

PERSPECTIVE ONE

EVANGELICAL AND ECUMENICAL ANTECEDENTS

The Protestant Reformation did not produce a missionary movement. The Reformers were not “missionary” in their thinking and purposes. The nations may have found a place in theology, but there was no tangible expression of mission in practice.¹ This deficiency has been variously explained. Latourette ascribes the Protestant failure to six causes.² First, Protestantism in its early stages was so preoccupied with internal affairs and with “making a place for itself against Roman Catholicism” that it had little concern for non-Christians outside Europe. Second, early Protestant leaders held that the Great Commission had been fulfilled long ago and had been binding only upon the original Apostles, hence imposed no further obligation. Third, wars—the Protestants were fighting for existence. Fourth, Protestant rulers were indifferent to the spread of Christian faith among non-Christians (in contrast to Roman Catholic governments who were sometimes eager for the spread of Catholicism). Fifth, Protestants lacked any structure for mission, having abolished the religious orders.³ Sixth, they lacked contact with non-Christian peoples.

Protestantism was a “reform” movement. Its concern was the Church, whereas mission pertains to the world. The Reform did not result in mission. With the advent of Pietism, however, Protestantism gained a missionary vision.

THE RISE OF PROTESTANT MISSIONS

1. **The Pietists.** Pietism originated in Germany and is associated with the names of Spener, its father, and Franke, its scholar, who as its leader gave a great impetus to missions from Halle, the Pietist training centre. Pietism was a spiritual movement within the nominal Lutheran State Church, the power of which was felt far beyond Germany.

In England Pietism was an important influence in the formation of the Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) in 1699 and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG) in 1701. Both were directed toward the British colonies, not so much as instruments for the conversion of non-Christians, but to serve the British Christians.

When in 1705 King Frederick IV of Denmark wanted to send missionaries to his colonies in India, his own church was spiritually cold, but he found candidates at Halle. Thus was launched the Royal Danish-Halle mission. Financed by the Danish King, the first missionaries were the German pietists Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg and Heinrich Plutschau who arrived in Tranquebar in 1706. Pietism was the vanguard of the modern missionary movement. Ziegenbalg's biographer waxes eloquent:

In order that love for missions and the sense of responsibility in evangelical Christendom for the non-Christian world might be awakened and become a fact, hardly any more suitable mission field could have been found... And that such a sincere and highly gifted person as Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg should enter India as the first missionary and apostle of the evangelical world mission was due to the wonderful guidance of God.⁴

It is an interesting fact that the early English as well as the Danish mission were staffed by German pietists. Thus under the best known of the Tranquebar missionaries, Christian Friedrich Schwarz, who served continuously in India from 1750 to 1798, "the Tranquebar Mission reached its Zenith" as "the Lutheran missionaries spread to all the European stations of Tamilnad" and the "methodical pattern of German pietism appeared everywhere."⁵

But the greatest impact of Pietism was to come through the Moravians. When in 1722 Count Zinzendorf gave shelter to the persecuted Moravian Brethren, they founded on his estate a colony called Herrnhut which became the centre of a world-wide missionary endeavor. "The entire Moravian community made obedience to the Great Commission its chief objective. By the time Carey went to India, Moravian missions had been planted in Europe, North and South America, Africa, Asia, and the Islands of the Sea."⁶

It seems significant that John Wesley came in contact with the Moravians on his voyage to North America and later with Zinzendorf in Europe.

2. **The Evangelicals.** "The Evangelical Revival in England was to the Church of England as Churchly Pietism was to the Lutheran Church."⁷

The movement associated with the names of Wesley and Whitefield is said to have transformed the religious and social life of England.⁸ John Wesley denounced the social evils of his day and urged reforms.⁹ Secular historians have paid tribute to the Evangelical awakening in England as having completely altered the course of history.

And the awakening stirred missionary concern. "These revivals . . . stimulated the expansion of the faith."¹⁰ England was revived, and Christianity was firmly planted among the colonists in America, but also there developed missions to non-Christians—"almost immediately to the American Indians and to Negroes on the English plantations in the New World, and later to other parts of the world."¹¹

The Awakening spread across all denominational lines. "The sweeping power of the Evangelical Awakening in England moved in the Baptist and Congregational fellowships and helped to pave the way for Carey's pioneering accomplishment in missionary organization."¹²

In his *Enquiry* William Carey made reference to Ziegenbalg and the Moravians and to mission work in the West Indies of "the late Mr. Wesley" (who passed away while the *Enquiry* was being completed).¹³ Carey was a product of the Evangelical Awakening. "Wesley's emphasis upon God's free grace led logically to an enlarged concern for foreign mission."¹⁴ As Hogg states regarding the Wesleyan Revival, "this fresh burst of Christian vigour embodied the spirit of world missions."¹⁵

Pietism and the Evangelical Awakening—these precedents paved the way for William Carey with whom the modern missionary movement began.

3. **William Carey.** Carey embodied the genius of the Evangelical Awakening and the inspiration of Captain Cook. As Carey the cobbler mended shoes, he studied the Bible and the

world. From scraps of leather he made a map upon which he traced the journeys of Captain Cook. Carey's imagination—soul—was stirred. Carey began to think about people beyond England; beyond Europe, beyond Christendom. Then one day Carey stood up in a Baptist minister's meeting and suggested that they do something about taking the Gospel to the heathen. John Ryland's reply typified the Calvinism of the day: "Sit down young man; when God wants to convert the heathen, He'll do it without your help or mine." That happened in 1785. In 1792 William Carey made his reply in the publication of *An Enquiry Into the Obligations of Christians To Use Means For the Conversion of the Heathens*. As Ernest Payne states, "The publication of Carey's *Enquiry* may rightly be regarded as a landmark in Christian history."¹⁶ Shortly after this, Carey preached his famous sermon from Isaiah 54:2, "Expect great things from God, attempt great things for God." Within five months the Baptist Missionary Society was formed.

The first line of the *Enquiry* reads, "As our blessed Lord has required us to pray that his kingdom may come, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven, it becomes us not only to express our desires of that event by words, but to use every lawful method to spread the knowledge of his name."¹⁷ That was a direct challenge to the rebuff by his senior pastor of a few years before.

The *Enquiry* is a missiological treatise of five sections. The first section is theological. Here Carey inquires whether the Great Commission is still binding upon Christians and concludes that it is. He thus challenges the assumptions that it was fulfilled in the first century and that missionary obligation died with the Apostles.

The second section is historical. Carey presented a resume of missions from the time of the Apostle Paul down to the eighteenth century. Missions did not end with the apostles! Carey discussed the missionary penetration of Europe, the work of the Jesuits in Asia, of John Elliott and David Brainerd in America, of Ziegenbalg at Tranquebar and of the Moravian Brethren. Last of all he spoke of the late John Wesley who "Lately made an effort in the West-Indies, and some of their ministers are now labouring amongst the Caribbs and Negroes, and I have seen pleasing accounts of their success."¹⁸

The third section is a survey of the world. In it Carey tried to determine the status of Christianity in the countries of the world. Populations are listed as Christian, Jewish, Mahomedan and Pagan. Most of the world outside of Europe was classified as "pagan". He estimated 420 million pagans, 130 million Mahomedans, 100 million Catholics, 44 million Protestants, "thirty millions of the Greek and Armenian churches, and perhaps seven millions of Jews" out of a total of 731 million inhabitants.¹⁹ He discussed conditions of ignorance and immorality, then stated, "All these things are loud calls to Christians and especially to ministers, to exert themselves to the utmost in their several spheres of action, and to try to enlarge them as much as possible."²⁰

Section four is concerned with "Practicability of something being done, more than what is done, for the Conversion of the Heathen,"²¹ The objections were said to be five: distance, languages, uncivilized conditions, danger of being killed, and the difficulty of obtaining necessities. To all of these Carey agreed, but replied, "A Christian minister is a person who in a peculiar sense is *not his own*; he is the *servant* of God, and therefore ought to be wholly devoted to Him."²²

The final section contains practical suggestions as to "the Duty of Christians in general, and what Means ought to be used, in order to promote this work." Carey was reiterating his thesis that Christians should take positive steps "to concur with God in promoting his glorious designs."²³ Carey's first suggestion was prayer: "One of the first, and most important of those duties which are incumbent upon us, is fervent and united prayer." But Carey did not stop there (even his Calvinist opponents were willing to pray for the heathen). He added: "We must not be contented however with praying, without exerting ourselves in the use of means for the obtaining of those things we pray for."²⁴ Carey's idea of "means" was very specific; he proposed the formation of a society to promote the Gospel in foreign lands: "I would therefore propose that such a society and committee should be formed amongst the *particular baptist denominations*."²⁵ A tangible obstacle, however, was lack of funds. The Baptists apparently objected that they had no money to support a society since they lacked access to the royal treasury (perhaps thinking of the patronage of the King of Denmark which had launched the

Danish-Halle Mission). But Carey reasoned that if people with very moderate circumstances would devote a portion, suppose a tenth, of their annual increase to the Lord, it would be more than enough not only “to support the ministry of the gospel at home, and to encourage village preaching in our respective neighbourhoods, but to defray the expenses of carrying the gospel into the heathen world.”²⁶ He concludes, “Surely it is worth while to lay ourselves out with all our might, in promoting the cause, and kingdom of Christ.”²⁷

In 1793 Carey and party landed in India, the first missionaries under the newly-formed Particular Baptist Society for Propogating the Gospel Among the Heathen. The Baptist Missionary Society (BMS), as it soon became known, was different from other societies that preceeded it because it was not colonial: it was not designed to serve the Christians but to propagate the Gospel in the non-Christian world.

4. New Structures. Carey is called the Father of Modern Missions not only because of the BMS, nor because he came from England to India, but because he recovered for Protestants the missing structure for mission, the *society*.

The Baptist Missionary Society (1792) was quickly followed by the formation of the London Missionary Society and the Netherlands Missionary Society in 1795. Then came the Church Missionary Society in 1799 (representing the evangelical awakening within the Anglican Church but sending German Pietists as its first missionaries), the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, the Presbyterian Foreign Missionary Society, the Netherlands Missionary Society, the Rhenish Missionary Society, the Leipzig Mission, the Basel Society, the Berlin Missionary Society, the Gossner Missionary Society, the Berlin Missionary Seminary (which was founded in 1800 and in 27 years had sent out 80 missionaries)—in all there were 8 Germans societies, the expressions of Pietism—the Danish Missionary Society (1821), the Norwegian Missionary Society (1842), the Swedish Missionary Society (1835) and others. To the list should be added the Bible Societies, the “Faith Mission” societies (e.g. Hudson Taylor’s China Inland Mission), the Salvation Army, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, the Evangelical Alliance Mission and other

later agencies. “The total of all the organizations, local, regional, and national, must have mounted into the thousands.”²⁸

Thus the formation of the BMS was a momentous historical event. Here then was a dynamic innovation “in which laity and clergy joined” to form a voluntary agency for propagating the Christian faith, a Protestant equivalent to the Roman Catholic orders.²⁹ The result, states Winter, was a rush to use Carey’s kind of “means” for converting the non-Christian world to Christ. “Once this method of operation was clearly understood by the Protestants, three hundred years of latent energies burst forth in what became ‘the Great Century’.”³⁰ The Protestant missionary societies became the new structures for mission, the vehicle for evangelical initiative.

The modern missionary movement is directly tied to Pietism and the Evangelical Awakening through Carey.

NINETEENTH CENTURY COOPERATION

Carey not only urged the involvement of all denominations, but he saw the importance of cooperation and consultation in the work of mission. Carey was a missiologist who, in his insight, thinking and work, was far ahead of his time. As early as 1806 Carey proposed that a world conference be convened at the Cape of Good Hope in 1810.

The Cape of Good Hope is now in the hands of the English; should it continue so, would it not be possible to have a general association of all denominations of Christians, from the four quarters of the world, kept there one in about ten years? I earnestly recommend this plan, let the first meeting be in the year 1810, or 1812 at furthest. I have no doubt it would be attended with very important effects; we could understand one another’s views by two hours conversation than by two or three years epistolary correspondence.³¹

The consultation was never held. The proposal, says Payne, was dismissed as “one of Carey’s pleasing dreams.”³²

1. Cooperative Missionary Conferences on the Fields. Carey’s dream had to wait for fulfilment until the World Missionary Conference gathered in Edinburgh in 1910, one hundred years later. But in the meantime on the fields there was cooperation and consultation among the missionaries.

India exemplified this ideal. First were the local conferences at Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. In Bombay missionaries of the American Board, the IMS, the CMS, and the Scottish Missionary Society all got together. In Calcutta the Protestant missionary force met monthly at the Baptist Mission Press. And in Madras there was an organized Missionary Conference.

The second stage was the initiation of North India and South India Conferences which was broader than the local conferences. The first North Indian Conference was held in 1855 when 6 societies met in Calcutta; it met again in 1857 at Benares, and again in 1862 at Lahore at which time they celebrated the Lord's supper. The South India Conference convened in 1858 in Ootacammund, in 1879 in Bangalore, and in Madras in 1900 as a "working" conference with delegates from 26 groups.

Finally the third stage was the All-India Conference with workers from the whole of India at Allahabad in 1873, Calcutta in 1883, Bombay in 1893 (with 620 members present) and Madras in 1902. Madras 1902 set a pattern for Edinburgh 1910.

Similar events took place in Japan at Yokohama in 1872, Osaka in 1883, and Tokyo in 1900 when missionaries of various societies and denominations gathered together not only for fellowship, but also to discuss the work of mission.

China held missionary conferences at Shanghai in 1877, in 1890, and 1907. Among the themes, problems, and needs that were discussed was that of "Unity".

Other conferences were held in Africa, and in Latin America. There were conferences for the Moslem World, conferences which considered comity and permanent cooperation entailing organization. The "common ground" in all these conferences was the task of propagating the Gospel. What denominationally divided churches at the home base had never achieved was accomplished by the missionaries who were able to cross the divisions and barriers as they engaged in mission. It is not surprising that the ecumenical movement evolved from the world missionary movement.

2. Anglo-American Conferences. The popular appeal of Missions as well as their promotion is indicated by a series of

conferences in Britain and America. The first were held at New York and London in 1854. These first two are of interest to us because of the presence and influence of Alexander Duff who was to make an impact in India. Conferences took place at Liverpool in 1860, London in 1878 and 1888, and at New York in 1900. The Ecumenical Missionary Conference that met in New York from April 21 to May 1, 1900 is described by Hogg:

Its daily sessions crowded more than 4,000 people into Carnegie Hall, and overflow meetings were necessary. In all, between 170,000 and 200,000 people are estimated to have attended its various meetings. The word "ecumenical" had been employed increasingly to describe past missionary conferences. Now for the first time, it appeared in the title. "Ecumenical" was used, however, not because the conference represented every branch of the Christian church, but "because the plan of campaign which it proposes covers the whole area of the inhabited globe." For sheer size, it was the largest missionary conference that has ever been held. It claimed for its president a former chief Executive of the United States, Benjamin Harrison, and it was opened with an address from the President of the United States, William McKinley.

The conference demonstrated as nothing before had ever done the outreach of the missionary enterprise around the world and the popular interest that it claimed.³³

In stark contrast to the antagonism and indifference of the pre-Carey era, missions had now captured the imagination and attention of a significant sector of the Protestant world.

3. Cooperation at the Home Base. The New York Conference of 1900 revealed the enthusiasm of the common people who supported missions. Here was voluntary cooperation at the "grass roots" level.

At the home base there was also the beginning of organizational cooperation. A London Secretaries' Association began in 1819 representing the BMS, LMS, CMS, and the WMMS. Later the China Inland Mission, the SPG and the Bible Society became members. Interdenominational agencies and movements, rather than being excluded, were an integral part of cooperative efforts.

In Europe we hear of Northern Missionary Conferences of Scandinavian Lutherans, a Continental Missions Conference in Bremen, Germany and a German Standing Committee of which G. Warneck was secretary. There existed a Dutch General Missionary Conference. In 1893 was founded a Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

Cooperation was both international and interdenominational. As Johnston states. "The predominance of the pietist spirit in nineteenth century missions not only made coordination and cooperation possible but actively encouraged it."³⁴ The objective of cooperation was conversion of the world to Christ.

