latin American* mission agency.

**Systems Implications**

In addition to the proposals for macro-level structural retooling, the following internal/micro systems should be considered. These preliminary proposals would need to be detailed in conjunction with experienced practitioners in the various areas. The ability to draw on the expertise of others is a prime advantage to implementing a team leadership approach.

**Entering Mission.** New missionaries are the lifeblood of any mission agency. In the light of globalization, pluralism, and the needs of the emerging generations, new paradigms and systems must be created for recruiting new workers. A seamless, holistic, career view of missionary service is required. This system would start with the initial contact with potential missionaries.

A long-term commitment to interested individuals is a key to moving people from a *desire* for missions to actual *service*. Reynolds writes that “the reasons students do not
make it to the field are the same virtually everywhere. Among the most prevalent are
debt and marriage” (Reynolds 1999:15). Once students understand the missions call and make a general commitment to become involved, the process often stalls. Whereas “most mission agencies and campus ministries focus their efforts” on getting people to this point,

there is a great need for mentoring as the students grow in their mission commitment in order to make the many necessary decisions. For the mission-oriented student to plan his future effectively, a like-minded person must be available to influence those decisions. Through much research, the most recurrent ‘need’ stated is for mentoring, church involvement, and unity among mission efforts. (Reynolds 1999:15)

This whole-life approach is distinct from the way missions has normally been done. This concept will be expanded below under the Career Tracking and Member Care sections.

The first step, however, is revamping the organizational entry system.

Support Raising/Financing the Mission. Financial, prayer, and relational support from home churches and families should be integrated into a whole-life view of the mission vocation. Missionaries cannot go to the field or remain there for years without a secure financial/support base.

Fund raising for individuals and institutions is increasingly difficult, and an adequate support base may take years to develop. Engel sees an “unmistakable downtrend which is likely to intensify no matter what we do in the way of public relations and marketing firepower” for contributions to world mission (Engle 1996:11). Support raising assistance and instruction should be a leadership priority for potential and existing undersupported missionaries.

Beyond the North American setting, LAM has a growing number of Latinos wanting to serve as LAM missionaries. Cross-cultural mechanisms need to be developed
in cooperation with local national churches to meet this need. If LAM is serious about latinizing its mission force it must help Latinos address financial issues.

**Training.** As was mentioned above, debt is one of the major bottlenecks to becoming a missionary. Alternative modes of training should be developed reducing the length of time and quantity of money students spend in traditional colleges and seminaries in preparation for the field. For instance, students could take theology and ministry courses at greatly reduced rates through mission-related seminaries in various countries. The seminary, *Escuela de Estudios Pastorales* (ESEPA), in Costa Rica hosts several English-speaking professors who could potentially develop a missionary training track.

Another possibility would be for the mission to supply its candidates with direct ministry training and cultural orientation through experienced field missionaries. This approach has the advantage of combining academics with hands-on ministry. Training should be fully orbited and should include not only ministry skills, language acquisition, and cultural considerations, but family and career issues as well. The responsibilities for these areas may need to be divided between practitioners in education, mobilization, and member care.

**Deployment.** Mission agencies like LAM must become more deliberate in their deployment and placement of missionaries. LAM requires all missionaries to have a work contract, a system inherited from the CLAME era (LAM 2000b:5). However, it seems a bit much to expect a new missionary to properly understand the ministry options available prior to arriving on the field and having language studies. Most missionaries are unaware of the multitudes of ministries in which they could serve, since most of their
attention in the USA was focused on fund raising. LAM’s CFC program did things differently. Bypassing the rigidity of requiring a work contract prior to field exposure, CFC assigned its personnel during or after its workers understood their options (See Chapter 6). There was no question that they would serve under CFC, simply where would be the best fit.

Placement issues would consider any strategic direct ministries in which LAM was engaged as well as placing workers in seconding positions. Deployment decisions are made between the national partners, the missionary, and LAM leaders. A balance needs to be struck between these three interested parties if LAM is to be more than a missionary placement agency.

Career Tracking. Once missionaries are in place it is insufficient and unwise to simply leave them alone for months or years at a time. Periodic reviews need to occur between missionaries and their ministry teams or specific leaders. Reporting mechanisms should be designed for missionary accountability to the mission agency, its partner entities, and donors.

Regular monitoring brings issues to the surface before they become major crises. Problems requiring pastoral and marriage counseling would fall under member care, which will be expanded in the next section. General career needs would fall under career tracking.

People want to feel good about their jobs. When frustrations arise with current ministry assignments, help may be needed in three areas. First, assistance may be needed in dealing with whatever or whoever is causing the frustration. Appropriate leaders could intervene and work toward a solution.
Second, people’s dreams and passions vary over time. As the years go by, the missionary ages, the family grows, and experiences vary. “In so doing they undergo changes in the pattern and intensity of their needs, motives, and characteristic responses” (Katz & Kahn 1966:307). Schein notes,

Here again we find that a developmental perspective can provide the key to understanding these issues. The psychological contract changes over time as the organization’s needs and the employee’s needs change. What the employee is looking for in a job at age 25 may be completely different from what that same employee is looking for at age 50 (Hall, 1976; Schein, 1978).” (Schein 1980:23)

People will leave their jobs when they can’t see how their present positions can help them meet their career goals. Mission leadership helps by redirecting the missionary to alternative ministries which will recapture their imagination and vision. Part of the process involves discovering a person’s career anchor. “The anchor is that set of needs, values, and talents which the person is least willing to give up if forced to make a choice” (Schein 1980 84). Based on this anchor, leaders responsible for career tracking help the missionary brainstorm possibilities for a future ministry which will be satisfying.

