

In appointing the Deputation, it is well known that neither the Coleridge Board of Managers was consulted. It is stated in the Magazine, that the Executive Committee would gladly have created themselves of the selection of the Board of Managers; and there being time for a reference to them. What would emergency would have selected in the interval between the annual meeting in May 1832, and the appointment of the Deputation in October, to justify such a course. It is difficult to understand the appointment of Harrow was known at the May meeting. In July, discussions were sent to the Missionaries to hold a conference for the purpose of selecting individuals to occupy the most desirable stations in the newly annexed territory. That conference would, no doubt, have been fully occupied to perform the duty assigned them. No persons would be better qualified to select the proper stations and the persons to occupy them, than the Missionaries themselves. It does not appear to have been thought, at the time this resolution was appointed, that a Deputation would be necessary. If anything unusual had occurred, it would not have been more difficult to call an extra meeting of the Board than it was in 1825, when information had been received that pamphlets in the Missionaries were set on fire by the natives. But on each meeting was called, no movement had taken place which would justify such a result, and no one, I am persuaded, could be justly held answerable for it, that the call for such a meeting, and a full and fair discussion of the measures to be carried into execution by the Deputation, would have resulted in a refusal on the part of the Board and the Association generally, to sanction their appointment.

It may be said that the intention is too strong, and that the measure was sanctioned by the Board at the annual meeting in Albany in 1832. But the question remains. Were the objects for which a Deputation was sent, fully presented before the Board at Albany in 1832, and that the measure was unanimously sanctioned, did they understand the original grounds of

19
the appointment, and still maintain they the necessary appointment of the clergy, which were not then known, being allowed among the Mission in the west. Upon the occasion of that meeting, so far as the minutes had the means of information, the resignation of Harrow was the prime cause of creating a Deputation. No one appears to have supposed that this was not a general measure. The object of the Deputation was announced in the Magazine for Dec. 1832, in the following terms:

—To devise the best methods of organizing, appointing and directing the Mission, which is and ought to be enlarged, and to establish the mission on a just footing in relation both to our past and to our prospective efforts for the evangelization of the west of Texas; a general meeting of the Directors and Agents Missionaries to be convened at Monterey; and a Deputation from the Executive Committee are also on their way, to sit with them, to aid their deliberations, and to communicate the resolutions made to their respective homes.

The foregoing was maintained at the annual meeting in 1833. No indication appears to have been given of a change in the policy of the Mission, if we except the opposition to which alluded by Dr. Wayland. His remarks however, appeared to have no connection with the action of the Executive Committee; and it is probable that many an individual in that meeting, beyond the general statement, had any idea that while Dr. Wayland was preparing a resolution of inquiry, in reference to schools and the press, the work of evangelization was going on in Spanish, under the sanction of authority committed to the Deputation by the Executive Committee. It happens probably, indeed, that some of the members in 1834, that the Executive Committee themselves were not aware of the extent to which Dr. Wayland's views were being carried out by the Deputation. The following year we find that General Dr. Hays reported to the Trustees with Dr. Snow's reply:

"It was apparent there was a pronounced intention of making great changes in the Massachusetts according to a resolution. The charge of persons having been denied and approved, it is recalled that the individuals mentioned might show themselves, but the fact was not known. The resolution of the motion of Dr. Weyland on this subject with the work which the Deputation were thinking on the other side of the world, was not successful."

"Dr. Weyland said that the Executive Committee were not responsible for Dr. Weyland's motion, at all connected with it. On the contrary, they all regretted that it was made at the time."

The Executive Committee must have known, when they appointed the Deputation, that as long as of their constant views on the subject of schools changed with those which Dr. Weyland had been urging for some years. They could not therefore have been greatly surprised to find that the people powers with which the Deputation were charged, had been started in favor of the new theory.

Before the meeting in 1874, it had become generally known that the proposed re-organization of the State had created an anxiety which was for the appointment of a Deputation. It was plain that the designation of individuals among the new party, might have been easily set with the Massachusetts, and that they were in fact, the only proper persons to make the selection. The Executive would have considered in the Massachusetts as a body, if such was the case, why should they not allow the benefits to be made by a vote of the majority? Why did the Deputation withhold the permission to nominate individuals, which had been given to the Committee by the Executive Committee?

The ground taken the previous year, having become untenable, new reasons for the appointment of a Deputation were brought forward, and the Union was started upon the side of the movement, most sweeping charges against

21
Massachusetts, over which it is by a religious audience. These charges made by the high authorities, and connected with such matters, could not fail to obtain credit with most of the members. On the supposition that they were true, what must be thought of the system which, at the previous conference, demanded the surrender of an important fact from those who had a right to the fullest information of a system to maintain which it was necessary to keep back the true names for a great public concern, and substitute parties, which were not but incidental and comparatively unimportant?

Let us look for a moment at the different positions occupied by the official reports in 1872 and 1874. In the former year the language used in reference to Dr. Weyland's proposal for an inquiry concerning the time and place required on schools, and the price, was as follows:

"The House Committee, before subjecting to a committee. They were agreed that something was directed instrumentally to be done, and it was not aware that the system of any of the Ministers was liable to just criticisms in the matter."

How the Executive appears to be ignorant that there was anything in the practice of the Ministers in the matter of schools and grading, that called for executive intervention. But at the annual meeting in 1874, because the following statement, which is copied from the New York Record:

"The Executive Committee found that in certain instances their instructions were not complied with. They thought it was better to send a Deputation, and over the performance of these things. In this we have failed, and you shall have the which, if that be the true situation. In 1874 the Hon. Mr. Vinton, and others, and spoke of the performance of parties, and spoke of the performance of parties over preaching in the Ministers. In consequence of this Dr. Weyland made objection, and a resolution was called at a meeting of the Board in New York, and the result

22
was to them preaching before teaching and book-making, and the Department was instructed to give information as to this point. The resolution may have made them to see that the Board and Executive Committee have this mentioned in almost every report for five years past. It could not have been done without doing it in that which the Board could not do, because the Missionaries refused to comply.