4. Student Movement. The student movement of foreign missions has its roots in the famed "haystack" prayer meeting of 1806 in North America. A student named Samuel Mills, who was enrolled in Williams College in Massachusetts and who was interested in missions, prayed regularly for a religious awakening on the campus. David Howard relates the story:

It was Mills' custom to spend Wednesday and Saturday afternoons in prayer with other students on the banks of the Hoosack River or in a valley near the college. In August, 1806, Mills and four others were caught in a thunderstorm while returning from their usual meeting. Seeking refuge under a haystack they waited out the storm and gave themselves to prayer. Their special focus of prayer that day was for the awakening of foreign missionary interest among students. Mills directed their discussion and prayer to their own missionary obligation. He exhorted his companions with the words that later became a watchword for them, "We can do this if we will."³⁵

From this prayer meeting emerged the first student missionary organization in America from which in turn would come the initial impulse for overseas missions on the part of American churches. Mills eventually entered Andover Theological Seminary where he was joined by Adoniram Judson in the promotion of missions. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions emerged through the instigation of these two and other "Brethren".³⁶

The "haystack" developed into the "Brethren" Society at Williams College and was organized in 1808 formally calling

themselves the Society of Brethren. It was a secret society, but their purpose was to spread the Gospel around the world. In 1811 at another American college "The Society of Inquiry" was formed, and, with similar groups on other campuses, became influential in promoting missionary activity. Howard states,

So pronounced was this missionary activity among students that the establishment of Societies of Inquiry became widespread by the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1856, there were 158 colleges and 46 theological seminaries in the United States. Seventy of these colleges had Christian societies of one sort or another. Of these, 49 had societies which included in their title "Society of Inquiry" to designate foreign missionary emphasis.³⁷

A number of emerging organizations coincided to form a dynamic movement for missions. The Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) was formed in 1844 with evangelistic purposes. Evangelist D. L. Moody was instrumental in its formation. The YMCA was not only evangelistic, but it was part of the student movement for foreign missions. Under secretary Wishard the YMCA programme focused upon foreign missions.³⁸

In the year 1866 D. L. Moody invited students to spend the month of July studying the Bible at Mt. Hermon. The conference began with no formal programme. Informal discussion centred around the Bible. Through the conference, students continued to meet for prayer that God would raise up a great host of missionary volunteers. Gradually missionary enthusiasm grew. By the end of the conference 99 out of the 251 students present had indicated their desire to go to the unevangelized fields.³⁹

Meanwhile, the Princeton Foreign Missionary Society had been organized on the Princeton campus and also from this an Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance, another branch of the student movement, was formed. This linked similar organizations on various campuses. The first meeting of this Alliance drew together some 250 students from 32 colleges and seminaries "centering wholly on the home and foreign missionary obligations of the church and of the schools and colleges."⁴⁰ The influence was far reaching and the Alliance continued to hold annual conventions. Eventually this organization was replaced by the Student Volunteer Movement.

Moody's work in the Mt. Hermon is not unrelated to that at Princeton. At Mt. Hermon the students had signed the Princeton Declaration stating that they were "desirous and willing, God permitting, to go to the unevangelized portions of the world."⁴¹ Among these students were John R. Mott, Samuel Zwemer, and Robert E. Speer, each destined to become a significant leader in world missions. This was the beginning of a ministry on the campuses which, by the end of 1887, had enrolled 2,106 students for missionary work.⁴² No wonder that the following year, 1888, saw the formation of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions with John R. Mott as Chairman. Their watchword was "the evangelization of the world in this generation."

The Student Volunteer Movement continued to grow until in the 1920 Convention at Des Moines there were 6,000 students in attendance. One of the addresses that day was given by Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer. Entitled "The Reality of the Difficulties on the Mission Field," Zwemer's message challenged the audience to sacrificial commitment:

In a few hours all who are here present in this hall will be back again in the comfort of our hotels or the hospitality of the homes of Des Moines. Every one of us tonight will enjoy the material luxuries of our American civilization, but the spiritual luxuries, they are enjoying over there. The men who tonight over there on the border marches of the Kingdom of Christ are enduring hardship and loneliness and isolation and pain and misunderstanding and persecution, are the ones to be envied, not we. They are dealing in dynamics; we are dealing in statistics. They have loneliness and we have the crowds. They have Christ and some of us here are still looking for Him. They are shedding blood and tears and we are, some of us, satisfied by shedding ink.⁴³

The Student Christian Movement also grew out of this movement in Great Britain. In more recent history the Student Foreign Missions Fellowship was formed in 1936 as a new successor to SVM (linked with Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship).

To conclude: Pietism, the Protestant missionary movement, movements of cooperation, and the student movement all shared one undying concern—the mandate to pursue the unfinished missionary obligation. The missionary and ecumenical movements originate from these common roots.

NOTES

- * ECUMENICAL MISSIONARY CONFERENCE NEW YORK, 1900, VOL. 1. American Tract Society: New York, 1900.
- 1. Various attempts have been made to defend Luther and Calvin on this score. Recently Vander Werff (*Christian Mission to Muslims: the Record*) has brought out the latent missionary impulse in Luther's teachings. "While Luther does not prepare a program of missions *per se*, he was keen on preaching the Gospel to all lands." (p.12). "Luther's limited treatment of mission is due to external circumstances, not to theological defect" (p. 13). Luther did, however see the Turks (who invaded Europe) as an opportunity for preaching the Gospel, and demanded that the Pope "send evangelists rather than warriors to the Turks" (p. 13). Likewise Calvin is said to have created a theological foundation for missions so that "wherever Calvinism spread, it planted the latent seeds of missionary zeal" (p. 16).
- 2. Latourette, *Three Centuries of Advance*, pp. 25-26.
- 3. This may well have been the most serious disability of all. As Latourette notes, "Protestants lacked the monks who for more than a thousand years had been the chief agents for propagating the faith.
- 4. Eric Beyreuther, *Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg*, p. 17.
- 5. Firth, *An Introduction to Indian Church History*, p. 143.
- 6. W. Richey Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundations*, p.3. Colin Grant adds that "In the first 150 years of its endeavor, the Moravian community was to send no less than 2,158 of its members overseas!" (*Europe's Moravians – A Pioneer Missionary Church*, p. 219).
- 7. Durnbaugh, *The Believers' Church*, p. 130.
- 8. Hogg, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
- 9. J. Edwin Orr, "Evangelical Dynamic and Social Action", p. 275. Latourette, *op. cit.* p. 399, lists the evils opposed and reforms encouraged by Wesley and his followers.
- 10. Latourette, *op. cit.*, 49.
- 11. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
- 12. Hogg, *loc. cit.*
- 13. Cf. comment by Dr. Ernest A. Payne in his "Introduction" to the 1961 facsimile edition of Carey's *Enquiry*, p. xiv. The reference to Wesley is on p. 37 of the *Enquiry*.
- 14. Hogg, *loc. cit.*
- 15. Hogg, *loc. cit.*

16. Ernest A. Payne, in his "Introduction" to the fascimile edition of Carey's *Enquiry*, p. i
17. William Carey, *Enquiry*, p. 3.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
28. Latourette, *The Great Century*, p. 94.
29. Latourette, *Three Centuries of Advance*, p. 50.
30. Winter, "The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Missions", p. 132.
31. Quoted by Payne in his "Introduction" to Carey's *Enquiry*, pp. xviii-xix.
32. *Ibid.*, p. xix.
33. Hogg, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
34. Arthur P. Johnston, *World Evangelism and the Word of God*, p. 58.
35. Howard, *Student Power in World Evangelism*, p. 67.
36. Latourett, *The Great Century*, pp. 80, 81.
37. Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 74.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 82-84.
40. Hogg, *op. cit.*, p. 84.
41. Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
43. Zwemer's address is found in the published proceedings of the Des Moines Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement, p. 231.

Document One:

From the Ecumenical Missionary Conference, New York 1900.

THE SUPREME AND DETERMINING AIM

Robert E. Speer

It is the aim of foreign missions that is to be defined, and not the aim of the Christian Church in the world, or of the Christian nations of the world. There are many good and Christian things which it is not the duty of the foreign missionary enterprise to do. Some things are to be laid, from the beginning, upon the shoulders of the new Christians; some are to be left to be discharged in due time by the native Christian churches that shall arise, and there are many blessings, political, commercial and philanthropic, which the Christian nations owe to the heathen world, which are not to be paid through the enterprise of foreign missions. It is the aim of a distinctive, specific movement that we are to consider.

It will help us in defining it to remind ourselves, for one thing, that we must not confuse the aim of foreign missions with the results of foreign missions. There is no force in the world so powerful to accomplish accessory results as the work of missions. Wherever it goes it plants in the hearts of men forces that produce new lives; it plants among communities of men forces that create new social combinations. It is impossible that any human tyranny should live where Jesus Christ is King. All these things the foreign mission movement accomplishes; it does not aim to accomplish them. I read in a missionary paper a little while ago that the foreign mission that was to accomplish results of permanent value must aim at the total reorganization of the whole social fabric. This is a mischievous doctrine. We learn nothing from human history, from the experience of the Christian Church, from the example of our Lord and His apostles to justify it. They did not aim directly at such an end. They were content to aim at implanting the life of Christ in the hearts of men, and were willing to leave the consequences to the care of God. It is a dangerous thing to charge ourselves openly before the world with the aim of reorganizing States and reconstructing society. How long could the missions live, in the Turkish Empire or the Native States of India, that openly proclaimed their aim to be the political reformation of the lands to which they went? It is misleading, also, as Dr. Behrends once declared, to confuse the ultimate issues with the immediate aims; and it is not only misleading, it is fatal. Somethings can only be secured by those who do not seek them. Missions are powerful to transform the face of society, because they ignore the face of society and deal with it at its heart. They yield such powerful political and social results because they do not concern themselves with them.

It will help us also to remind ourselves that we must not confuse the aims of missions with the methods of missions. It is an easy thing to select a method with a view to the accomplishment of some given end, and then, because the end is difficult of accomplishment, because the method is easy of operation, because its results, apart altogether from the main aim, are pleasant and useful in themselves, it is easy to exalt the method into the place of the end. Have not many of us seen this same happen, to be quite frank, in our schools? We establish a school with a view to the realization of our aim; the aim becomes a difficult thing, the maintenance of the school is an easy thing. It is a good and civilizing thing in itself, and by and by we sacrifice for the lesser good the greater aim. Our method rises up into the place of our end and appropriates to its support for its own sake that which the aim had a right to claim should be devoted to it for the aim's sake alone. Let us once and for all distinguish in our minds between the aim of missions and the results and methods of missions.

Having cleared the ground so far, what is the aim of foreign missions? For one thing, it is a religious aim. We can not state too strongly in an age when the thought of men is full of things, and the body has crept up on the throne of the soul, that our work is not immediately and in itself a philanthropic work, a political work, a secular work of any sort whatsoever; it is a spiritual and a religious work. Of course, religion must express itself in life, but religion is spiritual life. I had rather plant one seed of the life of Christ under the crust of heathen life than cover that whole crust over with the veneer of our social habits or the vestiture of western civilization. We go into the world not primarily as trustees of a better social life; we go as the trustees of His life who said of Himself: "I am come that they might have life, and might have it more abundantly." "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

"The aim of missions," to borrow President Washburn's phrase, "is to make Jesus Christ known to the world." You can adopt other phraseology, if you please. You can say the aim of missions is the evangelization of the world, or to preach the gospel to the world. And if we understand these terms in their scriptural sense, they are synonymous with the phrase which I have just quoted. But many of us will persist in using them at less than their scriptural value. And to make perfectly clear what the aim of missions is, I paraphrase them in these other words—the aim of foreign missions is to make Jesus Christ known to the world.

And almost any method, almost any agency, may be recognized as legitimate which subjects itself with utter fidelity to this supreme aim. As Alexander Duff said years and years ago, in a conference in this city, which was the prototype and forerunner of this: "The chief means, of Divine appointment, for the evangelization of the world are the faithful teaching and preaching of the pure gospel of salvation by duly qualified ministers and other holy and consistent disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ, accompanied with prayer and savingly applied by the grace of the Holy Spirit; such means, in the providential application of them by human agency, embracing not merely instruction by the living voice, but the translation and

judicious circulation of the whole written Word of God, the preparation and circulation of evangelical tracts and books, as well as any other instrumentalities fitted to bring the Word of God home to men's souls, together with any processes which experience may have sanctioned as the most efficient in raising up everywhere indigenous ministers and teachers of the living gospel." I call that fair and broad. It sets out openly a range of mission effort that will throttle and restrict no useful missionary enterprise, and it exalts to a predominant and royal place the supreme end of making Jesus Christ known to His world.

I choose this language because it does not lift off our shoulders the burden of responsibility that we can not escape, and it does not lay there a burden of responsibility that we cannot bear. We dare not say that we have done our duty when we have spoken Christ's name to the world, or that we have made Jesus Christ known to the world when we have given the world such a proclamation of Christ as would suffice for us who already know Him to take in the full meaning of the message. Neither, on the other hand, dare any man tell us that we are to struggle, hopeless, under the burden of the world's conversion. We can not convert one single soul; how shall we convert the world? Yet, midway between the position of no responsibility and of all responsibility, we stand sharing something with God, sharing also something with our brethren of the world. We can not sever ourselves from that link of loving sympathy which binds us to their death; we can not sever ourselves from that link of loving sympathy which binds us to His life. We are meant to be, between His life and their death, channels of the grace and salvation of God.

The aim of missions is to make Jesus Christ known to the world with a view to the salvation of men for that eternity which embraces alike the time that is to come and the time that now is. We can not narrow salvation to but one world, this one or the next. And yet, even so, I have not exhausted the statement of our real aim. It is not a purely individualistic gospel with which we are charged. Our duty lies certainly to our own generation, but it does not stop there. We are bound to preach to every person in the world the gospel that Christ is his Saviour; we are bound also to make known to the world that there is a body of Christ, which is His Church, and to gather up these saved men into visible churches which shall be outward evidence of the body of Christ, and shall secure to the gospel an influence and perpetuity which institutions and not individuals must supply. We owe it to Henry Venn, one of the strongest minds that has ever worked on this missionary problem, we owe it to Dr. Warneck, to Rufus Anderson, that this element in missionary policy and duty has been properly emphasized. We are to establish and foster native churches, self-extending, self-maintaining, self-directing, which shall carry out to their own people, whom we may not reach, the message that has come to them, and shall carry down into the generations that are to come after them the blessings which we have given them as their own. This is the aim of foreign missions, to make Jesus Christ known to the world with a view to the full salvation of men, and their gathering into true and living churches in the fields to which we go.

And this is our supreme aim. It is a just thing to challenge the world to sympathy with missions, because of the philanthropic and social results that missions achieve, and the heroic spirit which they display. But our supreme aim is neither to establish republics or limited monarchies throughout the world, nor to lead Chinese or Hindoo people to wear our dress, or to remodel their social institutions where these are already wholesome and clean. Our supreme aim is to make Jesus Christ known. I make room in my view of the world for all other forces than ours. I believe that God is King, and that as surely as His hand is upon us to-day, and upon the work of missions, it is upon all the great forces that are making this world. I will not acknowledge that the force of political influence has escaped from His control, that He stands impotent before the commerce and civilization of the world. I believe His hand is upon those things; that they play at last into His mighty purposes; that they are but party of His tremendous influence; that they and all the forces of life do but run resistlessly on to the great goals of God. But I believe also that these things are but as chaff before the wind, are but as "the fading dews of the morning before the roaring floods," compared with the power that we hold in our hands from His pierced hand, who died and rose again, and who is King of them that reign as kings, and Lord of them that rule as lords. This is the supreme aim of Christian missions.

It is also its determining aim. We must confess that we have lost sight, too often and too sadly, of the determining character of our mission aim. We have sometimes allowed ourselves to drift into methods of work that presuppose a quite contrary aim. When we lift off the shoulders of a new native church, for example, the burdens that it must bear, if it is ever to grow, we think we are dealing kindly, while we are taking its life and are false to our own supreme aim. We are here to do our own work, and not other people's work, or the work of other agencies or other forces. Our methods of work, in their proportion, in their perpetuation, should be ruled as with an iron hand by the supreme and determining aim of our work.

And not alone the methods of missions must be brought into utter subjection to their supreme and determining aim, but our spirit and the spirit of the enterprise must be ruled by that aim. We propose for ourselves no promiscuous and indefinite project; we have set before ourselves, sharp, distinct, and clear, the aim and purpose that have been given us to pursue. We have our own clear piece of work to do, and with a spirit as clear as our work, fruitful, persistent, indomitable, we are to go out, our spirit ruled, as well as our plans, by the aim and purpose of the work that has been committed to us by our Lord.

And, my friends, many of you not distinctively and technically related to the mission work, there is a relation between this aim and your spirit, too. Those, who in the Christian churches at home, are responsible for this enterprise, are not summoning the Christian Church to any miscellaneous and undefined task; they are calling it to a project plain, clear, simple, practical. The Church could do the work if it would, if this aim ruled its spirit. I was glad to read on the first page of our programme those dying

words of Simeon Calhoun: "It is my deep conviction, and I say it again and again, that if the Church of Christ were what she ought to be, twenty years would not pass away till the story of the Cross would be uttered in the ears of every living man;" and there came back across my memory this morning the words of a resolution of the American Board, adopted, I believe, at its annual meeting in Hartford, in 1836, that in view of the signs of the times and the promises of God, the time had arrived to undertake a scheme of operation looking toward the evangelization of the world, based upon the expectation of its speedy accomplishment. Sixty-four years have rolled by since then. The promises of God have not been abrogated. Each passing year has only given them fresh authentication, has only touched with new hope and glory the signs of the times. We stand here today before these same promises, vindicated by two generations more of trial, face to face with an open and appealing world. Has not the time now come at last, for action, for great action, for a serious attempt by the whole Church to attain our aim?