Third, career tracking means that agencies provide help in retooling missionaries in need of additional career skills. Education is a life-long process. Mission agencies could network with other missions and schools to provide pertinent seminars throughout the year in various countries targeting the needs of its missionaries. As leadership attends to these real needs, preventable attrition will be reduced.

Member Care. Closely related to the career tracking system would be member care (O’Donnell 2001; Moreau & O’Rear 2001). The WEF attrition study notes, “Once on the field, missionaries must receive proper supervision of their work and must be shepherded by their local church pastor or mission leader, as well as by the pastoral
supervisor of the mission agency” (Girón 1997:27). Member care workers would be specifically trained in counseling and pastoral strategies. At times they may network with national churches and partner ministries to ensure the missionary is being cared for emotionally and spiritually, while at other times they would deal with the missionary family directly.

As with any of the systems being described, member care workers may have other primary assignments. They are selected for member care, however, because of their sensitivity in dealing with life issues. It may be that a member care leader is a retired missionary meeting with missionary spouses on a regular basis to counsel and encourage them. Likewise, another may work closely with particular missionaries in a career tracking mode. Some may serve as mentors to younger missionaries, while others would deal with the realities of MK (missionary kid) life. In all these ministries they would tend the soul. They would be watching over the spiritual and emotional health of the missionaries.

The point in all of this is to supply a network of workers who assist one another, working through the normal stresses and issues of missionary life. “Investing in workers’ personal and professional growth will result in greater job satisfaction and productivity,” thus reducing missionary attrition (O’Donnell 1997:288).

All of the systems highlighted here share a common commitment to treating current and potential missionaries holistically, particularly through viewing their career tracks from a whole-life perspective. Moreover, these proposals break down departmental walls between systems. They advocate an organic view of mission organizations whereby all parts are interrelated to organizational health and effectiveness.
Ministry

The proposals set forth thus far deal largely with internal organizational needs (organizational transitioning, multileveled vision, and mobilization). This final set of proposals deals with the organization’s external activities. Ministry is what most people think of when considering missions. While this is the organization’s goal, it would be impossible to sustain the ministry without the internal components.

As documented in the historical chapters, LAM has had an amazing diversity of ministries. Since the mission is committed to partnering with the Latin church there are any number of ways to serve. The importance of a multileveled vision is obvious in an environment of multiple visions and allegiances.

The following section is divided into two parts. First, seven ministry commitments related to Latin America’s contemporary context will be proposed. Next, six specific strategic ministries arenas will be identified as appropriate to LAM’s historic and present competencies.

Seven Ministry Commitments for the New Millennium

The following commitments are distilled from both missiological insights and LAM history. They are not to be taken in isolation from specific ministries which would work them out in human interactions.

#1 Evangelism By All. Evangelism has been LAM’s hallmark since its founding (See Chapter 3). For the agency to continue being faithful to its original calling, all the missionaries must make sharing the gospel a part of their normal lifestyle and work. While LAM continues to have ministries whose specific focus is evangelism, this is not a
replacement for a missionary force which fervently believes that salvation is in Jesus Christ alone. Personal testimony will continue to be more effective than any programmatic approach to evangelism.

#2 Social Ministries. Distinctions between ministries serving physical and social needs, and those tending the soul, should be minimized. Indeed, Harry and Susan Strachan addressed both of these realms, particularly in the ministries in Costa Rica (See Chapter 3). God created body, soul, and spirit as one. Accordingly, ministries address whole persons and whole communities, participating “in the redemptive ministry of Christ by bringing shalom to creation” (B. Bradshaw 1993:4). This ministry commitment opens up exciting new possibilities, even within existing ministry commitments.

#3 Cultural Relevance. Any ministry must be continually evaluated against its cultural context in order to determine its relevance and impact. Ideally this evaluation takes place by missionary practitioners as well as by cultural insiders. If a ministry is not beneficial to the Latin church, then the project should be modified or terminated. LAM ministries exist for the benefit of the church, not the other way around. In all things LAM missionaries must strive for contextual excellence and relevance.

#4 Pentecostal Inclination. The majority of church growth in Latin America is of the pentecostal or charismatic variety (C. Padilla 1999; Brierley 1997; Berg & Pretiz 1996a; Berg & Pretiz 1996b). Latin American Church Growth documented this fact in 1969 as well as a disturbing trend in missionary distribution:

Missionaries of the faith missions constitute 32.4 per cent of the total although the Churches related to faith missions comprise only 1.5 per cent of the total communicant membership. Pentecostal missionaries make up 9.8 per cent of missionaries in Latin America, while Pentecostal Churches have 65.3 per cent of communicant membership. (Read, Monterroso & Johnson 1969:58)
Unfortunately, pentecostals are still largely ignored by most mission agencies. To ignore them is to run the risk of cultural irrelevance and of missing out on this move of God. Where “mission groups have been anti-charismatic, people with a pentecostal persuasion will break away” (Berg & Pretiz 1996a:52). Thus these new groups remain outside of the sphere of influence of such mission agencies.