The following, from the same speech, is reported in the *Standard*:

"The whole subject of the proper preparation of Missionary labor was considered in 1848, and the Executive Committee was instructed to investigate into what the necessary qualifications of. Why were not these instructions obeyed? Because—being granted to say so, but the ground was called out by others—the instructions of the Executive Committee were not followed in some of the Missions. Ever since 1848, the Committee had endeavored to fulfill the instructions of the Board, but had been thwarted, and it was their conviction that a measure must be adopted adequate to that end, & such a measure could be devised."

But why could not the missionaries as yet could work? Because missionaries are men, of the passions with others. Many people seem to think them angels. He loved his missionary brethren and would not willingly speak of their infirmities; but the truth must be told when the most important measures were thus called.

It is difficult to translate the language of (of last session with that) of the preceding year. It would seem that as early as 1849, schools had been placed before preaching. The Executive Committee were instructed to prevent that order. They endeavored to do so, but because of the Missionaries their instructions were a dead letter; the order could not be enforced, because the Missionaries refused to comply. Up to July 1852, the sending of a Department had not been contemplated, but

23
they were contemplated for some time, occurring between that time and October, the Committee came to the resolution that some measure must be adopted equal to the end in view, & such a measure could be devised, which I fully proved to be the appointment of a Department. And yet the Home Secretary, in 1853, did not know that the system preventing many of our Missions, was still in just exception to the matter of teaching and book-making.

If the plan's avowed object of the state-ments made by the executive officers is not such as I have given, it is impossible to attach any meaning to language. There could have been that was expressed made upon the minds of all who listened to the explanation of the Home Secretary.

What now can be thought if the facts referred to 1854, to justify a Department, should turn out to be purely fallacious? What if it should appear that schools and printing had everywhere placed before preaching, and that no Missionary had ever refused to comply with the instructions of the Committee in this respect? Yet such is actually the case. If the ground had been as to justify the appointment of a Department was untenable, that which was subsequently adopted will be found still more untenable, because directly opposed to them. Had there been a wish to disclose the real objects of the Department, it might have been done in the company of a single witness; yet to this day, not an official information is called on the supporters of Mission as we speak in the dark as they were at the annual meeting in 1853. Respectfully yours,

N. Brown.

Nov. and Dec. 1801

Not only were the dissenting opinions of the editors of the *Edinburgh*; but all the information equal to the extent of its power with which they were treated, was carefully withheld from the public. That power was essentially episcopal and was, in fact, greater and more absolute than that of any Anglican bishop. By its announcement in the *Magazine*, *Churchman's* phrase, "a just discretionary power" was authorized by the specification of themselves as such that power was made of use, "with the deliberation" of the conference, and "recommending the insertion or omission to the writers of books."

Subsequent information, received from the printer, has convinced the Committee to believe that a reputation of faithful men, clothed with a just discretionary power, and engaged with the two-fold service of aiding the conference in its deliberations, and of bringing before complete views of its resources, should be acceptable to the subscribers, and greatly increase the economy and efficiency of the enterprise, which through many various means.

The weekly general language was not intended to convey an idea that the disputation were clothed with episcopal power, but the contrary. No act or reading it would reverse the impression that journal of adding the deliberations of the conference, they were empowered to receive its decisions; no one would suppose that each was the same opinion of no likely to prove "acceptable to the subscribers," no one would suppose that instead of being desired to connect with their brethren and bring forward the results, they were clothed with the whole power of the association, to be used at their discretion in controlling and covering the publication.

The instructions given by the Executive Committee, including the act of authorisation, by which the disputation were treated with absolute power, most of which every member of the Union had a right to be informed, have never yet been published. It properly formed a part of the records of the Madras Convention, but in printing the minutes, the most important portion of the document was omitted. When you had received the minutes in London, and presented this paper as a subject for your notice, you were requested to allow a copy of the paragraph under above mention to be sent to be inserted in the records of our meeting. To this you assented. After considerable discussion, you allowed a copy to be taken, but with the express limitation, that it should not be published. It appears, however, that during the investigation at Albany, this limitation was placed in the hands of a Committee of which Dr. Weyland was chairman, and at the special meeting in March, 1802, it was called for and read before the Board of Managers. Had it not been for the above limitation here stated as the object, it would never have seen the light. As this act of authorisation has been publicly read, I consider that I am under no obligation to giving it no insertion in this place. It is deserving what all the friends of a legal document.

To accomplish these and such other objects as may engage their deliberations.

2. The Executive will regard themselves as clothed with authority, as the representatives of the Executive Committee, and for the time being will act in their behalf and their stead. They are directed to deliberate with one another together in assembly; and when the Disputation opens in opposition to the terms of the contract, require the immediate decision of any queries or questions, they will consider themselves as authorized to act decisively in all such cases, with all the powers constitutionally possessed by this Committee, with the single exception of the appropriation of money from the treasury. Whenever they

we need also this assurance, they will be engaged immediately to report their doings to the Executive Committee, with a detailed statement of the reasons therefor."

It will be noted that the authority to effect changes is not limited to those cases in which the mission and the Deputies are agreed, but in those cases where the members of the Deputation agree with each other. By another article, the same absolute power was vested in yourself alone, whenever the Deputation should separate, and with this power you acted in Africa.

It is said that some of the missionaries desired a Deputation. Nothing could be more natural. It is probable there was not a Mission in the Field, who would not have been delighted to see a Deputation of selected, distinguished men, clothed with its authority beyond what the New Testament sanctions. Such a Deputation would have been framed, not in word only, but in truth; their offer would have been to examine the operations of their brethren, to give them advice, and to make report of what they had heard and seen, good and bad, and without waiting until they were forced by "pressure" to "communicate all they know." The household responsibility of examination, counsel, and giving a report, would, it appears to me, be quite as much as any good Baptist would desire, without the exercise of a dictatorial power over their brethren. The venerable fathers of our denomination, who commenced the work of modern missions, would not have set out on a brother's journey clothed with this authority of fact. But there are changes, and we change with them. The *Manifesto* for Sept. 1854, says:

"The Synodical Convention of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions clothed their Deputation, recently sent forth, with precisely the same power as was given to ours. Indeed, we do not believe that any Board would consent to withhold such authority from one worthy the appointment, or that any two competent men would consent to

27
go forth as a Deputation to India without enjoying the right to do what they conscientiously believed would not be easily delayed."