PERSPECTIVE TWO

EDINBURGH 1910

The culmination of the events and movements which comprised the "Great Century" of Protestant missions was the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. John R. Mott spoke of it as "the most significant gathering ever held in the interest of the world's evangelization."¹

BACKGROUND

The period leading up to 1910 was characterized by evangelistic emphasis. Systematic theologian Augustus H. Strong, for example, at the Ecumenical Missionary Conference of 1900 in New York, had related ecclesiology and Christology to world evangelization, stating, "Theology is a science which can be successfully cultivated only in connection with its practical application," i.e. in mission and evangelism.²

Mission leaders were united in their concern for world evangelization. Mott, for instance, affirmed repeatedly the possibility of evangelising the non-Christian world.³ Johnston correctly observes, "Each missionary conference on the field or at home contributed additional knowledge toward the further extension of the Gospel."⁴

Comity, we have noted, had as its purpose greater efficiency in evangelism. As Johnston comments, "The desire to evangelize introduced comity even in the era of intense denominationalism."⁵ Movements toward cooperation, rooted in Pietism and Evangelicalism and expressed in the missionary movement, were essentially evangelistic. It was not cooperation for the sake of unity, but unity in order to better pursue the task of evangelism.

The student movements contributed greatly both to the missionary movement and to the ecumenical cause, but always there was the evangelistic priority. Edinburgh 1910 grew out of the spiritual revival associated with the name of Moody and the

student evangelism connected with the name of Mott (one cannot dissociate Mott from Moody, for the former was personally selected by the latter). The motto of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, "The evangelization of the world in this generation," became the watchword of the missionary movement.

The World Missionary Conference was concerned with fulfilling the Great Commission. As Gairdner reported,

The Conference at Edinburgh was . . . mainly a consultative gathering. Its primary purpose was the study of the great missionary problems of the present day by leaders in the missionary enterprise at home and abroad, in order that they might see more clearly what was immediately required for the fulfilling of the charge to "disciple all nations."⁶

The Conference met in a spirit of enthusiasm and optimism. Here were gathered true believers in missions to consider how better to get on with the task, convinced of the attainability of their objective of world evangelization in their generation.

THE BASIS OF EDINBURGH

The voluntary character of the missionary movement was well-expressed at Edinburgh. The World Missionary Conference was not the official meeting of any world organization. Carefully planned and organized, the conference was spontaneous in character, representing the enthusiasm of missions. The missionary movement, as Scherer notes, "was not a campaign of churches but a movement of men and women given to the discipline of prayer and Bible study and gripped by the Spirit."⁷ The concern at Edinburgh was the evangelistic mandate. This over-riding issue made superfluous the formulating of any basis for the gathering. "The fact of missionary obligation was more important than any attempt to state its theological basis."⁸ The absence of doctrinal formula at Edinburgh has been criticized,⁹ yet theology apparently presented no great problem to the delegates. As Scherer states, "Pietists of all ages have never really needed to define their consensus of faith."¹⁰

The Edinburgh Conference was broadly representative. Its 1200 delegates consisted of participants from nearly every non-

Roman Catholic Christian agency including the interdenomination or "Faith Mission" societies such as the China Inland Mission. In all, some 160 boards or societies were represented. Participating also were churchmen from India, China, Japan and Africa as well as from the West—"proof that the Christian religion is now rooted in all those great countries of the Orient and the South."¹¹ The Conference was not, however, a "church" meeting, for it was a voluntary gathering of representatives of the forces of world mission. "The large majority of those who attended were persons who were engaged in active missionary work abroad, or administrative work at home."¹²

Edinburgh was an inclusive gathering. Questions of doctrine and polity were deliberately excluded in the planning. "This procedure assured certain conservatives who were particularly sensitive about conditions for church fellowship and unity that their consciences would not be overridden."¹³ The absence of a doctrinal test was regarded, not as a compromise, but as expedient. The emphasis was on consultation and cooperation. It was possible to work together despite differing conviction.

Was Edinburgh 1910 devoid of theology? "Faith and order" questions we have noted, were excluded. Reports, even the one on "The Missionary Message," were not theological. It would be an error, however, to assume that the Conference was atheological. A consensus was assumed on essentials—they accepted one another's confession of Christ. Also we should remember that "the World Missionary Conference of 1910 did not require any elaborate justification for missions."¹⁴ Yet in the very assumptions about world evangelism there was a great deal of unexpressed theology, God's offer of salvation, the Christian's missionary duty, the world's need of Christ—these are profound and fundamental theological themes!

Spiritual agreement was expressed in the daily periods of prayer and in the fellowship of the working groups. Edinburgh was a business conference. Its business was to think and plan for the evangelization of two-thirds of the human race. There was unanimity regarding the urgency of the task. On the part of staff, chairmen, members and delegates "the World Missionary Conference" represented work, plentiful, hard, and honest."¹⁵

TROUBLESOME QUESTIONS

Despite its spirit of uncritical optimism, Edinburgh did present some problems. First was the question of Anglican cooperation. At the earlier local and regional missionary conferences on the fields this problem was not raised. The CMS had joined freely with other evangelicals, but now the more high-church SPG came into the picture. Looking toward Edinburgh the question was whether the Anglicans as a Church should join this world gathering with its broad composition. Eventually the SPG was persuaded that it should send delegates; thus the "high church" party would be represented. Other uncertainties remained. The Anglicans as a Church were not yet committed, and the attitude of the Archbishop of Canterbury was not clear.

The Anglican hesitation had to do with questions of faith and order—church questions, not mission issues. Finally, just two months before the Conference was to take place, the Archbishop had been able to satisfy himself that inasmuch as Edinburgh was not a Church conference—churchly questions were not raised, nor did Edinburgh propose a theological or confessional base—the involvement of the Anglican would not cause embarrassment or compromise.¹⁶ Full Anglican cooperation was assured.

The Anglican presence meant a larger and broader representation. It was a new force to be reckoned with in resolving certain other questions. One such dilemma concerned the participation of missions working in Latin America. It was decided to not include Latin America, the rationale being that Edinburgh was devoted to mission in the non-Christian world and did not therefore embrace Latin America which was Roman Catholic. Thus a sizeable segment of Protestant missionary effort was excluded from the World Missionary Conference, despite the fact that numerous Protestant missions were busily engaged in efforts to convert the inhabitants of South and Central America.

Why this glaring omission? The decision was taken deliberately so as to not offend the Roman Catholics—at the insistence of the Anglicans who regarded the Roman Catholic as a sister Church.

Anglican cooperation was gained at the cost of Latin American participation. This procedure was bound to cause dissatisfaction.¹⁷ Edinburgh was not without its failures and criticisms.

Despite some weaknesses, the World Conference did meet—and it met successfully—chaired by J. R. Mott and prepared and guided to fruition by J. H. Oldham. Edinburgh has been acclaimed as "one of the most significant missionary events in modern history."¹⁸ For the first—if not the only—time in history a world missionary conference was convened. Edinburgh was, in many respects, unique: "one and only once in history, in 1910, was a conference held on the world level to which all Protestant mission societies sent representatives as the sole official participants."¹⁹

THE PROGRAMME

The Conference attracted much attention. a message was read from the King of England in which His Majesty expressed gratification for the "work of disseminating the knowledge and principles of Christianity" as important for "international friendship, the cause of peace, and the well-being of mankind."²⁰ Former President Theodore Roosevelt of the United States wrote his regret that he was unable to be present and expressed his hope that the Conference would initiate a movement to Christianize the remaining two-thirds of humanity, "and to Christianize it not merely in name but in very fact."²¹ In his opening address to "Fellow Workers in the Church Militant, the Society of Christ on Earth," the Archbishop of Canterbury spoke on "The Central Place of Missions in the Life of the Church." Affirming salvation in "only the name of one Lord Jesus Christ" for the "millions of the farthest East awakening," the Archbishop concluded dramatically:

It may well be that . . . "there be some standing here tonight who shall not taste of death till they see,"—here on earth, in a way we know not now—"the kingdom of God come with power."²²

The extreme optimism of the era is matched by the post-millennial theology of the speakers. The Archbishop apparently envisioned the coming of the Kingdom through the full conversion of the world to Christ. Robert E. Speer urged his hearers to open

their lives to the leadership of Christ “for the immediate conquest of the world.”²³

A sober note was sounded by the Rev. V.S. Azariah from India when he spoke on the sensitive topic. “The Problem of Co-operation Between Foreign and Native Workers.” Paying tribute to “the heroism and self-denying labours of the missionary body,” Azariah nevertheless spoke candidly of the relationship as “not what it ought to be,” and concluded, “We also ask for love. Give us friends!”²⁴

John R. Mott who had guided and chaired the meetings was the concluding speaker. “The end of the Conference is the beginning of the conquest”²⁵—Mott exuded the spirit of optimism which permeated Edinburgh from beginning to end. “God grant . . . that the words of the Archbishop shall prove to be splendid prophecy, and that before many of us taste death we shall see the Kingdom of God come with power.”²⁶

But according to Hogg, “The heart of Edinburgh was not its speeches but its periods of prayer.” Apparently long and short periods of prayer, were built into the programme as acts of worship as well as for intercession. Gairdner likewise referred to the spiritual impact of these sessions: “The dominating impression was that the Spirit of God, and not man, was the dominating personality in the Assembly.”²⁷

Following the worship period the Conference each day moved into its business. The daily programme centered around one of eight commission reports.

THE COMMISSIONS

The commission reports provided the content which made Edinburgh potent. For two years commission members carried out an enormous labour of correspondence, sending questionnaires, collecting and systematising information. The condensed data was compiled into eight published reports which were mailed to the delegates several weeks before the opening of the Conference. This might have been seen, in the words of Gairdner, “the spectacle . . . of a thousand delegates . . . mastering eight volumes of closest thinking, each averaging from 200 to 300 pages of ordinary printing . . .”²⁸

Commission I. “Carrying the Gospel to All the non-Christian World.” Chaired by Mott, this commission stressed the urgency and opportunity for evangelism. A survey of the non-Christian world was presented—a remarkable feat since the data was collected, not by a secretary in an office, but by people at work in scattered fields around the world. The section on India reveals the careful research and thinking that went into the report:

It is one of the shibboleths of the modern home Church official that the Indian Church should support its own evangelistic agency, a shibboleth quite acceptable to the missionary force on the field with the addition of the corollary—where there is an Indian Church strong enough to do it. But look at some of the figures: . . . Chittagong, 1,500,000 people, 1500 Christians, two-thirds of whom are Catholics; Dinajpur, 1,500,000 people, 179 Christians; Khulna, 1,250,000 people, 1275 Christians. In vast sphere, among millions, there is no Christian Church capable of evangelising, and if we are to await its coming India cannot be won to Christ.²⁹

The statistics and other data provided firm answers and pressed for further evangelization efforts. Evangelistic methods were discussed. Regarding India, it was found that “Evangelistic preaching seems to be commended by the missionaries more warmly and universally than any other single agency.”³⁰

This report stressed the importance of the Church as an evangelistic agency.³¹ The advantages and drawbacks of the foreign missionary in trying to carry out the task of evangelism were discussed as was the inadequacy of the existing native churches for the evangelistic task. The job is too big to be completed by the emerging churches, many of which are weak and small. The cry of the unevangelised in those areas is a call for foreign reinforcements as well as for more earnest advance on the part of the native Church: “Further, in many mission fields the situation is critical. There are at present great opportunities which may soon pass away.”³² The evangelization not only of India but of the entire non-Christian world was a matter of urgency. This commission in many respects set the tone of the conference.

Commission II. “The Church on the Mission Field.” Commission II sought to define the Church in light of its

relationship to its non-Christian setting. "It is a Church surrounded by a non-Christian community whom it is its function to subdue for the Kingdom."³³ Evangelism was a mark of the Church in the non-Christian world.

The Report presented the Church of India and Ceylon as an illustration of a growing Church "whose yearly increase is more than four times as rapid as that of the total population."³⁴ The Church was growing through the conversion of non-Christians. Even despised segments of the social order in South India were being gathered into Christian fellowship.³⁵ Edinburgh's optimism no doubt saw this as a sign of the imminent triumph of the Kingdom.

Commission III. "Education in Relation to Christianization of National Life" If this report was less optimistic than the former, it was however realistic in seeking to rectify the main assumption that Christian schools would quickly Christianize the national life of the world. Gairdner, however, appears to reflect the optimism of the delegates: "To Christianize the national life of China! Would not that, more than any one other thing, mean the conquest of the world for Christ."³⁶ The schools were the intended agents of conversion. The report states that "the chief aim of the pioneers in missionary education, including Dr. Duff, was the conversion of individuals."³⁷ Other aims included the development of the Christian community, and a general preparation and leavening in society.

What were the results? There were direct conversions; there was the diffusion of Christian ideas; there was the leavening in society, e.g. the education of girls, and the improvement and help of various classes of people. But what about the chief concern of Duff and the other pioneers for conversion? The Report contained the sad conclusion that "on the whole, the constant and most spontaneous witness of our correspondence does not seem to give direct conversion as an immediate result of education in Christian schools and colleges."³⁸

Commission IV. "The Missionary Message in Relation to Non-Christian Religions" Edinburgh 1910 was a world missionary conference, not a consultation on world religions. Nevertheless the Report of this commission is among the most brilliant of the entire series, a "masterpiece" which, according

to Gairdner, reaches its highest point in its treatment of Hinduism.³⁹

The study included debate over the question of spiritual dissatisfaction within Hinduism. One correspondent from India reported that "higher caste Hindus seldom expressed dissatisfaction with their own religion until they have definitely become Christians. Many afterwards admit that they had been groping in the dark in a vain effort to find peace and assurance."⁴⁰ On the other hand it was reported that "the lower castes are often ready to acknowledge that the worship of idols is worse than useless, but they are held back by the influence of caste from becoming Christians."⁴¹ The concern of the report was not with the religions *per se* but with conversion of their adherents to Christian faith.

As a general rule converts are drawn to embrace the Christian faith not merely by dissatisfaction with their old religion, but by the positive attractive character of the new. It is after they have become Christians that their dissatisfaction with their former religion becomes intensified.⁴²

The Report spoke of the necessity of a "sympathetic attitude toward India's most ancient religion" on the part of the missionaries: "more harm has been done in India than in any other country by missionaries who have lacked the wisdom to appreciate the nobler side of a religion which they have labored so indefatigably to supplant."⁴³ A point was made that they should try to understand Hinduism. Sympathetic understanding did not, however, displace the motive of evangelism. Edinburgh optimistically believed in the unanswerable appeal of the life of Christ to Hindus. "It is the influence which this positive appeal has exerted during the past century, and the results that it is even now producing, which justify the hope that India will one day become a Christian country."⁴⁴

Testimonies were included in the Report of persons who told of the influences leading to their conversion. A pastor from South India told about being dissatisfied, then added, "what finally helped me to accept Christ as my personal Saviour was the sense of my sins."⁴⁵ An Indian professor at Allahabad wrote, "It is very difficult to analyse one's conversion, but I believe the sudden dawning of a new relationship to God, through Christ,

as implied in the word Saviour, somewhat explained it."⁴⁶

The chief concern of Edinburgh, evidenced by these testimonies, was evangelism resulting in conversion to Christ and His Church. As one converted affirmed, "so far as Christian truth is concerned there is only one type of Christianity and that is the New Testament and Apostolic Christianity."⁴⁷ The missionary message was the historic Christian message which would result in conversion to Christ.

Commission V. "The Preparation of Missionaries"

If the evangelization of all the world, the Christianizing of the nations by a gospel presented in its fulness and its universality, by an education as profound as spirit and as wide as life, through daughter-churches raised to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:—if this be the task before the Church, then what manner of men must they be who are sent to set their hands to it . . .⁴⁸

How was the missionary to be equipped for his great task? The Commission outlined five headings of training considered indispensable for all missionaries: comparative religion, the science and history of missions, sociology, the teaching of "how to teach", and language study. Edinburgh apparently expected "a profound reform of missionary training."⁴⁹

Commission VI. "The Home Base of Missions" Commission six was concerned with the sending bodies in Europe and America. One point of interest concerns missionary recruitment. This study indicated the vast number of missionaries recruited through the student movement: as estimated 75 per cent of those under the regular denominational societies were recruited through the Students Volunteer Movement.⁵⁰ Volunteers from America, as of 1909, totaled 4,377.⁵¹ From the time the student Movement was organized, through March 1909, the statistics compiled showed a total of 3,284 sailed volunteers.

