

Why Change Dissolution Clause, unless Preparing to Dissolve MBC? (Sell & transfer or merge)

Amidst the flurry of other changes to the Constitution being proposed by MBC Leadership, there is one that is particularly interesting. It is the change to the Dissolution Clause – Art XI, Sect 2 in the current Constitution, Article VII, Section 7 in the Proposed.

With all the other changes being proposed, and all the fuss and confusion that it creates, why would the MBC Leadership make a change to this section of the Constitution at this time – unless they thought it was very important to do *now*.

It is quite a separate issue apart from the changes to the regular and routine operations of the church already being proposed. They certainly could have waited for the dust to settle on the other changes before raising this issue. But for some reason they thought it was so overwhelming important, that it had to be done now.

Setting aside the problems with the actual changes in the text for the moment, the question arises: *Why on earth would they want to make a change now in the dissolution clause, unless they were preparing to sell the property, liquidate the assets, and then either transfer the assets to another non-profit or merge with another organization?*

The Elders have received questions on this point before and seem to indicate they are not contemplating such a move, but this proposed change would seem to indicate otherwise.

Further, from what we can observe, it would seem that the financial situation for MBC is slowly sinking and we may be approaching the point where we can no longer sustain operations financially.

Then there are the changes to the language itself. It is important to note that these changes are significant.

Under the current Constitution, any assets remaining after the church is dissolved would be “...*divided among the missions organizations supported by the McLean Bible Church and those represented by the missionaries receiving support from the church, proportioned on the basis of current support...*” as long as each was still a valid 501(C) 3. This would mean that the missions we are supporting at the time of dissolution would receive a share of the remaining assets proportional to our current support for them.

But under the Proposed Constitution, this language is changed to say the remaining assets “...*will be distributed exclusively for the religious purposes of the Church to religious organizations described in section 501(c) (3)...*”. There is no mention of missions organizations or missionaries. As this change creates a more nebulous definition of recipients, the Elders will now have wide latitude and discretion to pass on the assets to a broad range of 501 (C) 3 organizations. It is also my personal understanding that both the state and IRS would be quite flexible and generous in approving the organizations to receive the assets, as long as those organizations receiving the assets are Tax Exempt / non-profit organizations. One can only speculate as to what organizations the Elders would select to be on the list to receive the transfer of assets.

But the question remains: “Why else would the MBC Leadership propose to change the Dissolution clause as part of the myriad of other changes being proposed now in the Church’s Constitution, unless it was contemplating a dissolution of the property and assets? (We should understand that this dissolution could be used not only to transfer assets to another organization. It could also be used to form a merger, to merge MBC with another organization.) This proposed change is not a good sign.

No matter how you look at this, something appears to be hinky here and is just another reason to vote “No” on the Proposed Constitution and prevent the Elders from having this expanded power.

One More Very Concerned Member