The Deputation of the American Board of Commissioners have gone to India in order to introduce substantially the same principles of missionary labor in their mission, and a Deputation, for the same object, have landed in power north on behalf of the English Baptist Board.

There can be no doubt that the Massachusetts had the most accurate information in regard to the facts here stated. All our great missionary societies either act in concert, or follow each other's lead. The mutual understanding between our committees and those of the American Board, has long been manifest. It is understood that the officers of the principal missionary societies in London are assembled to view the mutual manifestations of the management of missions. Before leaving their shores, as we learned from your statement in the *Manifesto* Convention, you were aware that the officers of the American Board had adopted the same principles in regard to articles of their constitution by yourself, and you were, doubtless, well prepared to expect that a Deputation from their Society would soon follow in your steps. It is not surprising that the same legal instrument of authority exercised by yourselves, should also occur to others. It might be supposed that the English Baptist Missionary Society would have sent their Deputation with a conviction less respectful to their original principles. But it has been shown by one of the officers of that Society, that they did leave their Deputation with similar powers, although they had not deemed it advisable to name this fact public. How painful to find that Deputations are thus following in the wake of other Deputations, and adopting a system of worldly policy, such as we have always been taught to regard as essential to truly permanent and durable establishments by us.

It is, however, very satisfactory to learn that the English delegation, Dr. Mc. Underhill, although divided with such ardor, has yet said a certain number with cooler and moderate views, and that the House Committee, so far from adopting any narrow views of missionary operations, especially encourage the prosecution of educational efforts, together with the teaching of English.

The Methodists reckon that "competent men" would not consent to go out, unless they were clothed with this arbitrary power. It would seem that Baptist ministers have such a position in the eyes of the people, that they would not go to India, unless they could enjoy the right of enforcing whatever they thought best, irrespective of the opinions of their missionary brethren. Or, if any individuals could be found who would consent to go with less power, they are not the men that would be desired. We should suppose that a dissent would be the reasonable fathers of our Zion, might have issued their agents such arbitrary operations. Until we have evidence that the Methodists have more authority for attributing such sentiments to the ministers of our denomination generally, I shall continue to believe that the exercise of compulsory power over their missionary brethren, would be also repugnant to their principles and their feelings, and that they would much sooner visit our mission fields for the purpose of inspiring our operations and giving advice, than they would go for the purpose of controlling our movements and breaking up our plan.

Suppose a missionary were to be appointed as a delegate, (for there is nothing absurd in the supposition) is it to be believed that he would desire to be invested with the power of control over his brethren? Who, amongst all our ministers, would be found willing to place himself in a position so totally inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our denomination? And yet, if episcopal authority could properly be intrusted to a delegate,

29
it would be in our possession of all and experienced missionaries, who, in addition to their opportunity for the study of their business, would realize a richness of knowledge and judgment that could never be obtained by persons so engaged, that, however much they might have prepared themselves by previous study.

Our churches are urged to be reconciled to the late measure, by the probability that the necessity for sending a delegate will seldom occur. This is a mistake. On our present system, missions cannot be managed except by the frequent appointment of delegates, as the exercise of episcopal power is necessary. The necessity for interference will become instead of diminishing. The frequency with which some churches already send their delegates shows that it is not altogether because a permanent arrangement. And it will soon be found that a number of two or three years, as the plan contemplated by the present Synod of the English Baptist Missionary Society, will be absolutely necessary, in order to prevent the evils of hurried legislation. Experience will show that the duties of government can be much more satisfactorily performed by delegates who reside in the field than by transient visitors. Indeed, if we must have a system of authoritative direction, the wisest a regular episcopal government is introduced the better. Let the ground on which we stand be fairly understood. Far better to have superintendents, openly and regularly appointed, as in the English Church, than to have persons deputed to exercise the same power, by an act of authorization derived from public meeting, and recommended by the masses of the congregation. It is not all events, quite certain that missionaries, who have entered the field on New Testament principles, however much inclined to submit for the sake of peace, will never recognize the validity of the powers assumed and exercised by the late Synod.

I remain, yours very respectfully,

NATHAN HARRIS.

How and How Slow

The public have an idea of something what were the objects of the deposition, except from the work they have actually done. Farther than the course they have pursued with all our relations, as well as from their engraved tablets and written documents, I had that I was standing on our ground, when I received that the leading objects of their deposition were as follows:

First, to reorganize our missionary operations, on the basis that the real proclamation of the gospel is the only mode of evangelization, sanctioned by Christ's commission.

Second, to reduce missionary to the condition of hired servants, and to enforce a system of mechanical industry in every department of missionary labor.

To the former of these objects the church of Jesus-Christ was wholly, though not exclusively, devoted, while the latter was, so I believe, the paramount object with yourself, and one to the attainment of which your labors have been long directed. It is certainly the paramount question; it forms the very foundation of our ecclesiastical structure, and occupies the first place in all our discussions. Now as the other subject was first by the proceedings of the Maryland convention, it will be convenient to follow the same order in these letters.

I do not wish to be understood as saying that the executive committee had these objects in view, when they espoused the deposition to act. I was inclined to doubt whether the committee anticipated that so many radical changes would be introduced by the deposition. With Drs. Ripley, Fiske, and Neale, and Dr. James Lincoln, I had the pleasure of an acquaintance before leaving this country; and I fully expected that, with a full knowledge of facts, they would not have lost their meeting

to what has been done. On the ground of this, it is indeed impossible for the executive committee always to obtain a proper knowledge of the numerous subjects on which they are required to vote. They are liable to mis-judgments regard to facts. When it is remembered that these brethren are fully occupied with their appropriate pastoral and other duties, how is it possible that they should be familiar with the details of missionary operations? They are not depend on the secretaries, who are able to devote time to the examination of missionary correspondence. If the secretaries, the real executives of the Union, are not to be so overburdened, it would be strange if the executive committee did not include, as a greater or less extent, the same impressions. The representations against missionaries which have been published throughout your the land for the last two years, affecting the ministers and churches from their business almost, have no doubt been spreading like a rank growth on the minds of the executive committee. Still as the present measures have been carried into effect in their name and by their authority, it is proper that they should bear the full responsibility.