The publication of *Latin American Church Growth* in 1969 fell like a bombshell . . . particularly on the conservative evangelical boards . . . whose labors were resulting in relatively little church growth. They believed themselves to be theologically sound, and knew they were working hard; yet they were experiencing less growth than the mainline missionary societies and the Pentecostal churches. (McGavran & Wagner 1990:272)

Mission Agencies, including LAM are faced with a choice impacting the way they do ministry and with whom they minister.

Berg and Pretiz have pointed out the cultural relevance of this movement for Latinos:

The greater family spirit of the Pentecostal Church reflects Latin Americans’ sense of community.

- Ethics and moral discipline do get imposed, but outbursts of passion in a service parallel the frenetic dance and excitement of the fiesta of the local culture.
- All-night prayer meetings evoke the personal sacrifice formerly invested in arduous trips to distant shrines.
- The wonder of tongues-speaking and pentecostal ecstasy (rather than a cerebral approach to religion) reflects the many mysteries to which people have been exposed all their lives in the Roman Catholic Church. (Berg & Pretiz 1996a:144)

If LAM wants to work where the majority of church growth occurs they will deliberately assume a pentecostal inclination. LAM missionaries should not simply tolerate, but rather embrace such spiritual disciplines as healing, spiritual gifts, deliverance, prayer, and spirited worship.
#5  Latino Missionaries. LAM desires more Latino missionaries in the organization (Task Force II 1997). This desire for latinization must translate into concrete invitations to significant service, leadership and ministry. Current LAM missionaries may need to make room for former recipients to experience the joy of giving and service. Likewise, former LAM authorities may have the blessing of learning from previous students. As the Strachans themselves affirmed, Latin America will ultimately only be won to the degree Latinos become involved in the task (See Chapters 3 and 4).

#6  Networking. In this age of globalization and technological advances, it is desirable and cost effective to network with likeminded national churches and mission agencies. These possibilities must be explored to reduce redundant ministries, freeing personnel in a world of limited resources. Particularly when partnering with national churches, sharing information, equipment, personnel, and pastoral care, can make mission work more culturally integrated and effective.

#7  New Initiatives. LAM must reserve its historic prerogative to initiate new ministries. In its attempt to serve the national church, LAM must not limit itself to any one group’s agenda. LAM should survey the wider continental realm with an eye toward overlooked, strategic new initiatives. These enterprises may take the form of new ministries, new partnerships, and new fields of service. As a mission with a reputation for innovation, LAM must continue thinking outside of the box while envisioning the future. Again, a multileveled vision helps LAM maintain the balance between service and innovation.
Six Strategic Ministries for the New Millennium

Beyond the seven broad ministry commitments, 15 specific strategic ministries for the new millennium can be identified. Some of these represent LAM’s historic emphases, while others address emerging challenges. The following ministries are described in summary form only.

#1 Metro Church Planting. Church planting was mentioned as one of Latin American church leaders’ top priorities (Halls 1996:6-7). While a few LAM missionaries plant churches, it has never been an organizational priority. LAM was correct in identifying the need for urban church planting in the Christ For the City (CFC) initiative, but CFC did not actually plant many churches (See Chapter 6). Wagner claims that “the single most effective evangelistic methodology under heaven is planting new churches” (Wagner 1990:11). Since LAM is committed to evangelism it must place greater emphasis on church planting. This ministry would identify national groups wanting to begin new churches and areas needing new congregations. Through a combination of missionaries and nationals, teams would be formed to plant clusters of churches in strategic metro areas.

#2 Short Term Teams. Short Term Teams (STT) are a burgeoning phenomenon (See Chapter 7). Quite often a STT gives adults and young people their first real taste of mission work. With its rich heritage and ample contacts on the field, LAM stands poised to give STT participants a realistic view of cross-cultural ministry.

A STT has at least three benefits. First, the participants themselves are often deeply affected. Their worldview is challenged and their priorities altered in a manner that would be impossible apart from personal exposure. Second, an STT can accomplish
significant ministry in the host country. Both national churches and individual nationals can be encouraged by those who take their time and money to share life together, albeit briefly. Third, some of these same STT missionaries may ultimately return to serve for longer periods of time with the sponsoring mission. This has certainly been the case for a number of LAM missionaries who started out in LAM’s short term Spearhead program, located in Mexico City. The time is ripe to expand the STT concept to include other countries and to equip it to handle not only individuals, as Spearhead does, but teams as well.

#3 Latin Mission Movement. The Latin church is now a sending church (See Chapter 7). There are numerous opportunities for missiologically trained professors to share their expertise on cross-cultural missions with this new breed of missionary. Beyond education, there are critical needs for the development of support structures and Latin-based mission agencies. This will be a cutting edge ministry in the ensuing decades.

#4 Children. Through a combination of creative evangelistic approaches geared to children, a greater harvest could be reaped. Children represent a unique challenge since they are still under the care of adults. Unlike those who have grown skeptical, children retain the ability to exercise simple faith. Children, in general, are more open to the gospel than adults.