But Edinburgh was concerned with utilizing the "entire resources" of the Church for the extension of the Kingdom.⁵² The Report commended the Moravian ideal as the solution to the problem of world evangelization, i.e. the whole Church should make world evangelization its first duty.⁵³ The Home Base should be educated to this ideal.

Commission VII. "Missions and Governments" The Report of this commission consisted of a survey of conditions and findings regarding relationships between mission societies and governments in India, China, Japan and other countries.

Johnston criticizes this Report for apparently advocating collaboration between the "world" and the Kingdom. "No reason was seen to not accept the help of a government in the advance of Christian work."⁵⁴ Mission organizations (and churches) find it necessary to deal with governments, but the Report went so far to recommend to "all Christian governments to extend the right of entry of Christian Missions into other nations."⁵⁵ This Commission's thinking is to be understood in light of the colonial era. Scherer's comment seems apropos: "Few in that period would have made a sharp distinction between the Christian calling to propagate the gospel and the colonial obligation to extend the blessings of enlightenment and civilization into the non-Christian world."⁵⁶ The Conference also discussed the possibilities of bringing pressure to bear against social evils among oppressed peoples.⁵⁷

Commission VIII. "Cooperation and Promotion of Unity"

This proved the most crucial Commission at Edinburgh. The historic World Missionary Conference was in itself a visible demonstration of unity. The heart of the concern for cooperation and unity, especially brought out by Commission VIII, was "to plant in every non-Christian nation one united Church of Christ."⁵⁸

Gardner speaks of the day which the Report on Cooperation and the Promotion of Unity was to be discussed as "the day on which all these desires and demands for some definite method and permanent organ of co-operation must be consummated."⁵⁹ Unity in an organic sense had become a prime concern. The Commission brought a resolution proposing formation of a Continuation Committee with the following scope:

To maintain in prominence the idea of the World Missionary Conference as a means of co-ordinating missionary work, of laying sound lines for future development, and of generating and claiming by corporate action fresh stores of spiritual force for the evangelization of the world. . . . To confer with the Societies and Boards as to the best method of working towards the formation of

such a permanent International Missionary Committee as is suggested by the Commissions of the Conference and by various missionary bodies apart from the Conferences.⁶⁰

It showed, he noted, that the keen interest in unity was tied to concern for world evangelization which was also the objective of the Edinburgh Conference. The kind of cooperation and unity proposed by the resolution, while interdenominational, did “not involve the idea of organic and ecclesiastical union.”⁶¹ It was a functional unity for accomplishing the task of world evangelization. As Mott was to write, “Experience has already shown that by far the most hopeful way of hastening the realization of true and triumphant Christian unity is through the enterprise of carrying the Gospel to the non-Christian world.”⁶²

The proposal represented a historic movement. Gairdner describes the drama in the meeting hall as the delegation prepared to vote on the resolution:

Was the Conference ready to vote on the Resolution? a murmur of assent, not loud, but deep—voluminous. . . . Then after a pause: “*Shall the vote be now taken?*” Again the same murmur, charged with the emotional intensity of expectation that has reached its climax . . .

Then—

“*The Motion has been moved and seconded: those in favour of it say Aye!*”

A war: “Aye!” short as the monosyllable itself, but with a volume like a Handel chorus.

“*Contrary, NO!*”

A silence, as voluminous as the former sound.

“*The motion is carried unanimously.*”

All now vented their pent-up feelings, spontaneously bursting into singing to the glory of God—“Praise God From Whom All Blessings Flow . . . Praise Father, Son and Holy Ghost.”⁶³

The Continuation Committee is by many regarded the most important result of Edinburgh.⁶⁴ The Conference was to be the beginning of a process.

CONTRIBUTION

“Edinburgh,” states James Scherer, “represented the flood-time of missionary optimism.”⁶⁵ How should we view Edinburgh today?—As success, or as failure? As unrealistic? What is its true significance?

“The evangelization of the world in this generation” was both the theme and the purpose of the World Missionary Conference. Evaluation must therefore consider the contribution of the Conference to evangelization. There was no debate about the meaning of mission. The aim and purpose of missionary activity was understood to be evangelization of the non-Christian world. Edinburgh assumed the need of the world for Christ. Data was collected and findings published in order to encourage the effort to convert the world to Christ. “Edinburgh gave new emphasis to missions as worldwide task and responsibility. In doing so, some non-Christian lands were recognized as open and responsive. Encouragement was given to evangelize the entire world.”⁶⁶

Edinburgh was called in order to consult regarding world evangelization. Each of the commissions was devoted to some aspect of that task. Edinburgh presented no theological confusion or uncertainty about evangelism. The first (and perhaps greatest) contribution of Edinburgh was to the cause of evangelism. Even the emphasis on cooperation and unity was so as to be better able to evangelize the world.

The second great contribution of Edinburgh was ecumenism. “The World Missionary Conference of 1910 had back of it more than a generation of experience of cooperation among the Protestants in seeking to spread the Gospel throughout the world.”⁶⁷ If the Nineteenth Century was the great century for missionary expansion, the Twentieth Century would be characterized by the growth of ecumenism. As Hogg explains,

Edinburgh had distilled the best from past missionary cooperation and offered this powerful concentration to the churches. Yet Edinburgh was more, did more, than this. Something new had happened. Those present knew that from within their midst something different was emerging. It was a desire for an inclusive togetherness unknown before. From Edinburgh sprang a new

willingness to respect and recognize wide differences and at the same time to work together as Christians. Here was born the kind of international and interdenominational Christian cooperation that has increasingly characterized the twentieth century.⁶⁸

The importance of Edinburgh for ecumenism is seen in succeeding events and movements. Previous to 1910, "except for one body in the U.S.A., none of the organized evidences of the Ecumenical Movement . . . then existed."⁶⁹ Out of Edinburgh was to emerge, first, the International Missionary Council as the organ for missionary cooperation, then, later, the World Council of Churches as the agent for Church unity. Edinburgh was of supreme consequence to the ecumenical movement.

Edinburgh did not make theological pronouncements, nor did it manifest a doctrinal platform. Was there, however, a theological contribution? Much theology was assumed, even though doctrinal issues were not generally raised. "In practice the agreement to avoid theological differences constituted a new theological position."⁷⁰ Johnston feels that Edinburgh represented theological modification since everyone present was accepted as a Christian and all differences were tolerated.

In his critique Johnston points out that several participants at Edinburgh were less than orthodox in their theological statements and assumptions. "The historical creeds of Christendom—especially those of the Reformation and post-Reformation period—were depreciated."⁷¹ Authority became a matter of consensus. This "theology of consenses represented a shift away from the authority of Scriptures . . ."⁷² Johnston feels Edinburgh had an ambiguous doctrine of man. "There was a greater appreciation for man and a depreciation of the Scriptures."⁷³ If so it is hardly surprising that "the Gospel was described in relation to the individual and to the social community but not defined."⁷⁴ But is Johnston's judgement too severe?

Edinburgh must be understood in light of its times. An unrealistic optimism was typical of orthodoxy (post-millennialism) as well as of liberalism (Schleiermacher). Nor was Edinburgh a conference on theology! It was a missionary conference, and its primary contribution was to missionary strategy. Discussion of ecumenical and theological issues tends to obscure the true nature of the Edinburgh gathering. "In 1910 only a few non-

missionaries attended."⁷⁵ As Ralph Winter points out, there was need for neither a creedal statement nor for discussion of points of theological disagreement since this was a meeting of mission strategists and not a Church conference.⁷⁶ The chief importance of Edinburgh lies in this fact. As we shall see, however, the true meaning and intent of Edinburgh becomes lost in the developments which follow.

NOTES

1. Mott, *The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions*, p. vii.
2. Cited by Johnston, *World Evangelism and the Word of God*, p. 61.
3. See, for instance, Mott's assurance of the "Accessibility and openness of the non-Christian world" following Edinburgh (Mott, *op. cit.*, p. 257), a theme which he had previously elucidated at New York in 1900.
4. Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
6. W.H.T. Gairdner, "Edinburgh 1910", p. v.
7. James A. Scherer, "Ecumenical Mandates For Mission", p. 20.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
9. E.g., Johnston, *op. cit.*
10. Scherer, *loc.cit.*
11. Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p. 56
12. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
13. Scherer, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
15. Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
16. Latourette comments that "on the insistence of Anglo-Catholics questions of faith and other were expressly left off the official programme" (*The Nineteenth Century Outside Europe*), p. 489.
17. One result of the omission was the calling of a special conference on Latin American in 1913 at New York out of which came the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America. (C.f. Latourette, *loc. cit.*).

18. Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 91
19. Ralph W. Winter, "1980 and That Certain Elite", p. 145.
20. World Missionary Conference, *History and Records*, p. 141.
21. The letter is quoted in full in Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
22. World Missionary Conference, *op. cit.*, p. 150.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 306-315.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 347-351.
26. W. R. Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundations*, p. 124.
27. Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
29. World Missionary Conference, *Carrying the Gospel Into All the Non-Christian World*, p. 159.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 306.
31. Gairdner reports the stimulating debate among delegates who cited the Churches in Korea, in Uganda, and the South Sea Islands as splendid examples of what can be accomplished in non-Christian areas by Churches endued with an evangelistic and missionary spirit (Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 85).
32. World Missionary Conference, *op. cit.*, p. 341.
33. World Missionary Conference, *The Church in the Mission Field*, p. 5.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
35. *Ibid.*
36. Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
37. World Missionary Conference, *Education in Relation to the Christianization of National Life*, p. 17.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
39. Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 135.
40. World Missionary Conference, *The Missionary Message in Relation to Non-Christian Religions*, p. 165.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 171.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 187.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 211.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 212.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 212.
48. Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 215.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 217.
50. World Missionary Conference, *The Home Base of Missions*, p. 140.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
52. Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 240.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 241.
54. Johnston, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-111.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
56. Scherer, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
57. Gairdner, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-173.
58. World Missionary Conference, *Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity*. p. 131.
59. Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p.187.
60. *Ibid.*, pp.187-188.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 187.
62. Mott. *op. cit.*, p. 277.
63. Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
64. E.g. Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 489.
65. Scherer, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
66. Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 117.
67. Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 487.
68. Hogg, *op.cit.*, p. 130.
69. Hogg, "The Oikoumene", p. 15.
70. Johnston, *loc. cit.*
71. *Ibid.*, p. 117.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
74. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
75. Winter, *op. cit.*, p. 148.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

Document Two:

Address by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, 1910. Published in The History and Records of The Conference (Vol. 9), Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

THE CENTRAL PLACE OF MISSIONS IN THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH

by the Archbishop of Canterbury

FELLOW-WORKERS in the Church Militant, the Society of Christ on earth, Lord Balfour has reminded you, and few men could do it with more lucidity, effectiveness, and simple weight, what it is that brings to this hall to-day an assemblage which, if men be weighed rather than counted, has, I suppose, no parallel in the history either of this or of other lands. Yes, gentlemen, this Conference is in some respects unique, not merely in missionary annals, but in all annals. Where and when have 1200 thoughtful men and women met who could contribute a like amount of knowledge acquired at first hand, for that is the real point, from literally every region of the round world, about the forces, past and present, seen and unseen, which are moulding the lives of the peoples, civilised and savage? And you come, not to talk casually and irresponsibly, not to tell us at haphazard what you know, but to bring from a hundred work-fields, the thought-out, argued-out conclusions to which you have been led. The written reasons, the ripe experiences, which have led you to those conclusions and resolves have already been sifted and pondered and compared. That, my Lord Balfour, makes our gathering unique in character. God grant it be unique in fruit. The Lord God grant it, for it is to Him that we bring it all to-night.

Gentlemen – I say it in all earnestness— it is with reverence and holy fear that I obey the call to be the first speaker in these debates. I can contribute nothing that is new; very little that is my own. But if I interpret rightly the privilege which you have offered me, I stand here for a special purpose. It is to say, from the standpoint of one who holds of necessity a position of central responsibility in our country's religious life, that we whose actual work lies prosaically at home, feel, with an intensity beyond all words, that, among the duties and privileges which are ours in the Church of Christ, the place which belongs of right to missionary work is the central place of all. As regards opportunity of knowledge I have, I suppose, some qualification to speak. Four times, at intervals of ten years, I have in one capacity or another taken part in the great gatherings of bishops at Lambeth, men who bring from near and far afield the knowledge which leaders gain about the work of one great section of Christ's Church on earth. In our last gathering in 1908, 240 bishops took part, and it is

perhaps not presumptuous to say that probably to the desk of no other man in the British Isles does there flow in weekly, daily, almost hourly, so varied a stream of communications about the Church's activities and problems, its mistakes and its failures, and its victories, as flows in steady volume from the whole circumference of the earth to my room, not, of course, as to a place of authority or governance—pray understand that—but as to a central pivot or exchange. And happily it is not letters only that flow in; it is also men and women.

Brothers and sisters in the Lord Jesus Christ, I tell you deliberately that with that increasing knowledge—and even the dullest man must in such a position gain some increase of knowledge—there comes a deepening conviction that what matters most, what ought to loom largest in it all, is the directly missionary work, such work as we are gauging and planning in this eventful fortnight. Many a time, after quiet talks with some simple-hearted worker who is spending himself ungrudgingly in the Master's service—be it under an African sun, or in the Arctic circle, or in the islands of a stormy sea—I have found myself literally tingling with a mingled sense of humiliation and of eager enthusiasm as I have set the value and the glory of his persistent self-sacrificing devotion to our Lord against the value of our own poor commonplace work at home; and I have fallen on my knees and asked that He who seeth in secret will show us how to co-operate in some more fruitful way, and to link the two tasks, that man's and mine, more wisely, more effectively than we seem to link them now. Well, it is for that sort of endeavour that we are here this week. We meet, as has been well said, for the most serious attempt which the Church has yet made to look steadily at the whole fact of the non-Christian world, and to understand its meaning and its challenge. We look at it from standpoints not by any means the same, geographical, racial, or denominational. Not one of us bates a jot of the distinctive convictions which he deliberately holds. Therein lies in part the value of the several contributions which will be made to our debates. But we are absolutely one in our allegiance to our living Lord. To Him we bring it all. When the disciples returned from their first missionary work they told the Master both what they had done and what they had taught. They must also have told one another. And the outcome we know.

Your deliberations this week will deal mainly with the special opportunities and the special difficulties of our own day. About the opportunities, I venture upon a single word of caution—not exactly of warning, but of caution. It is dangerous, it is perhaps presumptuous, to dogmatise too decisively about the particular opportunities of one generation or epoch as contrasted with another. We believe in the continuous guidance of Him who knows, and weighs, and understands. To some of us—to me personally—it is frankly incomprehensible why the Christian leaders and teachers of former generations in the last few hundred years gave so comparatively small a place to direct missionary endeavour. The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. He has guided our fathers, as we believe He is guiding us. It may be that by spoken word or busy pen the men whom we reverence for what they did served their generation best, and used the opportunities which were theirs, not ours.

"It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath set within His own authority. But ye shall receive power"—that is quite certain—"ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost is come upon you"—power to see the present opportunity and to use it—"and ye shall be witnesses unto Me . . . unto the ends of the earth." Whatever the facts of other days, there can be no manner of doubt about the facts of our own. The opportunity is almost limitless. It is urgent and even clamorous. It is perhaps temporary and passing. And it is ours. And for its use—"ye shall receive power." The work of this coming fortnight, and of the eighteen preparatory months which have led up to it, is capable, I verily believe, of indirectly doing more for the right manner of "telling out among the heathen that the Lord is King," than any fortnight of Christian history since the days of the Apostles. I need not re-paint the picture, familiar to everybody here, of what to-day's opportunity is and means. The whole world in closest, speediest touch. The millions of the farthest East awakening like some giant from the stupor of ages, and deliberately, even eagerly, calling for the very knowledge and intercourse which they had hitherto barred out. Nationalism, with all its powers and perils, feeling its way to life among Asiatic races, with a call to us to show what is Christ's definite message for nations, and what the claim He makes upon each several race for its separate contribution to the common good. And then the great new nation bounding into strenuous manhood on the Canadian plains, in touch at once with the Eastern and the Western worlds, and capable of bringing strength to each. I could easily run on. But you are familiar with it all. The when and the how are His. The work is ours. "Ye shall receive power," He will show us when and how.