I have sincerely remarked that, so far as official information is concerned, the opposition of relations are still in the dark as to the changes which the deposition might occasion. A person positively possessing the files of the Maryland and Missouri, would not be aware of the real points at issue between the deposition and the abolitionists who differed from them. The general impression conveyed by the publication of the executive is that they regard the passing of the gospel as more important than subjects of our opposition of the press, and that it was to bring the pressure of the abolitionists into connection with this principle, that the deposition was not act. This is distinctly asserted by the House Secretary in his remarks already quoted, and is brought up

was a body of them in the presence of the Work of the Deputation. One or two gentlemen will confirm.

"The deputation wanted themselves of every man within their reach to learn precisely in what way and in what extent the missionary work in Hawaii should be modified, so as to secure to the preaching of the gospel its rightful position and effectiveness, and in other respects a just subordination to it."

"1. With respect to working in the work of preaching its rightful position and effectiveness, the ground was taken by the deputation, and in the end sustained in by most of the missionaries, that every ordained missionary should give himself to the work during the whole of every day season, and at other times to the extent of his ability; that his conversation with sailing agencies should be adjusted, as far as possible, to such employment of his time that the burden of all preaching should be the way of life through Jesus Christ; that it should be directly to the heathen in the language in which they were born; and so far as practicable, in upon the plains of common sense."—*Magazine*, July, 1854.

"As stated in our previous paper, the deputation, regarding the preaching of the gospel as the prime agency for the conversion of the people, and desiring to give it the widest scope, advocated and pursued measures providing that every ordained missionary during the whole of every day season, and at other times to the extent of his ability, should preach directly to the heathen in the language in which they were born."

Magazine, May, 1855.

The instructions, contained in these papers, that missionaries, or at least most of them, do not consider preaching the gospel of more importance than schools and other auxiliary agencies, is a most serious objection. You will

and colleagues will know that not a single member of the Hawaiian Association ever assumed an opinion of this kind. You cannot have forgotten that when charged with such opinions, members of the association were and expelled the indignation. None of our missionaries has ever placed schools above the preaching of the gospel; and yet this stigma upon our labor has been stamped and repeated through the land. The case of American Christian (Hague) witnesses at home and our affectionate remonstrance to their missionary brethren, warning them against substituting schools for preaching the gospel; remonstrance in Germany, Spain, and China are enough that their brethren in Hawaii should hold views on this point different from the deputation; and the official publications were with testimony, against the supposed policy, from every quarter of the globe.

It is true that the statements just made by the executives are guarded, and in some instances corrections have been made which go far to neutralize the accusations that have been so widely circulated. There has evidently been a feeling that the charge of "substituting schools as a substitute for, or a mode of preaching," needed softening. The following is from the Work of the Deputation:

"It was found that the missionaries were ready to admit that the preaching of the gospel was generally to be regarded as the prime agency in the work of evangelization, but that there were still differences of views both as to what should be considered as an essential condition for the maintenance of preaching the gospel, and the relative importance of an auxiliary agency."

In the supplementary paper, presented March, 1855, (re-charge is still further diluted)

"In saying that such policy and measures were advocated by the deputation, it is not designed to intimate that they were essential of the ordinary usage of missionaries, or were not sustained by the general views of the missionaries."

was desirable whether it should be presented to any extent among the heathen."

Week of Day, p. 221.

"If the subject speaking is not to be considered as a work preparatory to the preaching of the gospel, nor a scriptural mode of evangelization, we are to look upon it as a means of doing good by itself and disconnected from directly appointed missionary labor."

Weyland's Report, May, 1834.

Two extracts furnish a partial view of the opinion of a principle, extended by the deposition in all the departments of missionary labor. In order to bring out this principle more fully, I will transcribe a few passages from Mr. Weyland's report, taken from the time of our discussion in the Maritime Convention. The first extract is from the debate on the question, whether the great commission authorizes any mode of evangelization except oral preaching. In this discussion you were understood to admit that although the meaning of precept was specific, yet that the commission recorded in Matthew, did allow other modes besides preaching. I expressed my preference to hear this admission; but Mr. Graves arose and offered an explanation, showing that I had misapprehended your position. In this explanation you expressed your entire concurrence.

"Mr. Graves explains the statement of Mr. Park is, regard to the great commission. It was not that the great commission in Mark was different in signification from that in Matthew; the word preach in Mark defined and limited the term disciple, used in Matthew; it showed how this discipling of all nations was to be accomplished, viz: by preaching. Matthew intimates the end to be accomplished; Mark the means. And after they are disciplined, they receive the teaching, which includes trade, schools, &c., so far as they come at all. The executive committee do not wish to impose any new plan, nor in general spirit such a perversion as has prevailed in India."

"Mr. Graves takes the commission in Matthew as the broad platform. The word learn, used in Mark, is not intended to restrict the commission. What is the idea conveyed in Matthew? To make disciples of all nations. How is this to be done? By the word of God. The commission of the word is the great thing. How shall this word be communicated? By the mouth, certainly, but not only so. He is called upon to make known the word by every means. If he is dumb, and can write, the commission calls upon him to write. If he can prohibit the word, only through an interpreter, the commission calls upon him to do it in that way. He has no need liberty to stand upon the broad platform of Matthew as my brother has to call him down from that platform to the narrower one of oral preaching. In regard to the original word *kyrene*, I have said already its best meaning is to make proclamation. This was usually accompanied by a written decree. It was sometimes done by posting up the decree of proclamation. The word *kyrene* also sometimes means an edict."