The category of Children At Risk represents an enormous percentage of the population in many Latin cities. These children are put out on the streets begging money, selling their bodies, and stealing to survive. While storekeepers and shoppers may view them as vermin, missionaries must see them as persons for whom Christ died and wants
to make whole. Their needs are so vast that only a comprehensive strategy could produce long term results. Nevertheless, as Susan Strachan herself did (See Chapter 3), LAM missionaries should begin by doing what they can.

#5 Church Renewal.

Where people have experienced less cost to become evangelicals, where the ministry does not meet the needs of a more sophisticated generation, where there is disenchantment with the leadership, and where a church that is established for a greater length of time has second, third, and fourth generation evangelical families . . . there will be defection . . . and nominalism. (LAM 1990:10)

Missionaries with pastoral skills could minister in the area of church renewal. The Costa Rican church, for example, has experienced desertions (Gómez 1996) and its pastors need help in the areas of “finances and academics” (Anderson 1999:125). Experienced missionaries/pastors could come alongside them offering assistance in these areas. Church-level ministry would focus on revitalizing the congregation’s spiritual life and ministries. From Kenneth Strachan onward (See Chapter 4), LAM has demonstrated its solidarity with the local church in evangelism. Beyond evangelism, however, discipleship, renewal, community involvement, and church growth constitute significant challenges faced by local congregations.

#6 Creation-Centered Ministries. As people become increasingly displaced from nature in contemporary mega-cities, there is a growing desire to return to simplicity. Camping not only gives people a chance to get away for a few days to hear sermons, but perhaps just as importantly, it gives them the opportunity to be “re-created.” Christian camping integrates recreation with the good news that the Creator has come to recreate his new creation in Christ. LAM has been involved in Christian camping for decades and
has seen good results at its related Camp Roblealto and Camp Savegre (See Chapter 5). There is, however, potential for even more growth in this ministry.

Given Costa Rica’s reputation of being an ecological treasure, camp leaders should develop a theology of creation. For instance, Camp Savegre, located in the Costa Rican cloud forest, developed by the Asociación de Ministerios Cristianos a los Anglohablantes (AMCA) (Association of Christian Ministries to the English-Speaking), provides an ideal discipleship setting. Zahniser notes,

> discipling establishes powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations in believers by formulating conceptions of the kingdom of God and clothing these conceptions with such forcefulness that the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic. (Zahniser 1997:62)

Symbolically, Savegre is a “union of ecology and intellect that results in the materialization of an idea” (Turner 1995:26). The camp’s setting is a raw demonstration of the Creator’s handiwork speaking to a reality beyond itself. For many students Savegre becomes an “earthly microcosm of the heavenly, and as the place of the immanent-transcendent presence” (Turner 1979:353). By combining “symbols and ceremonies, the discipling tools of religion” camping’s effectiveness can be enhanced (Zahniser 1997:63),

A related project would be a ministry to ecology students and eco-tourists. Existing camps could be utilized in the off-season as on-site laboratories for studying nature. Under the guidance of a sensitive and informed missionary, a retreat center environment could be created where visitors interact with God’s special revelation, the Bible, as well as God’s general revelation in the form of nature. The Christian worldview touches all of creation.
Summary

This chapter presented a series of proposals affecting organizational transitioning, vision, leadership, management, location, mobilization, structure, systems, commitments, and ministries. These areas are key to repositioning a mission organization like LAM for continued strategic and innovative ministry in the 21st century.
Chapter 9

Rekindle the Passion—Conclusions and Recommendations

With the research conducted, data analyzed, and proposals made, this final chapter will summarize broader conclusions and make recommendations for future study. The study spanned eight decades and roughly four generations of organized missionary activity. While still a mid-size mission organization, the data shows that the Latin America Mission (LAM) has profoundly influenced many Latin American contexts and the whole field of missiology.

Overview

The study set forth to document LAM from an organizational perspective. Relevant sources were mined and data extrapolated creating a realistic portrayal of the agency’s past 80 years. Leaders, events, contributions, shortcomings, and rank-and-file missionary stories were integrated producing a mixture of insider accounts and outsider analysis.

Beyond documentation, the study hypothesized that theories on organizational history, stages, and phases could be useful in analyzing a mission organization’s life stages (Greiner 1972; Schein 1992). These analyses were largely descriptive of organizational culture at various stages. From these observations about past competencies, adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency (Denison 1997), strategies for future effectiveness were proposed (See Figure 9-1).
Figure 9-1 Past, Present, and Future

Vision

The study has shown that LAM originated with a clear vision. LAM founders Harry and Susan Strachan were committed to aggressive continental evangelism (See Chapter 3). Additionally, they understood the importance of balanced gospel ministries and training national leaders. Ultimately many others caught their vision and joined the organization as missionaries or supporters.

The primacy of evangelism in LAM priorities has seldom been questioned. Kenneth Strachan certainly upheld the vision (See Chapter 4), and Christ For the City
(CFC) did so too (See Chapter 6). At other times, however, the passion for evangelism has been less obvious.

Whether the goal was evangelism, latinization (Comunidad Latinoamericana de Ministerios Evangélicos—CLAME) (See Chapter 5), training, medical caravans, literature or radio, LAM has consistently needed a vision to keep it focused. Those times when the organizational vision was unclear, as has been the case since CFC, have been times of administrative confusion (Task Force II 1997).