And with the opportunities, the special difficulties to us: European knowledge, European science taken eastwards and assimilated there without the sanctions and the history and the long discipline which gave it birth, and nurture, and virility for ourselves; material wealth and comfort made the apparent deity or goal among the "Christian" nations from whom the message goes; the un-Christian lives of the representatives of Christian lands; and perhaps, above all—if you doubt it, read the gathered testimony from a hundred mission fields—the apathy and lukewarmness of the home Church, that is to say, of religious, God-fearing, Christian people, in the face of all these possibilities and perils. There, at least, we have a clear-cut task, an open road to tread. If the work is to be done, we must make men know and feel—yes, and make them live as men. Who know and feel, not in abstract theory, but in living, burning fact—that there is none other name under heaven, given to man, in whom and through whom, we or any other folk, can receive health and salvation, but only the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is the sense, strong and eager and aglow, or what we owe to God in Christ which can alone quicken the pulse and nerve the arm for the battle which is not ours, it is the Lord's. But, brothers and sisters, that means effort, that means the sort of sacrifice which Christ looks for and demands when He bids men count the cost of discipleship, and that means a courage that ten thousands of our shy, reticent people wholly lack. Be it ours to hearten them. Once more, God will show us how. But be quite

sure—it is my single thought to-night—that the place of missions in the life of the Church must be the central place, and none other. That is what matters. Let people get hold of that, and it will tell— it is the merest commonplace to say it—it will tell for us at home as it will tell for those afield. Secure for that thought its true place, in our plans, our policy, our prayers, and then—why then, the issue is His, not ours. But it may well be that if that come true, "there be some standing here to-night who shall not taste of death till they see,"—here on earth, in a way we know not now,— "the Kingdom of God come with power."

Document Three:

Address by the Rev. V. S. Azariah (later to become the first Indian bishop of the Anglican Church in India) at the World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh, 1910. From The History and Records of The Conference (Vol. 9). Fleming H. Revell Company: New York.

THE PROBLEM OF CO-OPERATION BETWEEN FOREIGN AND NATIVE WORKERS

by the Rev. V .S. Azariah

The problem of race relationships is one of the most serious problems confronting the Church to-day. The bridging of the gulf between the East and West, and the attainment of a greater unity and common ground in Christ as the great Unifier of mankind, is one of the deepest needs of our time. Co-operation between the foreign and native workers can only result from proper relationship. Co-operation is ensured when the personal, official, and spiritual relationships are right, and is hindered when these relationships are wrong. The burden of my message is that, speaking broadly, at least in India, the relationship too often is not what it ought to be, and things must change, and change speedily, if there is to be a large measure of hearty co-operation between the foreign missionary and the Indian worker.

I desire to say that personally my relation with my foreign fellow-workers has been simply delightful, and that in all my travels throughout India I have received nothing but true courtesy and kindness from missionaries all over India, in many of whose homes I have been a welcomed guest. Moreover, in all that I say I want it to be clearly understood that I am fully aware of happy exceptions.

Having safeguarded my remarks with these preliminaries, I proceed to state plainly some of my convictions in regard to this subject. My personal observation during a period of ten years, some of which have been spent in travelling through different parts of India, in mission districts worked by different Missionary Societies, has revealed to me the fact that the relationship between the European missionaries and the Indian workers is far from what it ought to be, and that a certain aloofness, a lack of mutual understanding and openness, a great lack of frank intercourse and friendliness, exists throughout the country.

This is not only my own impression, but what I have gathered from a large number of my Indian brethren, and even a few European missionaries.

This feeling is stronger and more in evidence in some missions than in others. Some Missionary Societies are in great advance in this respect over others. In the Young Men's Christian Association we have a body that

stands foremost in having successfully solved the problem. Now, if this separation is more or less widespread, and I am here to say that I know it is, we will agree that this state of affairs cannot but affect the co-operation of these two arms of missionary work, and it cannot but hinder the growth and development of the Church in India. So far as such a spirit exists, and wherever the spirit exists, it is impossible for the Church to fully develop a vigorous life and exhibit a united front to non-Christian forces round about.

I do not deny that there is blame on both sides. That cannot but be so. I do not overlook the fact that hindrances to a proper relationship exist also on the side of the Indian Christians, but since my audience is not composed of these, I feel that it will serve no useful purpose to detail them here. Before my Indian friends I have endeavoured to remove the hindrances on their side, but what I plead for here is that the difficulties on the foreign missionary side may, if possible, be entirely done away.

1. Let us first consider the *personal* relationship that ought to exist for effective co-operation. For the ideal of this relationship we look to our Master and Lord. The relationship between Him and His immediate disciples and fellow-workers was not only one of Teacher and pupils, Master and disciples, but, above all, that of Friend and friends. He placed Himself alongside of those weak, frail, and stumbling disciples as their Friend and Brother, and lifted them up to a clearer vision, stronger faith, and nobler life. The disciples were admitted into the closest friendship with their Divine Teacher, they learned to love Him, confide in Him, follow Him, and walk even as He walked.

Can it be truly said that the foreign missionary has become a *friend* to his fellow-workers? Can it be said that this has been his aim? I am afraid in many cases the answer must be in the negative. If it has been the aim, as I trust it has been, at least it has not been sufficiently avowed, nor always made manifest in action. I thankfully remember that there are scores of missionaries all over the country who are justly proud of the fact that they can count some at least of their Indian Christian fellow-workers among their truest friends, and there are Indian Christians in all parts of India who are deeply thankful to count among their closest friends many foreign missionaries. But such are far too few.

Friendship is more than condescending love. I do not for a moment deny that the foreign missionaries love the country and the people of the country for whom they have made such noble sacrifices, but friendship is more than the love of a benefactor. I cannot do better than quote the words of one who is himself a foreign missionary in South India. He writes: "The popular appellation in use about missionaries in this country is 'father'; but a time comes when children ought to begin—and if they develop normally, do begin—to think for themselves and to have aspirations and plans of their own. That is a critical time for the father in his relation to his children. His continued influence for good, at any rate for the greatest good, in his son's life now depends on his becoming the son's friend. This change from benefactor to friend implies that a new element of reciprocity is introduced. If I rightly regard a person as my friend, I respect his individuality and

remember that he has peculiarities, rights, and responsibilities of his own, which require, in some measure at any rate, that a feeling of equality and freedom shall pervade our relations and our intercourse with one another. This is the point where we find ourselves in India to-day."

But while "East is East and West is West," is such a friendship possible between two races, that in habits, customs, and modes of thought are so diametrically opposed to each other? I know in my own experience that such friendships *are* possible. I am thankful to say that some of my best friends are among the foreign missionaries. I can testify to the great enrichment that has come into my own life through these real friendships. This very enrichment impels me to plead with my missionary brethren that they will lay themselves out to form friendships with their Indian fellow-workers.

I quote another authority, this time from North India, the Lord Bishop of Lahore. He says: "With abundance of kind feeling for, and unsparring labour and self-denial on behalf of Indian Christians, the missionaries, except a few of the very best, seem to me to fail very largely in getting rid of an air of patronage and condescension, and in establishing a genuinely brotherly and happy relation as between equals with their Indian flocks, though amongst these there are gentlemen in every truest and best sense of the word, with whom relations of perfect equality ought easily to be established." Do not these voices from North and South call attention to the same danger and the one remedy?

The pioneer missionaries were "fathers" to the converts. The converts in their turn were glad to be their "children." But the difficulty in older missions now is that we have a new generation of younger missionaries who would like to be looked upon as fathers, and we have a new generation of Christians who do not wish to be treated like children. If the Christian community of the second and third generations, through the success of missionary work, has risen to the position when they do not any longer care to be treated like children, should we not be the first to recognise this new spirit and hasten to strengthen the relationship, by becoming their friends? Is it not such a relationship, and such alone, that can, more than anything else, prevent the growth of the spirit of false independence, foolish impudence, and flagrant bitterness against missionaries that we often meet with in Indian Christian young men today?

The Bishop of Lahore goes on to make some practical suggestions. He says, "If we could get into the way of treating Indian Christians with perfect naturalness, exactly as we treat English friends, asking them more frequently to stay with us in our houses, and genuinely making friends of them, realising in how very many things we have to learn from them, and how large are the contributions which they can bring into the common stock—this, I believe, would do more than anything else to draw us more closely together again, and it would be to the non-Christian world an illustration of boundless potency and effect, of the unity into which our races can be brought within the body of Christ." Much can be done along these lines.

Let me give some extreme cases of the contrary attitude. I do it with the deepest pain in my own heart, feeling that if some of my missionary friends have failed, I am also responsible for it. I can now think of one Indian superintending missionary, for over fifteen years in responsible charge of large districts, who said recently that he had never been invited to a single meal at the house of any of his European missionary brethren. I think of a pastor, who is confessedly the right hand of a station missionary, who said to me that during the eighteen years he had been a pastor, his missionary had never once visited his humble home. Two men, holding very high positions in a native State, said to a friend of mine recently that though they had been for several years in the city, and even called on the missionary, the missionary never thought of returning the call. I remember two or three younger missionaries who have told me that while they themselves like to go and call on the leading Indian Christian gentlemen, their senior missionaries are against such innovations. I recall how years ago a young missionary told me of what he called the impudence of an Indian clergyman, who was a graduate of one of the Indian universities, in going forward to shake hands with him. "This man," he said, "thinks, that because he is a graduate and has put on European costume, I must shake hands with him!"

I do not want you to think that these instances represent the general state of affairs, nor do I want to think that these are but solitary instances. Even if they were solitary instances, occurrences of this extreme type ought to be impossible.

On the other hand, I can never forget a sight I saw near the foot of the Himalayas, on the borders of Kashmir. At dinner at a missionary's table the British Civil Surgeon of the district, the missionary, an American Secretary of the Y.M.C.A., a native pastor, and an ordinary catechist sat round the table, with the wife of the missionary presiding at the table. It was not a got-up show. The perfect ease with which the pastor and the catechist conducted themselves was proof positive that there the relationship was natural and customary. I noticed that the mission on the whole was far ahead in this respect of most others.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not plead for retuning calls, handshakes, chairs, dinners, and teas, *as such*. I do, on the other hand, plead for all of them and more if they can be expressions of a friendly feeling, if these or anything else can be the outward proofs of a real willingness on the part of the foreign missionary to show that he is in the midst of the people, to be to them, not a lord and a master, but a brother and a friend.

II. The effective co-operation will only be possible with a proper *official* relationship.

The official relationship generally prevalent at present between the missionary and the Indian worker is that between a master and servant; in fact, the word often used in South India by the low grade Indian workers in addressing missionaries is *ejaman* or master. The missionary is the paymaster, the worker his servant. As long as this relationship exists, we

must admit that no sense of self-respect and individuality can grow in the Indian Church.

A missionary of the American Board said to me years ago that the last words his Board Secretary spoke to him in New York harbour were, "Make yourself unnecessary in the field." I can bear testimony to the fact that that missionary is endeavouring to do it in the most tactful way. The aim of the Missionary Societies, we know, is to develop self-governing churches and to give freedom and scope to indigenous leadership, and to strive to make themselves unnecessary in the field. But the Societies have not convinced the native that this is their aim. Nay, in some missions Indian Christians truly, though I know erroneously, believe that the missionaries are against any full self-support and real self-government, because that will make them unnecessary in the leadership of the work. It is commonly supposed that the man of independent thought and action is the man least consulted in the administration of the mission. I know some instances where independent action in the smallest affair has been repressed, and indigenous efforts—even indigenous missionary efforts—have been looked upon with suspicion and distrust.

There can never be real progress unless the aspirations of the native Christians to self-government and independence are accepted, encouraged, and acted upon.

I do not forget there is too often a danger of Churches claiming complete self-government and full independence without any regard to the problem of self-support, and of individuals claiming equality in salary and desiring to be called "missionaries" of a foreign missionary society. While I am fully aware of these and similar dangers, I cannot but feel that in most older missions there is great room for advance in the direction indicated at this Conference.

In an article that appeared in a leading Anglo-Indian paper on the World Missionary Conference, the writer says: "The Indian Christian is kept in leading strings. It is true that of late years there has been among the leading missionary agencies a considerable advance in the way of giving Indian Christians more control over their own affairs, yet the reform movement is all too slow. Is it to be wondered at that young Indians of ability turn aside to the various secular professions where the powers they feel they possess will find a fuller scope for their exercise? It is obviously unwise to go on from year to year drifting along in the old way, for it leads to the drifting away of the flower of the Indian Christian youth from the ministry of the Church."

Let me not be understood to say that this is the only cause why educated Christian young men do not enter the ministry. The question of salary, I am afraid, often takes too prominent a place in their minds. The spiritual life too often is not vigorous enough to overcome the temptations to earthly greatness. But at the same time it cannot be denied that some *are* kept away from the ministry because of the conditions existing in the missions.

I plead, therefore, that an advance step may be taken by transferring from foreigners to Indians responsibilities and privileges that are now too exclusively in the hands of the foreign missionary. Native Church Councils should be formed, where Indians could be trained in the administration of their own churches. Missionary Conferences should find a place for Indian leaders so that the Indian and the European may consult and work together for the welfare of the common work. The favourite phrases "our money," "our control" must go. Native Christian opinion ought to be constantly consulted in regard to any fresh step taken. In short all along the line, the foreign missionary should exhibit unmistakably that he is not afraid to give up positions of leadership and authority into the hands of his Indian fellow-worker, and that his joy is fulfilled when he decreases and the Indian brother increases.

I am fully aware of the fact that all advance in responsibility should be transferred *gradually* and not by the sudden withdrawal of foreign funds and control. But gradually, but none the less steadily, it *should be done*. For, without growing responsibility, character will not be made. We shall learn to walk only by walking—perchance only by falling and learning from our mistakes, but never by being kept in leading strings until we arrive at maturity.

If such an advance is to be made, what should be the relationship of the foreign missionary to the Indian Christian leader? Surely, that of a friend. To quote again: "The foreign missionary's official connection with the Indian Church must cease some day. If, when that day comes, the leading Indian Christians are looking upon us as old, jealous fathers, who did not seem to like the idea of their children trying to stand on their own feet, we are not likely to be consulted by them at those junctures when a word of advice or encouragement might be badly needed. Even if the situation is felt to be difficult, it will be a matter of honour to the children who have set out to build their own house to show that they can manage their own affairs. But if we are regarded by them as friends, they will continue to be willing, when need arises, to seek and receive advice from us, even though they are no longer under any obligation to be guided by us."

III. True co-operation is possible only with a proper *spiritual* relationship.

No personal relationship will be true and permanent that is not built on a spiritual basis. India is a land that has a "religious atmosphere." To the Hindu "the one and only ultimate is God: his great and only reality the unseen: his true and eternal environment the spiritual."

In such a land, therefore, the easiest point of contact with the heart is on the spiritual side. The Indian nature has aptitude to develop devotional meditation and prayer, resignation and obedience to the will of God, the Christian graces of patience, meekness, and humility, the life of denial of self, the cultivation of fellowship and communion and practice of the presence of God. These elements of Christian mysticism find a natural soil in the Indian heart. Not by decrying this aspect of the Christian life, but only by cultivating it and developing it in himself can a foreigner win the

heart of an Indian. It is then, and then only, the westerner can impart to him what naturally he has not: elements of Christian character, Christian activity, and Christian organisation. These characteristics which the westerner has developed often fail to appeal to the Indian, because too often they are advocated by men who have not reached the heart of the Indian through finding the point of contact.

Whatever others may think, I do not myself look forward to any time in the near future when we in India will not need the western missionary to be our spiritual guides and helpers. Through your inheritance of centuries of Christian life you are able to impart to us many things that we lack. And in this sphere I think the westerner will be for years to come a necessity. It is in this co-operation of joint study at the feet of Christ that we shall realise the oneness of the Body of Christ. The exceeding riches of the glory of Christ can be fully realised not by the Englishman, the American, and the Continental alone, nor by the Japanese, the Chinese, and the Indians by themselves—but by all working together, worshipping together, and learning together the Perfect Image of our Lord and Christ. It is only “with all Saints” that we can “comprehend the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that we might be filled with all the fulness of God.” This will be possible only from spiritual friendships between the two races. We ought to be willing to learn from one another and to help one another.

Through all the ages to come the Indian Church will rise up in gratitude to attest the heroism and self-denying labours of the missionary body. You have given your goods to feed the poor. You have given your bodies to be burned. We also ask for *love*. Give us FRIENDS!

Document Four:

From the World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910, The History and Records of The Conference (Vol. 9). Fleming H. Revell Company: New York.