"Mr. Graves. Disciple all nations, does not point to the means; the second passage restricts it. Matthew tells us what is to be done; in Mark the specific way is pointed out precept; and that is the way indicated by the commission. In regard to *kyrene*, it was well known that it meant to prohibit by word of mouth, in some Greek. In the New Testament it would be prohibit or declare the gospel. *Kyrene*, in every instance where it was used, meant proclamation, educating, preaching."

"Concise—done—being evangelized—he had heard these things at home, he did not expect to hear them here. Compare that! Shall we say, because Christ tells us to preach, that we may be evangelized?"

I will insert another paragraph, taken from the minutes of April 14th, in which your own views are stated with much distinctness.

"Dr. Feltz claims the privilege of speaking very deliberately, so he has not had time to arrange his thoughts. He came out to talk with his mind blank; he came with the idea that the question of schools as a means of evangelization was an open question. He has since writing tried to obtain all the information in his power bearing on this question. He considers that the commission authorized only preaching. We have authority to do good in various ways, but he does not feel it necessary to go to the commission for it. In giving command to dispatch all nations, Christ meant that preaching should be the means. He says preach, and a man who leaves preaching for any other means, crosses the line. There may be good reasons for leaving doors, but if it comes down, he does not think a preacher should care with how preaching will be done or where it will be done as he had to preach in the first place. Did, granting this, has a man appointed to do a certain work by his employer a right to leave that work for another work without their consent, even though that work be a good one? He does not consider that a missionary has liberty to care where, how, the engagement he made at the outset. And yet since he left home, he has found a large body of missionaries teaching schools as a means of evangelization, when they were sent out to preach the gospel. As a question out of itself, but of practical expediency, he might regard towards those who to a limited extent advocate these means. He feels influenced by the course of those who advocate them as a means of evangelization."

It is not my purpose, in making this question to revolve on the question, does he acknowledge by those whose charges, especially by your statement, that you "had found a large body of missionaries teaching schools, when they were sent out to preach the gospel." I shall show, in the proper place, that such an assertion has no foundation in fact, and will

29
it regard to the world-wide mission, who were not sent out as preachers, but for the specific purpose of teaching. My very object now is, to show what was the point in dispute between the deputation and their own missionaries. As we have from the Minutes, in all respects which I have already referred, that our American Board have accepted the same principles of missionary labor as our own. It may not be well to quote, in this connection, a passage from the special report presented by the practical committee at their meeting in Hartford, in 1838.

"The commission, as recorded by Matthew, reads thus: Go ye therefore and teach all nations—Gospel, make Christians of all nations. There is the word to be done. The great commission, as recorded by Mark, reads thus: Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel—preach the glad tidings to every creature. How we have the instrumentality, by which the work is to be done. Our evangelist tells us what—the other tells us how."

We have now a distinct view of the point at issue between the deputation and the "thousand" missionaries whom they regarded as opposing their mission. The difference was not in regard to the expediency, but to the question of schools and preaching; the question was, whether schools and other kindred agencies were to be used as means of evangelization? You maintain that they were not, and on this point you found the views of the Missionary Commission to be different from your own.

No one can fail to perceive from the above extract how perfectly your views of the great commission correspond with those of the practical committee of the American Board. The former avowedly is that the commission in Matthew is no broader than the one in Mark; that neither of them authorizes any other means of evangelization than oral preaching; that they offer individuals are evangelists, schools and other agencies are to be used for instructing them in "all things necessary."

100
(Matthew) 107
them, they, as we at least, I am inclined to understand, "Preach the gospel," as the ordinary specific command. You deny that this applied with extent beyond the limits of apostolic preaching so far as the heathen are concerned. Others are of a different opinion. Galilee is the broad conclusion: "Go, teach all nations," as the appropriate special designation is consistent with which they are to be sent to the conversion of the heathen. I am not of those who entertain this view. I do not regard the commission in Matthew and Mark as being, in all respects, identical. I consider the commission in Mark as having special reference to the apostles; that in Matthew as being more particularly designed for the whole church, in every age and clime.

Under this plan, it is certain that the commission recorded in Matthew was uttered on a different occasion from that in Mark. The latter was addressed to the apostles as we know from Jerusalem. Hübner, in his Harmony of the Gospels, places it in connection with the events of the first evening after our Lord's resurrection. Others suppose it to have been addressed to the church by Galilee, and shortly before the ascension. Hübner is probably correct, but the question is not material. Along with the commission were given thine miraculous powers bestowed by the apostles and their associate followers. In addressing the twelve apostles, the specially appointed preachers of the gospel, it was natural that our Lord should employ terms corresponding to their official calling, and hence to use the word *preach*, or *proclaim*, rather than the more general and comprehensive term *teach*.

The commission in Matthew was given to the whole church. A special meeting had been appointed in Galilee, where the scattered disciples could most easily assemble; and this was no doubt the occasion on which he said, "where ever ye preach the gospel..." Here

41
to give the special commission under which his disciples, generally, were to labor for the conversion of the heathen to the end of time. He was addressed as numerous preachers or gifts of healing; he addressed his disciples without any distinction of office, as preachers or scholars; he used a term of universal application—*teach*, which designates a more broad enough to include all the members of all his people, acting through every instrumentality within their reach; and he extended this commission to the churches of our own time by the promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Such is the commission under which we are to labor and preach for us that which Christ has entrusted and entrusted us the work of humanity! We labor, and have our hold, that and preaching is the most direct, most direct, and natural way of reaching the human conscience, and as such we give it all prominence; but when we are told that other agencies are scriptural and unscriptural, we protest against

the doctrine as an innovation unscriptural by the New Testament.

Even if we had talking be... our reward to Mark, to preach, or better, to proclaim, the gospel to the world, all we should consider that the special terms of the promise only justified us in using unscriptural and other scriptural agencies, but none for enlightening reasons, but for evangelizing the heathen.