Interestingly enough, the lack of a compelling vision around which LAM could rally has not prevented ongoing ministry. Apparently, while a strong organizational vision is necessary for an organization to move effectively into new opportunities, it is less important for maintenance. Two dynamics may be at work here. First, as a not-for-profit organization, mission agencies do not have a fiscal bottom line. Souls, conversions, good works, etc. are impossible to measure accurately. While ideally, “non-profit institutions exist for the sake of their mission” (Drucker 1990:45), that mission can be stated in such a way that almost anything is mission.

Second, LAM has defined itself largely as a service mission. By seconding missionaries LAM obviates the need for its own compelling vision. If the organization exists simply to place missionaries, then almost anything they do meets the organization’s mission. Thus, LAM does not need to prove organizational effectiveness nor innovation, except to the degree that this affects the seconding of missionaries.

Organizations like LAM face two choices. First, a missionary placement agency provides a valuable service to nationals and missionaries alike. If LAM believes this is the best way it can serve the Latin church, then this is a valid route to travel. Second,
LAM could continue seconding while reemphasizing its organizational prerogative to initiate new ministries. For this to be truly effective, however, organizational loyalty would need to be directed first toward LAM, and secondarily toward the national partner. This second option seems more in line with LAM’s history, but it has proved to be increasingly difficult.

Identity

Organizational identity and culture are important factors in determining an organization’s effectiveness (Schein 1992; Denison 1997). When LAM was an innovative, progressive, initiating organization, a tight organizational identity was needed. Hence, up until CLAME era (1971), most missionaries described LAM as a family. They understood the culture, knew the stories, and propagated a common ethos. They functioned as a worshipping missionary community, a church in mission. In this environment it was possible to initiate new ministries, since members had a strong commitment to the organization itself.

Since CLAME the mission has been fragmented. While some missionaries experience LAM as a family, it is more local in nature. There is less loyalty to the overall organization itself. Many missionaries today are likely to see LAM more as a channel for funding ministry than as a family structure. Given this reality it is no wonder LAM is frustrated in initiating new organization-wide ministries.

Leadership

LAM began with strong, almost dictatorial, leadership under Harry and Susan Strachan. Their son Kenneth proved to be an equally dominant, if not superior, leader, but without being domineering. He multiplied leadership positions, training, and
opportunities. The organization expanded with new personnel and also new ministries under his direction.

Leadership since the Strachans has been varied. With CLAME, the mandate to lead has become problematic. LAM struggles to know if or when it should initiate new ministries, not wanting to offend its national partners. Under this arrangement LAM may do just as well with strong managers rather than leaders. Managers can maintain the organization by streamlining services to partners and missionaries. Strong leaders, on the other hand, are needed if the organization intends to move into new territory.

Theology

Theological convictions are exceedingly significant. Beyond vision, identity, and leadership, a mission organization is first and foremost a Christian enterprise. Particularly in the early years, theology was a significant motivator for mission, for giving, and for commitment, modeling sacrifice, urgency, and perseverance in the face of persecution (See Chapter 3). Harry and Susan Strachan were convinced that the time was short for people to respond to Christ. Thus, they poured their whole energies into evangelism and launching an organization capable of sustaining their theological convictions.

The theological motivations have lessened in intensity since the founders’ days. Competing theologies have, at times, undercut the urgency of the evangelistic task. Today, while still important, theological motivation appears more personal than organizational.
Implications

There are significant distinctions between secular organizations and Christian mission organizations. While all of the secular theories discussed above applied to mission agencies too, the latter added further layers of complexity. As mentioned above, theological considerations, a non-for-profit status, and LAM’s seconding position introduced new organizational dynamics.

Beliefs

What might this imply for secular organizations? While secular businesses do not claim to have a theological component, nobody operates in an ideological vacuum (Schein 1992:89). By being more self-aware of their own spirituality and personal (as distinguished from organizational) core values, founders and leaders might harness latent theological motivations. These motivations would need to be framed appropriately for today’s pluralistic environment, but they may prove to elevate an organization’s self-identity and overall effectiveness. People in any age are willing to sacrifice for a cause they truly believe. Faith comes in many forms. Today’s leaders would be wise to unpack this implication for their own context.

Seconding

In an age characterized by free-lance writers, reporters, and mercenaries, it is no wonder that some missionaries operate quasi-independently. Needs abound in most every country. No one organization can micro-manage every possible ministry outlet. Seconding allows missionaries, under God, and under their local church and supporters, to address these concerns directly. Care must be taken, however, to communicate an accurate view of the unity of Christ’s body, the church. Ultimately it is the corporate
church in mission, under God, that is the primary vehicle for mission, not simply individuals.

**Multileveled Vision/Leadership**

Multi-tiered organizations require more flexible structures than typical businesses, churches, or even mission agencies offer. Organizations committed to dealing with multiple visions should consider an overarching multileveled approach. A multileveled or meta-organization attempts to provide on-site leadership and oversight, as well as organization-wide vision, all the while cooperating with local leadership and vision. While not appropriate for all contexts, the multilevel organization will work where personal and organizational agendas are compatible and flexible. It also provides greater personnel care and organizational possibilities than a strict seconding arrangement. A meta structure is particularly appropriate for multinational organizations.

**Leadership Development**

Without building deliberate leadership development mechanisms into an organization’s structure, a leadership gap will eventually occur. Although outside leaders and managers can bring new ideas to bear, they often lack a commitment to the organization’s history and culture.