CLOSING ADDRESS

by John R. Mott

The end of the Conference is the beginning of the conquest. The end of the planning is the beginning of the doing. What shall be the issue of these memorable days? Were the streams of influence set in motion by God through this gathering to come to a stop this night, the gathering would yet hold its place as truly notable in His sight. Has it not widened us all? Has it not deepened us all? Has it not humbled us increasingly as we have discovered that the greatest hindrance to the expansion of Christianity lies in ourselves? Has it not tried us as though by fire? Gathered together from different nations and races and communions, have we not come to realise our oneness in Christ? Therefore though there have been few resolutions, though there have been no signs and sounds and wonders as of the rushing wind, God has been silently and peacefully doing His work. But He has infinitely greater designs than these. It is not His will that the influences set forth by Him shall cease this night. Rather shall they course out through us to the very ends of the earth. In a few hours we shall be scattering ourselves among the nations and the races of mankind, and God sends us forth to larger things. He is a great God. He is summoning us to vaster, greater plans than we had in mind when we came here, plans, adequate in scope, in thoroughness, in strategy, and in the spirit that shall carry them out. He is summoning us to larger comprehension of the peoples to whom we go, and the message that we bear. He is summoning us to this larger community which we have realised during these hours. He is summoning us to larger sacrifice, one that is like unto a new experience, like unto a revolution, a transformation. Our best days are ahead of us and not in these ten days that we have spent together, still less in the days that lie behind them. Why? Because we go forth to-night with larger knowledge, and this in itself is a talent which makes possible better things. We go out with a larger acquaintanceship, with deeper realisation of this fellowship which we have just seen, and that is a rich talent which makes possible wonderful achievements. Our best days are ahead of us because of a larger body of experience now happily placed at the disposal of all Christendom. Our best days are ahead of us because we have a deeper insight into the character and purposes, the desires and the resources of our God. Our best days are ahead of us because we have a larger Christ, even one who requires, as we have learned increasingly these days, all of us, and all nations, and races, and communions through which adequately to express His excellences, and

to communicate His power to our generation. We have a larger knowledge of the purposes and designs of God, and we have come to see that these are immeasurably greater than we had dreamt. Therefore, with rich talents like these which we bear forth, surely our best days are ahead of every one of us, even the most distinguished person in our great company.

But if this is to be true we must let two things strike deep down into our lives to-night, and in the days that shall follow. One is the need of reality. Better might it have been in many ways had we not come to this hall if this note is not to have full expression in our lives. Infinite harm will have been done to have gathered here and have had facts and arguments burning in our brains with convincing force, to have had our hearts stirred with deep emotion, unless we give adequate practical expression to all these emotions and convictions. There is something subtly and alarmingly dangerous in acquiring any knowledge of the needs of man and the designs and desires of our Saviour, if these convictions and feelings do not escape in genuine action. There has been a steady stream of facts and truths poured in upon heart and brain until we fairly recoil under the pressure of what has been recorded in these days. We have looked out beyond this whole hall into a situation throughout the non-Christian world absolutely unique in the history of our religion, unique in opportunity, unique in danger, unique in responsibility. These and other things that press upon the whole emotional and mental nature of the delegates constitute our undoing and our peril if they issue not in performance. If these things do not move every one of us, if these things do not move us to enter with Christ into larger things, I ask it reverently, what can the living God do that will move us?

This need of reality means much—may it mean much to each one of us, and especially to the one perchance who is most indifferent to it at this time. What does it mean? It means that all of us who have been entrusted by God with large responsibility in the direction of this missionary enterprise shall go quietly out of this hall to revise our plans, not in the light of our resources, but of His resources and wishes. I make bold to say that the Church has not yet seriously attempted to bring the living Christ to all living men. Reality means that we will not only revise our plans concerning the Kingdom, but we will revise with even greater faithfulness the plans with reference to our own lives. There is something strangely pathetic in seeing delegates at a gathering like this, perchance going out to feed with emaciated hands those who want the Bread of Life. May there be that revision of plans, of life, of habits, which will make possible our own enrichment and our own constancy of touch with our living Head, that these plans may have at the back of them right motives, and disposition, and temper, and the Spirit of God. Reality means that some of us will place our lives where we least expected to place them, when we came to this Conference. Well may each one ask at a time like this, Is my life placed where it will count most in this unprecedented situation? In this great company are some to whom the note of reality will mean a giving of substance, the entering into a life of self-denial. A life of reality will mean that some of us who have become ashamed in the quiet half-hours of these

days of the flatness, and timorousness, and self-consciousness of our intercessory life, will seek to school ourselves to greater faithfulness in this greatest ministry. A life of reality will mean that we will all to-night go with Christ into the garden. "If it be possible let this cup pass from Me," He said; and I think you and I have reached the place where we actually see things so clearly with reference to the world's needs that, like our Saviour, we shrink back from what we see it is going to cost. May we steal among the olive trees with Him this night, and say as He said, "Nevertheless not My will but Thine be done."

There is the need not only of reality but the need of immediacy. A sense of urgency should strike into the core of each one of us—even the most obscure delegate. Christ seemed to live under the spell of this sense of urgency by day and by night, and one here has in mind not so much that our lives may be cut off quickly but that our opportunity will slip away. How true it is that—

"The work which centuries might have done
Must crowd the hour of setting sun."
As one of the sons of Scotland has written:—

"Time worketh,	Let me work too;
Time undoeth,	Let me do.
Busy as time my work I ply,	Till I rest in the rest of eternity.

Sin worketh,	Let me work too;
Sin undoeth,	Let me do.
Busy as sin my work I ply,	Till I rest in the rest of eternity.

Death worketh,	Let me work too;
Death undoeth,	Let me do.
Busy as death my work I ply,	Till I rest in the rest of eternity."

God grant that we all of us may in these next moments solemnly resolve henceforth so to plan and so to act, so to live and so to sacrifice, that our spirit of reality may become contagious among those to whom we go; and it may be that the words of the Archbishop shall prove to be a splendid prophecy, and that before many of us taste death we shall see the Kingdom of God come with power.

PERSPECTIVE THREE

THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL

O God, our Father, we give Thee thanks for men and women who through the many years have gone out (in the missionary movement) and who have poured out their lives in other lands.

We give Thee thanks for all that they have meant to the lands to which they have gone. We give Thee thanks for those who have laboured in years past and still labour that (missions) may continue to be a growing source of blessing to the world.

Help us, we pray Thee, in the silence of this moment to forget those about us, to remember Thee.

Bring before us our trusteeship to Thee. Bring before us our selfishness, our foolish expenditures of money, our wastefulness, all the un-Christian features of the way we . . . use Thy bounties; and then because Thou dost touch our hearts, help each one of us as stewards of Thine to know what Thy will is.

Strip us, we pray Thee, of our selfishness, and lead us to deeper devotion to Thee through Christ, our Lord, who gave His life that we might live. Amen.

(Prayer by Kenneth Scott Latourette at 9th International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions in 1924).¹

INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL PRECEDENTS

Edinburgh 1910 represented the trend toward cooperation which began in the 19th Century. The many missionary conferences held as well as the formation of the YMCA and the YWCA, the Student Christian Federation, Christian Endeavor, Federal Council of Churches in the U.S., The Foreign Missions Conference in North America, and World Sunday School

Association, and the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland are indicative of the growing trend toward cooperation in common tasks both for social reform and the spread of the Gospel. Edinburgh was part of a stream.

The Student Volunteer Movement was a major part of the stream that led to Edinburgh. Much of the SVM (its motto, personnel and motives) went into Edinburgh and into the continuation of Edinburgh. Yet the SVM also continued its own existence and program of recruiting foreign mission volunteers. The magnitude of its contribution may be gauged, for instance, by the convention in 1924, at Indianapolis. Robert E. Speer, on that occasion, gave an address on "Missions and the World Today" in which he spoke of the contributions of missions in building a better world:

. . . Far beyond the numbers of those who thus far have openly taken their places as the men and women who are to supply the Christian leadership of the new day, there are the men like Mr. Gandhi, who have never allied themselves openly with the Christian fellowship, but who up to our Lord as their supreme master and ideal and inspiration, and who have gathered the purpose of their lives out of His life.²

In Speer's view the Christian Church, planted in the life of a nation, was the greatest force for good. The Missionary enterprise was the means for planting the Church "in the life of the world."³

The effectiveness of the SVM was indicated by the number of its recruits into foreign missions. "Sailed volunteers", 1914 through 1923, were as follows:

Africa	1,149
Arabia	36
Central America	89
China	3,184
Europe	55
India & Ceylon	1,989
Japan & Korea	1,221
Mexico	262
Oceania	91
Persia	110

Philippines	256
Siam and Straits settlements	188
South America	770
West Indies	278
Western Asia (except Arabia, Persia)	333
Other Countries	298

The SVM was not yet out of business. The decade saw a total of 10,309 sailed Volunteers.⁴ The interest of the SVM gradually became less exclusively devoted to evangelization. That too was part of the general trend. Likewise Edinburgh 1910 was called to consider the task of evangelization—which it did consider—but ended focused upon cooperation and unity (albeit for purposes of evangelism). The effects of this subtle shift was to be seen in later events.

Edinburgh had been part of a stream. Yet Edinburgh was unlike any previous meeting. For one thing Edinburgh formulated plans for consecutive cooperation.

EMERGENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL

The World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh voted into existence a continuation committee which was to follow through with the work of Edinburgh begun by the Commission on cooperation.⁵

1. **Continuation Committee.** The Continuation Committee appointed at Edinburgh, with Mott as the chairman and Oldham as the secretary was to further the interests of the World Missionary Conference, especially in cooperative areas. Oldham explored the possibilities of publishing a journal, and in 1912 began the publication of the *International Review of Missions*. Around 1912/1913 a series of continuation conferences were held in India, Burma, Singapore, China, Korea, Japan and in other areas of the world. (The English language was the common bond because of the many Protestant missionaries from Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States). Other councils were also formed in Africa, Europe, and in Asia.

The First World War which brought to an end the work of the Continuation Committee ended much of the optimism of

Edinburgh. The war disrupted missions. It created an emergency situation. Missionaries and fields of the German societies were cut off from the rest of the Protestant world of Missions.

2. **Emergency Committee.** As the war came to an end it became clear that something needed to be done. What would happen to those mission fields that had been staffed by the Germans? A new committee was needed for the new situation. Thus was called into being in 1918 an "Emergency Committee" to deal with the emergency situation. The work of the old Continuation Committee was carried on, thus perpetuating Edinburgh. *The International Review of Missions* continued to be published under this new committee. Movement continued toward a definite organization which finally was realized in the formation of the International Missionary Council.

3. **International Missionary Council.** Conceived at Edinburgh, after eleven years the IMC emerged in 1921. "Through it the larger proportion of the Protestant missionary forces of the world were brought into cooperation."⁶ How would a world organization for missionary cooperation function? The IMC was the first of its kind on an international level. Its representative diversity alone presented a considerable challenge.

One of the characteristics of Edinburgh—at once its strength and its weakness, was that it met without a specified theological base. Theology at Edinburgh had been assumed, not stated. But for a continuing organization for cooperation between societies and churches of widely differing traditions would this be adequate? Hogg feels that there was a theological basis for the IMC, but that the Council did not try to solve doctrinal differences. It followed the pattern set by Edinburgh and let the Churches themselves settle the doctrinal issues.

The Council obviously had a strong theological undergirding and existed because of a common theological core among its members. This consensus the Council sought to make explicit. It included "a common obligation to proclaim the Gospel of Christ in all the world", an obligation made deep because of knowledge "of the havoc wrought by sin and of the efficacy of the salvation offered by Christ"; and "common loyalty to Jesus Himself," a loyalty which shared the confessions of Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God," and of Thomas,

"My Lord and My God." From these two basic affirmations flowed a whole series of agreements: yet, as the Council recognized, "our differences in doctrine, great though in some instances they are, have not hindered us from profitable co-operation in counsel. When we have gathered together, we have experienced a growing unity among ourselves, in which we recognized the influence of the Holy Spirit." Such recognition led to a common mind on many questions and made possible united recommendations whose final execution rested with the churches and missions concerned.⁷

"A common mind", however is not always clear, and may cause difficulties. The consensus, at times, appear less than biblical. Moreover its representations of constituent mission members was not always considered adequate. Johnston points out that at the first meetings of the IMC "the relationships to missionary societies were, in reality, only indirect through appointments of their members either in a home council or through a particular national council in a foreign field."⁸ That may not have been a theological issue, but it was a practical one. And it is not unrelated to later events.

For the IMC eventually lost its distinctive "Missionary" nature and function. Was this because the IMC's relationship to the missionary societies was only indirect? "The actual founding membership of the International Missionary Council, which consisted exclusively of mission societies, or councils of mission societies, clearly maintained a continuity with the nature of the 1910 meeting."⁹ Soon, however, membership came to include churches: "The trend from a conference of mission strategists to a conference of church leaders was now very clear as the roots (the mission agencies) and the fruits of missionary work (the churches overseas) became confused."¹⁰

To what extent did the IMC truly reflect the concerns of Edinburgh? The functions of the Council included the following:

- a) To stimulate thinking and investigation on missionary questions . . .
- b) To help co-ordinate the activities of the national missionary organizations in different countries . . .
- c) Through common consultation to help to unite Chris-

tian public opinion in support of freedom of conscience and religion and of missionary liberty.

- d) To help to unite the Christian forces of the world in seeking justice in international and intersocial relations, especially where politically weaker people are involved.
- e) To be responsible for the publication of the *International Review of Missions* and such other publications as in the judgment of the committee may contribute to the study of missionary questions.
- f) To call another world missionary conference if and when this should be desirable.¹¹

Johnston's observation is significant: "In the stated functions of the IMC, evangelism is not included in the same sense as freedom or race relations."¹² Edinburgh's consuming passion for the evangelization of the world is not evident. It is a theological or an organizational weakness? Weak or otherwise, the IMC was underway.

FRUITS OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL

The IMC made important and lasting contributions in at least three areas.

1. **Leadership.** The leadership contribution of the IMC was in the persons of John Mott, J.H. Oldham and Robert E. Speer. These men were great leaders. They wrote extensively. Mott's writings (e.g. *The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions*) concern for the Missionary task. We must remember that Mott was the product of as well as the leader of the Student Volunteer Movement before he became the leader of the world missionary organization. It was he who contributed the watchword both for Edinburgh and the SVM "the evangelization of the world in this generation." Mott and Oldham were among the greatest of Protestant missionary statesmen. Mott was regarded a giant among the world's international figures. Oldham was said to be the best informed missionary strategist in the world. Together, says, Hogg, they made a "perfect team." Yet they were little known beyond the circle of missionaries and the Protestant leaders of their time, although their endeavors were unequalled. Robert E. Speer although not part of this team, was an influential

thinker, writer and leader of the Student Volunteer Movement and of the Missionary Movement. Each of these men contributed to the development of ecumenism. The trend to cooperation in missions was to have its corollary in other areas of Church life.

2. **National Christian Councils.** The IMC encouraged formation of national Christian Councils around the world. The National Christian Council of India, for example, was formed in 1922. Soon other such councils emerged in various countries on every continent. The IMC was to lead in such organizational development.

3. **World Council of Churches.** The World Missionary Movement and the ecumenical movement share a common heritage. The concern for cooperation and unity, as we have observed, arose in *Missions* as a genuine desire for efficiency and effectiveness in evangelization. This concern led to Edinburgh, and it was there, in 1910, that the seeds were planted which eventually germinated as the IMC and the WCC.

Several movements originated in Edinburgh. The World Conference on Faith and Order and the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work arose to deal with questions omitted by Edinburgh. The Faith and Order and the Life and Work streams eventually united, they met together in 1937, and from that came a proposal for a World Council of Churches. A constitution was drafted in 1938, but the WCC was not actually formed until 1948 at Amsterdam.

Edinburgh had concluded with a great stress on cooperation. Out of Edinburgh came two streams: one issued in the IMC, the other in the WCC. What happened to the IMC? The fact that it no longer exists is another chapter in the story. For the two streams eventually came together and the IMC was merged into the WCC.

The IMC became the organizational leader of the World Missionary Movement. One of its functions was to decide if and when and where there should be another conference. The IMC decided that there should be a missionary conference at Jerusalem in 1928 and another one at Madras in 1938.

NOTES

1. Student Volunteer Movement, *Christian Students and World Problems*, p. 276.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 136.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
4. *Ibid.*
5. The history of the Continuation Committee and the IMC is told by Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundations*, to which I am indebted for much of the material in this section.
6.
7. Hogg, *op.cit.*, p. 217.
8. Johnston, *World Evangelism and the World of God*, p. 115.
9. Winter, "1980 and that Certain Elite", p. 149.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 149.
11. As cited in Johnstone, *loc.cit.*
12. *Ibid.*, P. 115.

PERSPECTIVE FOUR

JERUSALEM 1928

The Jerusalem Conference was called by the IMC to consider the problems facing the world missionary enterprise. "Jerusalem, it was hoped, would define anew in terms relevant to the day the nature and extent of the missionary enterprise."¹

Edinburgh had exuded optimism, but in 1928 at Jerusalem the mood of optimism was gone. A major war had dissipated the spirit of optimism. The theology of the church also changed: gone was all talk of bringing in the Kingdom through human effort. The war shattered the optimism of theological liberalism. That it was a Western War fought among the so-called "Christian" powers suggested that they were not so very "Christian" after all. Sober reflection on the present realities was bound to affect the tone of the discussions at Jerusalem.