I remain, yours very respectfully,

Samuel Haven.

to not labor to do this in conventional rote
extensive repetition to memory? A part then
to hasten would attend not at its scrapp-
ing observations, with nothing producing to
the eyes a solid shell, the instrument
of the word that gives light, or rather says
the breathily scattered seed, for John his
work day after day, and week after week, with
his repetition and progress upon progress, upon
the same understanding and the same heart.
—and these words and hearts have written
with various words, and heart revealed and
frustrated with the supply of another heart—
all the words between a garden, and both and
vicinity of which progress and the very, repeat-
ing the, heart to appear.

—Naturally the same process, to be even
needed, must be diligently presented by the
proceeding machinery, though with inferior
advantages. The pupils are almost in the heavy
barns of sea, weekly, neither own, and in
the realm of signs and words respectively
alike and intrinsically so. The heart-
ness may be numerous, but of all ages and occu-
pations, and they are ever shifting. It
promotes the thought, but they are taken, give
and take by the words, or so, the words, or
among these and things. This of the air
garden is, however, the instrument. It needs
to prepare the soil. The present must be
effect, if not in form and the teacher. He must
not with the common practice, read much but
day by day, and gradually spread his mind
from the paper and feelings of knowledge
by gradually placing his in their simple
element, the light and power of the thought.
This is the ordinary method, and if there are
exceptions, it is when first in some particular
matters has already prepared the way before
him.

These institutions were given in reference to
the Noyong Orphan Institution, a boarding
school, the object of which was to educate
heathen children, and train them for useful
work. This school stood in the same foundation when
these institutions were given as it did in 1836.

When you came to consider it well, it is the
enlarging element. The Orphan Institution,
as well as the girls' boarding school, was never
more "strictly evangelical," more than with
more references, than in the period immedi-
ately preceding the establishment of the institu-
tion. And yet you seek to introduce your
previous testimony in favor of such schools by
quoting in the Minutes of Feb. 1833, that
from the evidence referred to, "the words teach-
ing and preaching have come to be used in
different different acceptations and relations,"
that "visions which have taken or been here
leading to take (1) new forms, and that in ap-
plying language to these schools would be
to except it to a scope for which it never was
designed, and in which it is applicable only in
consequence of the new use of words." You
will pardon me, but not, for assuming me to be-
lieve that such testimony of those showing the
transmission of books and papers, the trans-
mission of these two plain, simple words has not
undergone the slightest change, outside of
the official publications for the last ten years.

But with regard, dear sir, there has been a
change. It is impossible to estimate your as-
sertion that "the expressions have retained
nothing new." The fact stated in The Work
of the Synagogue, p. 210, is sufficient to show
changes suggested or made by the deposition
in the words of missionary operations, that in
some respect these changes are fundamental
in too obvious to be denied. The rule for admit-
ting boarding schools, and for extending the
beneficial education in the Christian popula-
tion, although it may be considered by you as
merely an effort to "revive innovations," and
"bring the mission into the old paths," will
not be so regarded by the public. No the
statement that you "had entertained and would
upon no terms of voluntary work that were
not unalterably maintained long years ago,"
I will simply repeat, as correct from one of
your speeches in the Hawaiian Convention
is here dated April 15.

the Bible. We are sure to write vigorously. A few days in that it will be comparatively easy to apply them to the different nations and tribes among which we labor. The subject of schools has been before his mind for many years, and there has been some change in his views. Formerly, that they were to be had thought more highly of, and as a means of evangelization than in those days. He had his eye on the schools in England. The Roman Catholic schools attracted his attention, to wit their efficiency. He thought, too, that we might learn lessons from them. They had made schools a very efficient instrument, might we not and them equally useful? But he has since thought that it did not follow, that because a school or seminary was attended in the preparation of men, it would be equally useful in the preparation of youth. He is happy to say also that the views of Roman Catholic schools have not been radical. He would not follow them in anything. The plan of these men, his former friends, for sending schools, proved to be wrong in his opinion. His views have since changed. He trusts he is a woman. He would present a few slides illustrating the working of the school system in the Bible.

Though I trust, has been said to show that whatever change of views there may have been, it has not been with the missionaries and that if there has been a shaking of "the old party" it is by those who have sought to be party "fundamental changes" into general reform.

I remain, yours, very respectfully,

S. Jones

LETTERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF MISSIONS

TO THE REV. A. FEIN, D. D., CHUR. SEC. OF THE AM. BAP. MISSIONARY UNION

Letter 2.
Rev. and Dear Sir:
It has been still further alleged that some of the missionaries "appeared to think that preaching should be preceded by other preparatory to the reception of the gospel." The Work of the Deputation in the Magazine for July 1854, presents the allegation as follows:

"The discussion of these topics showed that however freely the faith of missionaries may be fixed in the ultimate power of the gospel, some of them have been impressed with the need of preparing the way for triumph by other means than the preaching of it in its simplicity and fullness; but the deputation and a majority of missionaries, dissent for the reasons presented in the commission of Christ, complete adaptation to the work of evangelization in all countries to the end of the world."

The implication here given that some of our missionaries have not so full faith in the adequacy and adaptation of the gospel to the work of evangelization, as the deputation, is most unjust. Not one of them believes in waiting for the education of a people before preaching to them the gospel. The charge is reiterated and amplified in Dr. Wayland's report, in the same number of the Magazine.

"It is supposed by many evangelical men, that, before we can preach the gospel successfully, some preparatory work is necessary, and this preparatory work must be done by teaching, especially teaching the young. One of our able and highly-esteemed missionaries has declared that 'missionary work has a two-fold object; the destruction of heathenism and the establishment of Christianity.' This preparatory work consists in bringing into the public mind the elements of human knowledge which shall prove the religious systems of the heathen to be false, and this being done, Christianity will set of itself. The Gospel of Christ will then be built on its ruins."

*Rev. M. Jones.