Teams are an appropriate response to current generational and attitudinal shifts in the working environment. Teams can also become the context where apprentice leaders learn the art of leadership. Teams do not, however, obviate or replace the need for leaders. Teams are merely cooperative structures. Leaders are needed on teams, just as they are needed in hierarchical settings.
Leadership development presupposes the need for leaders. Nothing is more frustrating for leaders and followers alike than to work in an organization that actually needs a manager, not a leader. Organizations would do well to decide this fundamental question: “Does the organization require a leader or a manager at this organizational stage?” Both roles are appropriate in given situations. Mismatched roles, however, will either stagnate an organization desiring to move forward or split an organization requiring stability.

**Future Study**

No single study can pursue all of the interesting side trails uncovered. This study revealed two such possibilities warranting future attention.

**Christ For the City International**

While it may be too young now, in a few years a study devoted exclusively to Christ For the City International (CFCI) would be appropriate. The organization is particularly poised to work with the burgeoning USA Short Term Team (STT) phenomenon. In fact, CFCI president Duane Anderson is one of the STT movement’s top conference leaders. The organization is fresh, inter-cultural, and has momentum.

**Latin Missions Movement**

Like CFCI, the Latin Missions Movement (LMM) is just beginning. Fledgling mission organizations are being formed and missionaries are being sent out. Their stories need to be chronicled and added to the annals of missiological history. Studies need to be conducted on the most effective models for educating local church pastors and laity in missionary support. Latin-based missionary training models are needed for seminaries
and emerging educational structures. Organizational guidance is required for new Latin-based mission organizations and leaders. Deployment issues should be addressed in order to place Latinos in strategic locations that maximize their gifting, background, and vision.

**Rekindle the Passion**

This author would be amiss not to reaffirm the motivation for this study. LAM’s history provides ample evidence that God has used this organization significantly in the past. The question today is, “What could God do with LAM now?” Personally, this author believes LAM’s best days could be ahead. Given its strong organizational culture, LAM could recapture its original evangelistic vision of impacting an entire continent for Christ. It should rekindle the passion, drive, and sacrifice that created the organization in 1921. LAM will sacrifice the lesson’s gained over eight decades, however, if it settles for simply catering to other groups’ agendas. Yes, LAM should maintain its historic commitments to cooperation and partnership, but not at the expense of sacrificing its own God-given mandate to be about the task of world evangelization.

Far from reaching the end of its usefulness, the age of *missioning* continues. The state of the world at the beginning of the third millennium represents an enormous opportunity to share the love of Jesus Christ before he returns. Never before have so many people been within reach of so many Christian witnesses. The gospel must be shared in word and deed.

Mission organizations in the 21st century will be of a different breed. In an age of pragmatism, those who adapt will move forward, while those who rigidly hold to the past
will be left behind. Paul McKaughan, president of the *Evangelical Fellowship of Mission Agencies* (EFMA), notes that mission executives today are the most open to new ideas that he has ever seen and yet they are unwilling to commit to an unknown future (McKaughan 2001). Mission organizations are in a parenthesis time between paradigms (McKaughan 2001). Mission paradigm pioneers are needed to point the way forward.

Finally, the words which the angel spoke to the church in Thyatira can be true of organizations like LAM: “I know your deeds, your love and faith, your service and perseverance, and that you are now doing more than you did at first” (Revelation 2:19 NIV). With God, who knows the future, the best days are still ahead.
Appendix A: Associate Ministries

- Asociación de Acampamentos, Brazil
- Asociación de Iglesias Bíblicas Costarricenses, Costa Rica
- Asociación de Ministerios Cristianos a los Anglohablantes, Costa Rica
- Asociación Internacional de Campamentos Cristianos, Costa Rica
- Asociación de Iglesias Evangélicas del Caribe, Colombia
- Asociación de Ministerios Cristianos, Costa Rica
- Asociación Pro-Literatura Cristiana, Costa Rica
- Asociación Roblealto Pro Bienestar del Niño, Costa Rica
- Asociación Evangelistica Decisión, España
- Brazos Abiertos, Colombia
- Campamento Kikotén, México
- Campamento Roblealto, Costa Rica
- Castillo del Rey, México
- Centro de Documentación y Capacitación para la Acción Social, Costa Rica
- Centro Evangélico de Misiología Andino, Amazónica, Perú
- Centro de Victoria “La Roca,” México
- Centro Pastoral, Costa Rica
- Christian Camping International, Honduras
- Comunidad Colombiana de Colegios Cristianos, Colombia
- Comunidad Internacional de Estudiantes Evangélicos, Brazil
- Corporación Instituto Para la Educación Pastoral, Colombia
- Clínica Bíblica, Costa Rica
- Colegio Latinoamericano, Colombia
- Colegio Monterrey, Costa Rica
- Christ for the City International, Costa Rica, Colombia, México
- Cristo para Miami, USA
- Escuela Cristiana para Sordos, El Salvador
- Estancia Victória, Brasil
- Faro del Caribe, Costa Rica
- Fraternidad Teológica Latinoamericana, Perú
- Fundación Kairós, Argentina
- Futuro Juvenil, Colombia
- HCJB Radio Mundial, Ecuador
- Instituto Forum Latinum, USA
- Instituto Internacional de Evangelización a Fondo, Costa Rica
- Instituto de la Lengua Española, Costa Rica
- Latin America Mision, Miami Service Office, USA
- Letra Viva, Costa Rica
- Misión Latinoamericana de México, México
- Minamundo, Ecuador
- Ministerios de Literatura a Hispanoamericana, USA
- Oficina de Promoción y Desarrollo Social, Colombia
- PM Internacional—Pueblos Musulmanes, España
- Seminario Bíblico de Colombia, Colombia
- Seminario Escuela de Estudios Pastorales, Costa Rica
- Seminario Evangélico de Caracas, Venezuela
- Spearhead, México
- Unidad Cristiana Universitaria, Colombia
- Unidad de Ministros e Iglesias Cristianas Evangélicas, Colombia
- Union Church, Costa Rica
- Universidad Evangélica de las Américas, Costa Rica
- Unión Bíblica del Perú, Perú
- Vanguardia Juvenil, México
- Visión Evangélica de las Américas, México (LAM 2001)
### Appendix B: List of Interviewees