A second factor affecting the Western Christian mood in 1925 was the rise of a militant atheistic ideology in Russia. Previously Russia was counted among the so-called "Christian" states of the world. But the Russian revolution gave expression to a new ideology both violent and anti-Christian (but which promised an ultimate secular utopia in place of the "kingdom on earth" of social betterment pursued by the religious liberals).

Third, a new and growing secularism in the West accompanied the social and economic changes of the day. The Church, at Jerusalem, felt inadequate for the new situation of skepticism, insecurity, instability, uncertainty, and rising secularism. When the IMC met in Jerusalem in 1928 gone was the optimism of Edinburgh. There also was no talk about evangelization of the world in this generation. Delegates were groping; the Church was uncertain of its mission. "The buoyant confidence and missionary vision of Edinburgh had become a total casualty of the new mood."²

The preparation for the Jerusalem meeting began several years earlier. In 1924 John R. Mott had reported on a series of conferences in the Near East. His report had stressed the accessibility of Islam to Christianity, Protestantism's neglect of Islam, and that Muslims are being converted to Christianity. (This was the same Mott who inspired Edinburgh, it is Mott the optimist and missionary world statesman.) As says Johnston, "Many of these thoughts must have contributed toward the choice of Jerusalem for the 1928 Conference."³ The *content* of the 1928 Conference is however, quite different from the report given four years previously by Mott.

Seven major subjects were discussed in the fifteen days of the Jerusalem meeting.

- 1) The Christian message in relation to non-Christian systems of thought and life.
- 2) The younger and older churches.
- 3) Religious Education
- 4) Missions and rural problems.
- 5) Missions and industrialism.
- 6) Missions and race conflicts.
- 7) International Missionary cooperation.

Whereas at Edinburgh the entire conference had been dominated by the concern for evangelization of the world. Jerusalem was occupied with theology. Nor was it the "missionary" message, but the "Christian" message which was under consideration. Jerusalem concerned itself with "application" of the gospel in society. The thinking is enlarged at Jerusalem: this conference was to be much more theological than that of Edinburgh. The message that came out of Jerusalem was set against the problems of the world. Many issues were raised. The concern for evangelism decreased."⁴

MESSAGE

The Christian message was the first consideration at Jerusalem. Two opposing viewpoints were represented at Jerusalem: one maintained the Gospel's uniqueness which demanded conversions, whereas the other saw Christianity as fulfilment and, following a comparative religions approach,

stressed values in the non-Christian religions. The second viewpoint made room for syncretism. It remained to William Temple to try to bring together these opposing views:

William Temple and Robert E. Speer set about the drafting of what they hoped would be an acceptable statement. Temple, as master at reconciling the irreconcilable, prepared the final summary. The key sentence affirmed: "Our message is Jesus Christ."⁵

Jerusalem thus became much more "theological" than its predecessor. Emphasis on Jesus Christ as the Christian message did not take away the differences but did place emphasis on social conscience as well as on the uniqueness of Jesus Christ. Jerusalem manifested the social gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch on the one hand, the eschatological theology of Schweitzer and Barth on the other.⁶

Jerusalem appeared to be restating Christianity as it tried to represent these diverse theological views. Finally, Jerusalem pinpointed "secularism" as the enemy of *all* religions.

Everywhere, this corrosive acid compounded of Humanism, scientism, and materialism, was deadening human hearts to God's claim upon them. Jerusalem thrust secularism into the consciousness of the churches as their arch foe, quite as deadly in "Christian" lands as in "non-Christian" lands.⁷

Ambiguity about the Christian message was reflected in Jerusalem's approach to the religions. In his preliminary paper published in preparation for the Jerusalem meeting, Macnicol spoke of the widespread attitude of many in India of "unwillingness", while convinced of the supreme worth of Christ, to join the Christian Church and accept baptism."⁸ Macnicol sought to bring out "the essential values in Hinduism",⁹ and concludes that the religious stimulus provided by Hinduism finds satisfaction in Jesus Christ in whom "both mind and heart are alike satisfied."¹⁰ *Advaita* and *bhakti* ideals are fulfilled in Christ who "is both the power of God and the wisdom of God."¹¹ In the discussion of values in the non-Christian religions, professor Heim from Germany suggested that if this were so was it not time to end all missionary work and begin instead "A free discussion between all the leading spirits

of all religions of the earth about the spiritual values of the highest religious systems."¹²

Another delegate felt it necessary to issue a warning against syncretism: he found in the papers "a very uncertain tone about Christianity itself."¹³

We must never forget that there is no salvation in Hinduism or Buddhism, but only in Christ. Therefore Christianity is not one of many religions, the highest and best perhaps; it is something quite different from them all. It is said that the missionary has to enter into partnership with the people of Asia in a great spiritual quest. This we cannot accept.¹⁴

Professor Wm. Hocking replied, however, that there was nothing to be feared in syncretism. All religions must stand together against materialism. Christianity must use the language and concepts of other religions in order to be understood, every man's religion must in some sense be the religion of his fathers (worship *with* his ancestors), our own conceptions of truth need to be enlarged.¹⁵

Conclusions about the religions—and about Christianity—were uncertain. The Council statement did, however, affirm the Gospel as "the answer to the world's greatest need."¹⁶ Seeking to restate the missionary motive, the Council repudiated "any symptoms of a religious imperialism that would . . . impose beliefs and practices on others."¹⁷ The motive was love: "We cannot be content to live in a world that is un-Christ-like."¹⁸ The goal is "the production of Christ-like character in individuals and societies and nations . . ."¹⁹ The Council called for "a more heroic practice of the Gospel."²⁰

Jerusalem endeavored to reconcile diverse views. The inevitable result was confusion. As Hogg says, "men from widely different backgrounds sought to affirm what they believed to be their divinely ordained task."²¹ The extent of the diversity is indicated by some of its prominent names: William Hocking, Luther Weigle, Karl Heim, K. L. Butterfield, E. Stanely Jones, John Mackay, William Temple, J. H. Oldham and Hendrick Kraemer.

Johnston has pointed out that "The missionary movement of the nineteenth century left its pietist moorings at Edinburgh

1910. Pietism represented theological orthodoxy. The theology of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Darwin, and Harnack began to infiltrate the entire movement."²² Jerusalem not only was more theological it represented a different kind of theology. It also represented a different interest. Edinburgh had been clearly interested in the propagation of the Gospel; Jerusalem was not so clearly concerned with the question. By focusing on Jesus Christ, Jerusalem thought to appeal to everyone. After all, who could object to Christ?! Could it be, however, that in its projection of the "Christian" message Jerusalem was more concerned for "unity" than with the missionary task? A Council statement asserted the "vital necessity today" of cooperation,²³ and noted the "the spiritual implications of the Gospel demanded unity among those who are seeking to spread the Good News."²⁴

THE YOUNGER CHURCH

Cooperation and unity concerned the delegates from the "Younger" Churches (those arising as the result of the missionary movement) as well as those representing the "Older" Churches (sending bodies). Thus the Council statement on "Co-operation through National Christian Councils", referring to this form of common witness said: "Perhaps the most outstanding contribution of co-operation to the progress of the Gospel has been the help thus given to the indigenous churches."²⁵

Moreover, the place of the missionary was *within the indigenous Church*. At Jerusalem emphasis on the Younger Church replaced the strictly "missionary" emphasis. "The Jerusalem meeting introduced a 'churchcentric' conception into the foreign missionary enterprise."²⁶ This attention to the Younger Church was legitimate and welcome, but few if any recognized that this meant the mixing of two distinctly separate (equally valid) entities. As Winter points out, the original founding membership of the IMC had consisted exclusively of "mission societies, groups of mission societies, or councils of mission societies." i.e. in keeping with the nature of Edinburgh 1910 it was felt that only missionary bodies should determine missionary policy.²⁷ This was changed, however, with introduction of the Younger Churches into the missionary structure.

By the time of the Jerusalem conference in 1926 this new voice would be heard much more strongly, and its legitimacy was not questioned. But the trend from a

conference of missionary strategists to a conference of church leaders was not very clear as the roots (the mission agencies) and the fruits of missionary work (the churches overseas) became confused.²⁸

Jerusalem began a trend which would eventually result in the virtual exclusion of the mission agencies from the missionary structure! The council at Jerusalem adopted a statement avowing the partnership of the older and younger Churches:

This "church-centric" conception of foreign missions makes it necessary to revise the functions of the "mission" where it is an administrative agency so that the indigenous church will become the centre from which whole missionary enterprise of the area will be directed.²⁹

Jerusalem thus effectively changed the base of the missionary operation. Foreign missionaries were still needed—particularly educators and other specialists—to serve under and in the younger churches. But where was the conception of the missionary as evangelist whose primary objective was world evangelization? The biblical notion of the apostolate, so simply enunciated by Edinburgh, was missing at Jerusalem. Thus the exaltation of the indigenous Church, while important in itself, became a trap: valid churchly concerns displaced care for discipling the nations in the one and only world structure created exclusively to further that interest, the International Missionary Council. Jerusalem's religious education emphasis, its adoption of the 1927 Faith and Order Conference's statement of the Christian message as its own, and its interest in a vast scope of issues reveal the trend away from a "mission" conference to a "Church" council.

Jerusalem was a departure from the primary concern for evangelization as well as from biblical norm. But nevertheless there was a positive side. For one thing, at Jerusalem the "younger" churches were well represented along with the "older" churches. ("younger" churches were those arising in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the Islands; "older" churches were those in Australia, Europe, and North America). Jerusalem was a meeting of Churches of East and West.

IMPACT

New evangelistic interest seems to have been aroused by the central emphasis on Jesus Christ. New evangelistic movements in both Japan and China were reported following the 1928 meeting.

In India a very significant development following the Jerusalem meeting was the study carried out under the auspices of the National Christian Council with the encouragement of John Mott and founded by the International Missionary Council. This was the study of Christian Mass Movements in India associated with the names of Pickett and Azariah.³⁰ This study proved monumental in its sociological scope and definitive for understanding evangelization in the Indian context.

Various studies of evangelism were made by Mott, Paton, Kraemer and others. A further contribution of Jerusalem was its organizational advancement of the cooperation and unity movement through its committees and meetings and representation.

As one would expect Jerusalem was criticised. Criticism came from many quarters. Muslims suspected a plot for a "vast assault against Islam."³¹ Criticism came from the more conservative Christians of Britain and America, and from continental theologians.³² In trying to please everyone Jerusalem seemed to have satisfied none. As Scherer says, Jerusalem employed skillful wording, to extricate Jesus Christ from the bankruptcy of western civilization but "wandered far from the biblical origins of the missionary movement."³³

The Jerusalem conferences became "syncretistic" when it entered into competition with the non-Christian religions and philosophies. Trying to be relevant it followed the false premise of "attempting to demonstrate the 'uniqueness' and 'supreme value' of Christianity on the world's own terms."³⁴ The mistake was to descend to the level of world religions.

As a result the concepts of salvation evangelism and conversion were changed at Jerusalem. The Jerusalem Report stated its understanding of salvation in terms of religious education, or personal and psychological "wholeness" and "experience" (remnescent of the Schleiermacher theology). This concept of salvation had more in common with the "social

Gospel" than with historic Christianity. As Johnston comments,

The goal of salvation through Christian religious education is seen in terms of "Christlike living in common life and in all human relations." Little attention was given to the sinful nature of man and to the reconciliation and redemptive work of Christ upon the Cross. Jesus Christ was an answer to the riddle of the universe, for God has also revealed Himself in other faiths—although in a more limited way. The culminating and fullest revelation of God, however, was in Jesus Christ. Christianity held the clue to an understanding of the evolutionary process for God as Creator is imminent in nature and continues to exert His influence in the whole process of creation. The work of Christ is more related to men through His example as the God-filled man rather than to His reconciliation of the sinner with God by His death.³⁵

It is not surprising that the conception of conversion likewise seemed garbled. The term was used in a number of ways, but seemed to suggest a psychology of religious experience interpretation. Evangelism was redefined so as to be unoffensive to modern man: "Elements of 'otherworldliness' are absent. The development of mankind dominates the thinking of the author."³⁶ Evangelism became a process of religious educational improvement rather than the confronting of men with Jesus Christ. Its goal was social.

The goal of evangelism optimistically anticipates the individual and corporate transformation of mankind. Jesus Christ was the human example for mankind, and His Gospel of the Kingdom represents the goal of society . . . A Christlike world replaced the Christianized world.³⁷

Jerusalem wandered far astray in its understanding of the traditional Christian concepts of salvation, evangelism, and conversion each of which was restated along lines consistent with the "social Gospel" ideology.

The theology of service began to displace the theology of conversion as a missionary motivation. Previously service had been an expression of Christian concern and an effort to alleviate human need. But service had not been the motivation for mission. As Scherer says, "Now, with the erosion of theologi-

cal certainty, service became for many the preferred alternative to proclamation."³⁸

Jerusalem finds many parallels today. There is a similar theological disarray; syncretism is still a missionary issue; there is a continuing blurring of Church and mission structures; and the definitions and goals of evangelism, conversion and salvation are again confused. Contemporary congresses, committees and spokesmen discuss the theology of service, values in the non-Christian religions, and salvation as socialization. Do we learn from history? Or are our leaders committed to repeating the vagaries of the past, perhaps without reference to results? Jerusalem, it would seem, is still with us.

Conferences such as Jerusalem tend to perpetuate theological confusion. One indication of the negative impact of Jerusalem was the Hocking Report of 1932.

NOTES

1. Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundation*, p. 241.
2. Scherer, "Ecumenical Mandates for Mission", p. 31.
3. Johnston, *World Evangelism and the Word of God*, p.141.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 150.
5. Hogg, *op. cit.*, p. 248.
6. A thorough discussion of the implications of these two opposing theological systems is found in Johnston, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-152.
7. Hogg, *op. cit.*, p. 249.
8. Macnicol, "Christianity and Hinduism", p. 15.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
12. International Missionary Council, *The Christian Life and Message in Relation to Non-Christian Systems*, p. 351.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 354.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 355.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 369-370.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 483.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 484.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 486.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 486.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 495.
21. Hogg, *loc. cit.*
22. Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 127.
23. International Missionary Council, *International Missionary Co-operation*, p. 75.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
26. Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 155.
27. Winter, "1980 and That Certain Elite" p. 149.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 149.
29. International Missionary Council, *The Relations Between the Younger and Older Churches*, p. 209.
30. The study, with recommendations, was first published in 1933 by the director, J. Waskom Pickett, under the title *Christian Mass Movements in India*. It is still in print and is a basic text for study of church growth in India.
31. Hogg, *op. cit.*, p. 251.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 251-252.
33. Scherer, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-33.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
35. Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 152.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 153.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
38. Scherer, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

Document Five:

The Statement Adopted by the International Missionary Council at Jerusalem, Easter 1928. Published in the Report of the Jerusalem Meeting, Volume I: The Christian Life and Message in Relation to non-Christian Systems, pp.479-495.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE

GO AND MAKE DISCIPLES OF ALL NATIONS

Throughout the world there is a sense of insecurity and instability. Ancient religions are undergoing modification, and in some regions dissolution, as scientific and commercial development alter the current of men's thought. Institutions regarded with age-long veneration are discarded or called in question; well-established standards of moral conduct are brought under criticism; and countries called Christian feel the stress as truly as the peoples of Asia and Africa. On all sides doubt is expressed whether there is any absolute truth or goodness. A new relativism struggles to enthrone itself in human thought.

Along with this is found the existence of world-wide suffering and pain, which expresses itself partly in a despair of all higher values, partly in a tragically earnest quest of a new basis for life and thought, in the birthpangs of rising nationalism, in the ever keener consciousness of race and class oppression.

Amid widespread indifference and immersion in material concerns we also find everywhere, now in noble forms and now in license or extravagance, a great yearning, especially among the youth of the world, for the full and untrammelled expression of personality, for spiritual leadership and authority, for reality in religion, for social justice, for human brotherhood, for international peace.

In this world, bewildered and groping for its way, Jesus Christ has drawn to Himself the attention and admiration of mankind as never before. He stands before men as plainly greater than western civilization, greater than the Christianity that the world has come to know. Many who have not hitherto been won to His Church yet find in Him their hero and their ideal. Within His Church there is a widespread desire for unity centred in His Person.

OUR MESSAGE

Against this background and in relation to it, we have to proclaim our message.

Our message is Jesus Christ. He is the revelation of what God is and of what man through Him may become. In Him we come face to face with the ultimate reality of the universe; He makes known to us God as our Father, perfect and infinite in love and in righteousness; for in Him we find God incarnate, the final, yet ever unfolding, revelation of the God in whom we live and move and have our being.