To refute the doctrine advocated in the latter part of this paragraph, Dr. Wayland proceeds to bring a series of logical and formal arguments. I am happy, however, to say that no such doctrine has ever been advanced by any member of the A. S. M. Convention. The claims to which exception has been taken should have been quoted with its context:

"In view of all these agencies, united, tell us what people on the face of the earth present a more powerful opposition to the Gospel than the deluded votaries of Heathenism. In heathen as well as Christian lands, no man ever came for embracing a new belief, until his old belief is clearly proved false. Missionary work therefore has a two-fold object, viz.: the destruction of heathenism and

the establishment of Christianity. The one precludes the other."

What is the natural and fair construction to be put upon this passage? Does it imply anything more than is contained in your own instructions to the superintendent of the Christian Institute, in reference to the labors of the missionary in "preparing the soil" and removing the "things which prevent the ingress of divine truth into the understanding and the heart?" The passage speaks not of an "infusion of human knowledge into the noble mind," but of removing every human individual mind; nor was it intended to convey the idea that heathenism is to be destroyed in the mass, and idolatry left to "fall of itself" before announcing the Christian message. No one would separate the dislodgment of error and the introduction of truth, as distinct and independent processes; the one and the other to be regarded as parts of the same work. Paul followed up his argument against Hellenism by preaching Jesus and the resurrection, and missionaries consider it such as copy his example.

But it is denied that the retention of heathen systems forms any part of the missionary's work. The deputation would not allow that the example of Paul, in that most persuasive discourse against idolatry ever uttered, justified a missionary in attacking the errors of heathenism. The report of the committee on modes of preaching, after asserting that "the

mission of all preaching should be the way of life through Christ Jesus," and that "the Gospel, in simplicity and in love, is the preaching ordained of God for saving man," contained a note, stating that "this was not all the work a missionary had to do;" and in justification of his engaging in disputation when necessary, and exposing the errors of idolatry, cited the example of Paul in his address to the Athenians. To this note both yourself and colleague made the strongest objections; you maintained that the report was a "two-headed man, of which the latter part swallowed up the former;" that "Paul's disputing in the school of one Tyrannus, was not disputing in the ordinary sense of the term, and that every Greek scholar knew it meant disputing or arguing." The exact position of the deputation will appear from a single passage in the debate on that report.

"Mr. Goodson, who ignored, practically, of the missionary work, contends that the principle on which the work is to be carried on, may be known unmistakably from the New Testament ecclesiastical history. Missionaries at home need rules, ministers at home require to be cautioned, and why should not missionaries? The note states that it is not the only work of a missionary to exhibit Christ crucified, even with simplicity and earnestness. There is not a man among us at home that would risk his reputation by submitting to such a sentiment. The greatest man among us could not carry a council with him on that point. No, sir, when I have exhibited Christ crucified, in simplicity, earnestness, and firmness, I have done my whole duty as a minister of the Gospel."

One other subject of difference, in this connection, is alluded to in the work of the deputation, viz.: the opinion of some missionaries that "it might in certain cases be the first duty of the missionary to translate and circulate the Scriptures, or to prepare and distribute other books and tracts; or even to establish and teach schools, according to Christian principles."

So far as the translation of the Scriptures is concerned, this statement is correct. "It is the opinion of some that on entering a heathen country where the Bible is not known, it may be, and generally is, one of the first, if not the

myself of a missionary's duties to accordance with the translation of the sacred volume. It is the opinion of some, and I trust I shall ever be found among the number, that the translation of the Word of God is not to be placed among the subordinate and auxiliary agencies of mission work. While fully recognizing the preaching of the gospel as the chief and principal business of a missionary, I also believe that the work of giving the pure Word of God to a heathen people in their own tongue, is fully as important and fully as much within the missionary's appropriate sphere. When the classification of the various auxiliary agencies, as schools, books, tracts, &c., was under consideration in the Madison convention, I objected to placing the translation of the Bible in a subordinate position, and proposed a resolution of a contrary import. My resolution was opposed by the delegation, and was withdrawn on your special request, the report under consideration being recommended for revision.

Such are the grounds on which missionaries have been charged with "breaking the old paths." Such are the facts in regard to their supposed departure from the simplicity of the Gospel, and such the accusations brought forward to justify the REPROBATION, which in the language of Dr. Williams's report, has been pronounced. Let there stand no more doubt as to the manner in which the missionaries in Hawaii regard these attacks upon themselves and their labors. I quote a few extracts from their published letters. The following is from Mr. Elisha, dated Puna, Sept. 20, 1834.

"A few days since the June and July numbers of the *Macedonian* came to hand, containing a report of what was said and done in Philadelphia last May, during the sitting of the Board and Missionary Union. As the *Macedonian* is an official organ of the Executive Committee, I suppose the report is a correct outline of the proceedings. Of course it must be a very meagre outline, but still revelations are made concerning to Bro. Hiram and me. How they may strike brethren in the several missions in Hawaii, and the old provinces, I do not know; but it seems to me they must be more than met or less than met, not to feel resembling the indignation at the state-

ments made by the delegation and Home Secretary. After what they said of us, I do not see how it was possible for the Board of Managers to pass a vote of confidence to the missionaries, and at the same time approve the charges of the delegation. If their statements are true, we are unworthy of confidence and unfit for the great work of preaching Christ and planting churches in this heathen land. If their statements are not true, we have been grossly slandered, and the slander published in an official paper, to be seen and read by all men over the Christian world, and like a foul stigma has been cast upon us as men, as Christians, and as missionaries to the heathen. No middle ground can be taken.

"An impression was made that missionaries had abandoned, at least in a great degree, the work of preaching to the heathen. I think any one, in reading the *Macedonian* would hardly fail to be justly impressed with this fact. Every man that is now preaching was preaching before the delegation came to Hawaii. Of those men now in the field, no change in their mode of labor has taken place. Those who are now preachers have always been preachers; the delegation's coming has wrought no change in this direction. In the very nature of things, no order, regulations, instructions or orders, ever did or can make a preacher out of a man whom the Lord has not made a preacher. When the Lord makes a preacher, all the members of the Vatican cannot silence him. It is all nonsense to talk about putting "trammels" on men. Men who can be trammelled are not men. Those who make "trammels," and those who wear them, will accomplish little in evangelizing the world, or I have read the Bible and history to little profit.