The following is a listing of those individuals or couples who participated in some way in this study. Interviews, questionnaires and conversations were conducted by phone, in person, by mail, by email, or a combination of these media. The column on the right indicates the missionary’s most significant organizational position, working status, country in which they served, or country in which they are currently serving.

#### Administrators

- Clayton L. (Mike) Berg  
  LAM’s fourth president, retired
- J. Paul Landrey  
  LAM’s fifth president, resigned
- David Howard  
  LAM’s sixth president, retired
- David Befus  
  LAM’s seventh president, current
- W. Dayton Roberts  
  LAM leader, former VP, retired
- Paul Pretiz  
  LAM leader, former VP, retired
- John Huffman  
  LAM and CFC leader, resigned
- Chip Anderson  
  LAM and CFC leader, resigned

#### Other LAM Missionaries

- Norm and Donna Piersma  
  Colombia, retired
- Lois Thiessen  
  Coworker with R. K. Strachan, retired
- Hugh Worsfold  
  Costa Rica, retired
- Edwin and Carolyn Kerr  
  Costa Rica and Spain
- René Padilla  
  Argentina, veteran Latino missionary
- Connie Kinch  
  Costa Rica, retired
- Bill and Sheila Burchett  
  Colombia and HQ, retired
- Ladoit and Ruth Stephens  
  Costa Rica, retired
- June and John McAdams  
  Costa Rica, retired
- Kathy Clark  
  Colombia and HQ
- Jeff and Barbi David  
  Mexico and Costa Rica
- William and Mary Isley  
  Costa Rica, younger missionaries
- Suzanne Emory  
  Costa Rica, younger single missionary
- Rebecca Meyerand  
  Mexico, younger single missionary
- Ralph and Laurie Tone  
  Argentina, transitioning
- Laura Smith  
  Venezuela, younger single missionary
- Jane Biggs  
  HQ, receptionist
- Robert and Nancy Sabean  
  Costa Rica, veteran missionaries
- Carol Nelson, Costa Rica and HQ
- Marilyn Meyers, HQ, assistant to president
- Miguel De Marco, Argentina and HQ, Latino
- Jorge and Gail Atiencia, Colombia, Latino
- Otto Kladensky Jr., Costa Rica, Latino, CFC, resigned
- Marie Strachan, R. Kenneth Strachan’s daughter
- John Stam, Costa Rica, veteran missionary
- Jo Ann Berg, Wife of LAM’s fourth president, retired
- Bill and Liz Baggenstoss, Costa Rica, younger missionaries, resigned
- Steve & Mary Ann Armet, Costa Rica, younger missionaries
Appendix C: Sample Interview Questions

The following is an illustration of the types of questions asked of the interviewees. Some interviews/questionnaires were tailored to the particular person. Even then, however the same material was typically covered in an attempt to uncover their story, particularly as it related to LAM vision, identity, leadership, and theology.

Tailored Sample

Dear________,

... Could you share your story with me, particularly as it relates to the following questions?

A) **Basics:** Your name; Email; Phone; Address; Number & Names of other family members that served with you under LAM; Dates you served LAM (from when to when); Positions; other basics....

B) **Tell Your Story:** What did you actually do? What countries were you in? Was your work satisfying? Did your family enjoy your missionary career?

What was your role as a LAM leader? What was LAM like at that stage? How was it at the end of your active service with LAM at that stage? What led up to you eventually leaving LAM? What didn't LAM have at that time that would have made it possible for you to remain? At heart here is the question, "Why does the organization lose good leaders like yourself?" Was there a reason or was it just the leading of God? What did you do in the following years?

What do you feel were the strongest accomplishments made during your career? What were your disappointments? How would you describe the condition of LAM when you led? When you left?

What was task force I and II? What did they accomplish? What was left undone?

Christ for the City was a significant LAM ministry. Could you tell me that story from your perspective? How did that program/ministry evolve? What were its origins? How did it relate to LAM's past? To EID? How did it relate to CLAME? What led LAM to re-engage in a direct ministry at that time? What were its goals? Why and how did the leadership of CFC change over to John Huffman? What strengths/weaknesses did this bring to the mix? Why did CFC get "spun" off? Was this a good thing or harmful to LAM? What was lost or gained? What did this do to LAM's ability to innovate or initiate new ministries?