We hold that through all that happens, in light and in darkness, God is working, ruling and over-ruling. Jesus Christ, in His life and through His death and resurrection, has disclosed to us the Father, the Supreme Reality, as almighty Love, reconciling the world to Himself by the Cross, suffering with men in their struggle against sin and evil, bearing with them and for them the burden of sin, forgiving them as they, with forgiveness in their own hearts, turn to Him in repentance and faith, and creating humanity anew for an ever-growing, ever-enlarging, everlasting life.

The vision of God in Christ brings and deepens the sense of sin and guilt. We are not worthy of His love; we have by our own fault opposed His holy will. Yet that same vision which brings the sense of guilt brings also the assurance of pardon, if only we yield ourselves in faith to the spirit of Christ so that His redeeming love may avail to reconcile us to God.

We reaffirm that God, as Jesus Christ has revealed Him, requires all His children, in all circumstances, at all times and in all human relationships, to live in love and righteousness, to live in love and righteousness for His glory. By the resurrection of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit God offers His own power to men that they may be fellow-workers with Him, and urges them on to a life of adventure and self-sacrifice in preparation for the coming of His Kingdom in its fulness.

We will not ourselves offer any further formulation of the Christian message, for we remember that as lately as in August 1927 the World Conference on Faith and Order met at Lausanne, and that a statement on this subject was issued from that Conference after it had been received with full acceptance. We are glad to make this our own.

‘The message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

‘The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ.

‘The world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God’s spirit in all humanity, but especially in His revelation as given in the Old Testament; and in the fulness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate and was made man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, full of grace and truth.

‘Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of judgment, His suffering death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sins, and has revealed the fulness of the living God and His boundless love

toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men.

‘Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Saviour and Lord, is also the centre of the world-wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church. Because He Himself is the Gospel, the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world. It is more than a philosophical theory; more than a theological system; more than a programme for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death; still more, it is the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth in the communion of saints, united in the fellowship of service, of prayer and of praise.

‘The Gospel is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ. It is the comfort of those who suffer; to those who are bound it is the assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The Gospel brings peace and joy to the heart, and produces in men self-denial, readiness for brotherly service and compassionate love. It offers the supreme goal for the aspirations of youth, strength to the toiler, rest to the weary and the crown of life to the martyr.

‘The Gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society at present into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord.

‘Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice and spiritual inspiration, the Church in the eternal Gospel meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past so also in the present, the Gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through His Church, the living Christ still says to men, “Come unto me! . . . He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.”

THE MISSIONARY MOTIVE

If such is our message, the motive for its delivery should be plain. The Gospel is the answer to the world’s greatest need. It is not our discovery or achievement; it rests on what we recognize as an act of God. It is first and foremost Good News. It announces glorious Truth. Its very nature forbids us to say that it may be the right belief for some but not for others. Either it is true for all, or it is not true at all.

But questions concerning the missionary motive have been widely raised, and such a change in the habits of men’s thoughts as the last generation has witnessed must call for a re-examination of these questions.

Accordingly we would lay bare the motives that impel us to the missionary enterprise. We recognize that the health of our movement and of our souls demands a self-criticism that is relentless and exacting.

In searching for the motives that impel us we find ourselves eliminating decisively and at once certain motives that may seem, in the minds of some, to have become mixed up with purer motives in the history of the movement. We repudiate any attempt on the part of trade or of governments, openly or covertly, to use the missionary cause for ulterior purposes. Our Gospel by its very nature and by its declaration of the sacredness of human personality stands against all exploitation of man by man, so that we cannot tolerate any desire, conscious or unconscious, to use this movement for purposes of fastening a bondage, economic, political, or social, on any people.

Going deeper, on our part we would repudiate any symptoms of a religious imperialism that would desire to impose beliefs and practices on others in order to manage their souls in their supposed interests. We obey a God who respects our wills and we desire to respect those of others.

Nor have we the desire to bind up our Gospel with fixed ecclesiastical forms which derive their meaning from the experience of the western Church. Rather the aim should be to place at the disposal of the younger churches of all lands our collective and historic experience. We believe that much of that heritage has come out of reality and will be worth sharing. But we ardently desire that the younger churches should express the Gospel through their own genius and through forms suitable to their racial heritage. There must be no desire to lord it over the personal or collective faith of others.

Our true and compelling motive lies in the very nature of the God to whom we have given our hearts. Since He is love, His very nature is to share. Christ is the expression in time of the eternal self-giving of the Father. Coming into fellowship with Christ we find in ourselves an over-mastering impulse to share Him with others. We are constrained by the love of Christ and by obedience to His last command. He Himself said, 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly,' and our experience corroborates it. He has become life to us. We would share that life.

We are assured that Christ comes with an offer of life to men and to societies and to nations. We believe that in Him the shackles of moral evil and guilt are broken from human personality and that men are made free, and that such personal freedom lies at the basis of the freeing of society from cramping custom and blighting social practices and political bondage, so that in Christ men and societies and nations may stand up free and complete.

We find in Christ, and especially in His cross and resurrection, an inexhaustible source of power that makes us hope when there is no hope. We believe that through it men and societies and nations that have lost their moral nerve to live will be quickened into life.

We have a pattern in our minds as to what form that life should take. We believe in a Christ-like world. We know nothing better, we can be content with nothing less. We do not go to the nations called non-Christian because they are the worst of the world and they alone are in need—we go because they are a part of the world and share with us in the same human need—the need of redemption from ourselves and from sin, the need to have life complete and abundant and to be remade after this pattern of Christ-likeness. We desire a world in which Christ will not be crucified but where His Spirit shall reign.

We believe that men are made for Christ and cannot really live apart from Him. Our fathers were impressed with the horror that men should die without Christ—we share that horror; we are impressed also with the horror that men should live without Christ.

Herein lies the Christian motive; it is simple. We cannot live without Christ and we cannot bear to think of men living without Him. We cannot be content to live in a world that is un-Christ-like. We cannot be idle while the yearning of His Heart for His brethren is unsatisfied.

Since Christ is the motive, the end of Christian missions fits in with that motive. This end is nothing less than the production of Christ-like character in individuals and societies and nations through faith in and fellowship with Christ the living Saviour, and through corporate sharing of life in a divine society.

Christ is our motive and Christ is our end. We must give nothing less, and we can give nothing more.

THE SPIRIT OF OUR ENDEAVOUR

Our approach to our task must be made in humility and penitence and love. In humility, because it is not our own message which we bring, but God's and if in our delivery of it self-assertion finds any place we shall spoil that message and hinder its acceptance; in penitence, because our fathers and we ourselves have been so blind to many of the implications of our faith; in love, because our message is the Gospel of the Love of God, and only by love in our own hearts for those to whom we speak can we make known its power or its true nature.

Especially do we confess the sluggishness of the older churches to realize the discharge their responsibility to carry the Gospel to all the world; and all alike we confess our neglect to bring the ordering of men's lives into conformity with the spirit of Christ. The Church has not firmly and effectively set its face against race-hatred, race-envy, race-contempt, or against social envy and contempt and class-bitterness, or against racial, national and social pride, or against the lust for wealth and exploitation of the poor or weak. We believe that the Gospel 'proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from class and race hatred.' But we are forced to recognize that such a claim requires to be made good and that the record of Christendom hitherto is not sufficient to sustain it. Nor has it sufficiently sought out the good and noble elements in the non-Christian beliefs, that it might learn that deeper personal fellowship with adherents of those

beliefs wherein they may be more powerfully drawn to the living Christ. We know that, even apart from conscious knowledge of Him, when men are true to the best light they have, they are able to effect some real deliverance from many of the evils that afflict the world; and this should prompt us the more to help them to find the fulness of light and power in Christ.

But while we record these failures we are also bound to record with thankfulness the achievements of the Christian Church in this field. The difference between the Europe known to St. Paul and the Europe known to Dante, to Luther, to Wesley is plain for all to see. From every quarter of the globe comes testimony to the liberation effected by Christ for women. Since the vast changes made by the development of industrialism have come to be appreciated, every country has had its Christian social movements, and the Universal Conference on Life and Work, held at Stockholm in—1925, revealed how widespread and influential these have become. Truly our efforts have not been commensurate with the needs of the world or with the claim of Christ; but in what has been accomplished and attempted we have already great encouragement for the days to come. In particular there is a growing sensitiveness of conscience with regard to war and the conditions that may lead up to it. For all these indications of the growing power of the spirit of Christ among Christians we thank God. And we call on all Christian people to be ready for pioneering thought and action in the name of Christ. Too often the Church has adopted new truth, or new goals for enterprise, only when the danger attached to them is over. There is a risk of rashness; but there is also possible an excessive action by which, because His Church hangs back, the glory of new truth or enterprise which rightly belongs to Christ is in men's thoughts denied to Him.

THE CALL TO THE WORLD

Filled with conviction that Jesus Christ is indeed the Saviour of the world, and conscious of a desperate need in ourselves and in all the world for what He only can supply, we call upon our fellow-Christians and all our fellow-men to turn again to Him for pardon and for power.

1. To all the Churches of Christ we call: that they stand firmly upon the rock of Christian conviction and whole-heartedly accept its missionary obligations; that they go forward in full loyalty to Christ to discover and to express, in the power and freedom of the Holy Spirit, the treasures in His unsearchable riches which it is the privilege and duty of each to win for the Universal Church; that they strive to deliver the name of Christ and of Christianity from complicity in any evil or injustice.

Those who proclaim Christ's message must give evidence for it in their own lives and in the social institutions which they uphold. It is by living Christ among men that we may most effectively lift Him up before them. The spirit that returns love for hate, and overcomes evil with good, must be evidently present in those who would be witnesses for Christ. They are also bound to exert all their influence to secure that the social, international and inter-racial relationships in the midst of which their work is done are subordinate to and expressive of His spirit. Especially must it be a serious obstacle to missionary effort if a non-Christian country feels

that the relation of the so-called Christian countries to itself is morally unsound or is alien from the principles of Christ, and the Church must be ready for labour and sacrifice to remove whatever is justly so condemned.

The task before us is beyond our powers. It can only be accomplished by the Holy Spirit, whose power we receive in its completeness only in the fellowship of Christ's disciples. We call all followers of Christ to take their full share as members of His Body, which is the Church; no discontent with its organization or tradition or failings should be allowed to keep us outside its fold; the isolated Christian is impoverished in his spiritual life and impotent in his activities; our strength both inward and outward is in the living fellowship. But in these hurried and feverish days there is also more need than ever for the deepening of our spiritual life through periodical detachment from the world and its need in lonely communion with God. We desire also to call for a greater volume of intercessory prayer. The whole Church should be earnest and instant in prayer, each part for every other, and all together for the Church's unity and for the following of God's Name throughout the world.

Further, we call on Christians in all lands who are trained in science, art or philosophy to devote their talents to the working out of that Christian view of life and the world which we sorely need to secure us against instability, bewilderment and extravagance.

Lastly, we urge that every possible step be taken to make real the fellowship of the Gospel. The churches of the West send missions and missions-of-help to the churches of Africa and Asia. We believe that the time is come when all would gain if the younger churches were invited to send missions-of-help to the churches of Europe and America, that they may minister of their treasure to the spiritual life of those to whom they come.

2. To non-Christians also we make our call. We rejoice to think that just because in Jesus Christ the light that lighteth every man shone forth in its full splendour, we find rays of that same light where He is unknown or even is rejected. We welcome every noble quality in non-Christian persons or systems as further proof that the Father, who sent His Son into the world, has nowhere left Himself without witness.

Thus, merely to give illustration, and making no attempt to estimate the spiritual value of other religions to their adherents, we recognize as part of the one Truth that sense of the Majesty of God and the consequent reverence in worship, which are conspicuous in Islam; the deep sympathy for the world's sorrow and unselfish search for the way of escape, which are at the heart of Buddhism; the desire for contact with ultimate reality conceived as spiritual, which is prominent in Hinduism; the belief in a moral order of the universe and consequent insistence on moral conduct, which are inculcated by Confucianism; the disinterested pursuit of truth and of human welfare which are often found in those who stand for secular civilization but do not accept Christ as their Lord and Saviour.

Especially we make our call to the Jewish people, whose Scriptures have become our own, and 'of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh', that

with open heart they turn to that Lord in whom is fulfilled the hope of their nation, its prophetic message and its zeal for holiness. And we call upon our fellow-Christians in all lands to show to Jews that lovingkindness that has too seldom been shown towards them.

We call on the followers of non-Christian religions to join with us in the study of Jesus Christ as He stands before us in the Scriptures, His place in the life of the world, and His power to satisfy the human heart; to hold fast to faith in the unseen and eternal in face of the growing materialism of the world; to co-operate with us against all the evils of secularism; to respect freedom of conscience so that men may confess Christ without separation from home and friends; and to discern that all the good of which men have conceived is fulfilled and secured in Christ.

Christianity is not a western religion, nor is it yet effectively accepted by the western world as a whole. Christ belongs to the peoples of Africa and Asia as much as to the European or American. We call all men to equal fellowship in Him. But to come to Him is always self-surrender. We must not come in the pride of national heritage or religious tradition; he who would enter the Kingdom of God must become as a little child, though in that Kingdom are all the treasures of man's aspirations, consecrated and harmonized. Just because Christ is the self-disclosure of the One God, all human aspirations are towards Him, and yet of no human tradition is He merely the continuation. He is the desire of all nations; but He is always more, and other, than they had desired before they learnt of Him.

But we would insist that when the Gospel of the Love of God comes home with power to the human heart, it speaks to each man, not as Moslem or as Buddhist, or as an adherent of any system, but just as man. And while we rightly study other religions in order to approach men wisely, yet at the last we speak as men to men, inviting them to share with us the pardon and the life that we have found in Christ.

3. To all who inherit the benefits of secular civilization and contribute to its advancement we make our call. We claim for Christ the labours of scientists and artists. We recognize their service to His cause in dispersing the darkness of ignorance, superstition and vulgarity. We appreciate also the noble elements that are found in nationalist movements and in patriotism, the loyalty, the self-devotion, the idealism, which love of country can inspire. But even these may lead to strife and bitterness and narrowness of outlook if they are not dedicated to Christ; in His universal Kingdom of Love all nations by right are provinces, and fulfil their own true destiny only in His service. When patriotism and science are not consecrated they are often debased into self-assertion, exploitation and the service of greed. Indeed, throughout all nations the great peril of our time arises from that immense development of man's power over the resources of nature which has been the great characteristic of our epoch. This power gives opportunity for wealth of interest, and, through facilities of communication, for freedom of intercourse such as has never been known. But it has outgrown our spiritual and moral control.

Amid the clashes of industrial strife the Gospel summons men to work together as brothers in providing for the human family the economic basis of the good life. In the presence of social antipathies and exclusiveness the Gospel insists that we are members of one family, and that our Father desires for each a full and equal opportunity to attain to His own complete development, and to make his special contribution to the richness of the family life. Confronted by international relations that constantly flout Christ's law of love, there is laid on all who bear His name the solemn obligation to labour unceasingly for a new world-order in which justice shall be secured for all peoples, and every occasion for war or threat of war be removed.

Such changes can be brought about only through an unreserved acceptance of Christ's way of love, and by the courageous and sacrificial living that it demands. Still ringing in our ears is the call, 'Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds.'

CONCLUSION

In our conference together we have seen more clearly the fulness and sufficiency of the Gospel and our own need of the salvation of Christ. The enlarging thoughts of the generation find the Gospel and the Saviour ever richer and greater than men had known.

This deepened assurance of the adequacy and universality of the Gospel, however, is not enough. More effective ways must be found for its proclamation, not to systems of opinion only, but to human beings, to men and women for whom Christ died. The most thorough and convincing intellectual statement of Christianity is necessary, but such statements cannot suffice. The Gospel must be expressed also in simplicity and love, and offered to men's hearts and minds by word and deed and life, by righteousness and loving-kindness, by justice, sympathy and compassion, by ministry to human needs and the deep want of the world.

As together, Christians of all lands, we have surveyed the world and the needs of men, we are convinced of the urgent necessity for a great increase in the Christian forces in all countries, and for a still fuller measure of co-operation between the churches of all nations in more speedily laying the claim of Christ upon all the unoccupied areas of the world and of human life.

We are persuaded that we and all Christian people must seek a more heroic practice of the Gospel. It cannot be that our present complacency and moderation are a faithful expression of the mind of Christ, and of the meaning of His Cross and Resurrection in the midst of the wrong and want and sin of our modern world. As we contemplate the work with which Christ has charged His Church, we who are met here on the Mount of Olives, in sight of calvary, would take up for ourselves and summon those from whom we come, and to whom we return, to take up with us the Cross of Christ, and all that for which it stands, and to go forth into the world to live in the fellowship of His sufferings and by the power of His resurrection, in hope and expectation of His glorious Kingdom.