C) **Follow-Up:** Why did you chose to serve with LAM? What (or Who) attracted you to it? Describe your relationship to Harry and Susan Strachan (if they were still alive then). To R. K. Strachan. What were they like to serve with? What did it mean to you to be part of the organization? How would you describe the culture or feel of the LAM when you joined? How did it change over time, or did it? What insights can you offer on other major LAM projects that you were aware of like EID and CLAME? What insights can you offer on other major LAM leaders?
Generic English Sample

Randy Smith here (LAMer on study leave who served in Costa Rica with AMCA) with a series of questions for you that I hope you can help me out on. I'm gathering data for my Ph.D. dissertation which involves LAM history and organizational issues. At this point I am interviewing a number of missionaries and would really appreciate it if you could share your story and insights with me. The following is a sort of "standard" list of questions that I'm asking of people:

Could you share your story with me, particularly as it relates to the following questions?

A) **Basics:** Your name; Email; Phone; Address; Number & Names of other family members that served with you under LAM; Dates you have served LAM (from when to when); other basics….

B) **Tell Your Story:** What do/did you actually do? What countries are/were you in? Is/was your work satisfying? Have you enjoyed your missionary career?
   - What was LAM like when you joined? What was LAM's "identity," or what it meant to be a LAMer? How would you describe it at this time? What has changed or stayed the same?
   - What do you feel are the strongest accomplishments you've made during your years? What were the weaknesses or disappointments?
   - How would you describe your working environment and the "attitude" of your partner entity? Of the environment working with other LAMers? What changes have you observed over the years positive or negative?

C) **Follow-Up:** Why did you chose to serve with LAM? What (or Who) attracted you to it? What did it mean to be part of the organization for you? What was LAM's "vision" as you understood it when you joined? What do you understand LAM's "vision" to be today? How would you describe the culture or feel of the LAM when you joined? How has it change over time, or has it? What has been the role of LAM leadership from your perspective? What insights can you offer on major LAM projects that you were either a part of or were aware of like EID, CLAME, AMCA, CFC, Spearhead? What insights can you offer on any LAM presidents other major LAM leaders?

D) **Extra:** What are the opportunities in Latin America for ministry that you think LAM should take advantage of? What do you hope to see of LAM in the next 15 years? What do you need from LAM that you are receiving? What do you need from LAM that you are not yet receiving?
   - *Anything else you want to tell me?*

This is a lot of info to deal with I know, but I really am interested. Thanks for your input!

-Randy Smith
rtnb@msn.com
116 Gaile Morris Ct.
Wilmore, KY  40390
Tel:  (859) 858-8349
Buenas Días,
Randy Smith aquí, soy LAMer estudiando en seminario Asbury, en el estado de Kentucky. Recojo data para mi disertación que enfrenta la Misión Latinoamericana. ¿Puede compartir su historia en LAM conmigo?

Comparta particularmente en las siguientes areas/topicas:

A) Básicos: Su nombre, país, teléfono, correo electrónico, los nombres de su familia que sirven con usted en la obra. Las fechas que han servido con LAM. Etc.

B) Su Historia: ¿Qué hizo y/o hace con LAM? En cual países estaban y cuando? ¿Estaba la obra satisfecha? ¿Le gusta, su familia, el ministerio?

¿Como fue LAM cuando empezó su ministerio? ¿Como fue la “cultura,” la ambiente, la identidad de LAM? ¿Que significó ser un misionero LAM? ¿Como describe LAM ahora? ¿Qué ha cambiado o queda la misma? ¿Que siente son sus mejores contribuciones en sus años de servicio? ¿Que eran los desafíos o cosas que le traí a usted?
¿Cómo describe las condiciones de trabajar con su entidad local? Como fue el actitud y ambiente del ministerio local? ¿Como fue el medio de trabajar con otros misioneros LAM? ¿Que cambios ha observado sobre los años positivo o negativo?

C) Subsiguiente: ¿Por que escogió servir con LAM? ¿Que o quien te atracó a LAM? ¿Que significó ser parte de la organización? ¿Que fue la “visión” de LAM cuando unió? ¿Que entiende ser la “visión” de LAM hoy? ¿Como describe la “cultura” de LAM cuando empezó? ¿Como ha cambiado sobre tiempo? ¿De su perspectivo, que ha sido el papel del liderazgo en LAM?
¿Que penetraciones puede ofrecer sobre los mayores proyectos LAM como Evangelismo al Fundo, CLAME, AMCA, Cristo para la Ciudad, Spearhead? ¿Que penetraciones tiene sobre los presidentes pasados de LAM y de otros lideres mayores?

D) Extra: ¿Como es ser un misionero latino? Como es ser latino y trabajar con LAM? ¿Que oportunidades hay en América Latina para ministerio, que piensa que LAM debe de participar? ¿Donde ve LAM en los siguientes quince años? ¿Que necesita de LAM que recibe? ¿Qué necesita de LAM que no recibe? ¿Qué mas puede decirme?

Yo se que es mucho información, pero, realmente tengo interés en su historia. ¡Gracias para sus informes!

-Randy Smith

correo electrónico: rtmb@msn.com

direcciones: Randy Smith; 116 Gaile Morris Ct.; Wilmore, KY 40390
teléfono: 859-858-834
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