"In reading the *Macedonian*, it would appear that every man who would speak favorably of schools and books, was deemed of little or no value in preaching, and some of our most distinguished pastors were charged to defend themselves from the charge of heresy. How was it possible to work up such a feeling in America? Is her some of the most enlightened ministers had to stand forth and defend themselves as true and orthodox, how can missionaries on this side of the globe con-

steps to obtain their character as ministers of the Gospel? What a pity there had not been an honest bold man in Philadelphia, who knew the facts, so got up in the Assembly and told the simple truth, that there was not one single school in all our missions in Normal taught by a missionary, and that he had secured credit authority from Boston. Some years ago two other missionaries had schools for a term as a small part of their work."

The following extract is from Mr. Dwyer's letter to the Executive Committee, dated Danbury, September, 1854:

"Every one, and all of us, here hold, and do still hold, and that most strongly now, that preaching the Gospel is the first and foremost work of the minister of Jesus Christ, whether to Christian or heathen lands. Hence it greases our hearts to the very quick, to see the false issue got up, that missionaries were putting books, schools, &c., before preaching. And this false impression must have been very widely spread, for different missionaries are receiving letters from our good old fathers in Israel, in widely different sections of the country, accusing over this heresy as much as though it were an established though lamentable fact."

The Foreign Secretary said, "the Department had introduced into the missions nothing new, but had merely removed certain innovations, and sought to bring the missions into the old paths." I ask what innovations? I cannot conjecture what can be meant by this expression, "introduced nothing new." But the rule making baptism a prerequisite for admission into our mission schools, is something that I am quite sure no Kewan missionary ever thought of before. And if it be not new, what is it? It certainly is not bringing the mission into the old paths, for they have never been in such a path. Again in speaking of the schools in the first part of the Kewan mission, he said "some lonely others and distant schools had been established." Not school, but in the plural schools. Now the very single instance of the kind I know of is the whole Kewan mission, is that of the Normal school in Haverhill, which received the unqualified support of the Executive Com-

mission, for seven eight years, and did far as in error of the great moral schools which has ever been known among the Indians."

In his review of the work of the Department, as described in the July number of the Missionary, Bro. Dwyer says: "As it is called 'the work of the Department,' and as it is the only description of that work which we have ever officially published, we take it for granted that the work thus described is 'the needed work,' which missionaries could not do because they are true, and hence the trend of the department. Let us then examine in detail that very important work."

"First, then, the general principle laid down. It was their leading object to advance those measures which were calculated to give the widest scope to that prime agency in effecting the conversion of the people, the preaching of the gospel, and to endeavor to bring each of the other departments into a natural and effective subserviency to it." A very good foundation certainly. But then, did the department first lay that foundation in our missions? If they did not, then how can this be called a part of that needed work? Let us examine the subject a little, and see if they did lay that foundation, or whether it was not laid at the very commencement of the mission, and continues unremoved and unshaken even to the present day.

"It is well known that Mr. Jackson was the first in the list of American missionaries to Danbury; and that he faithfully laid and carried out the above principle in practice, is most clearly shown in his late memoir. We have no desire to detract one iota from this pioneer brother, in this respect; for, though he spent much time in work other than direct preaching, yet it only proves that such work must be done, and that it can be done consistently with the great fundamental truth of preaching the gospel; that is, it can be brought 'into a natural and effective subserviency to it.' Now we believe it to be a matter of scriptural historical fact, that every single missionary, from Bro. Jackson to the present time, has held and carried out the above principle just as staunchly and practically as did Brother Jackson himself. We also believe it to be a simple fact that he was quite

schools, as any other teacher in the mission; and even more so than some who have always strongly opposed his school measures. In regard to the single instance of the teacher who spent several years in teaching, it was by the urgent request of Bro. Jackson, (contrary to the teacher's own convictions and strong opposition of several teachers,) that he was induced to commence the school, and Bro. Jackson was the enrolled and main supporter of the school. These are simple historical facts. Now after missionaries have spent some forty years in carrying out the very principles there laid down, we ask a candid public to decide whether the 'advocating of such measures' can be legitimately called a part of that sacred work, that required a deputation to be sent off in each house that the Executive Committee could not wait to consult the General Board; or whether the fact of publishing such things, to the world, as the work of the deputation, does not necessarily imply that the missionaries held and preached a different doctrine, and thus a *foet stigma* is fastened upon our missions and civilization.

"It was provided: 1. That every ordained missionary give himself to preaching during the whole of each dry season, when and where it is possible to traverse the jungle, and at other times to the extent of his abilities; and that other employment should be so arranged as to give scope to this." Now this in itself is of course very good. But really, had the above sentence appeared in anything but the organ of our Executive Committee, we should have been disposed to think that some teacher had intended to write a brochure on our missions. Did the deputation really intend to publish to the world that our missionaries have not been doing this very identical work! And doing it to the very utmost extent of their ability, and in many instances even beyond the endurance of their physical powers!

"It was provided that the way of education should be essentially proscribed to the heathen in their native tongue. Can it be possible! Really, we are almost disposed to doubt the correctness of our own views. We actually see it published in the official organ of our Executive Committee, that they sent out a deputation to Denmark in 1853, to

'provide that the way of education should be essentially proscribed to the heathen in their native tongue?' Yes, there it is, there can be no mistake on that point. Now what will be the natural and legitimate inference of those who read and think for themselves? It must be something as follows: 'What can these missionaries have been doing these forty years past? We certainly supposed they had been preaching in the heathen in their own tongue; and if they have not done this, if we have been deceived all this time, no wonder that a deputation was sent; it was high time that some decided step should be taken.'

"But, we would seriously ask, on the first single instance, in the whole history of our Danish and Karen missions, by printed out, where an individual has ever made an attempt to preach to the heathen in any other than their own tongue? We do not believe there has ever been a single instance of the kind; and it grieves our hearts exceedingly to see such things published to the world."

I remain, yours respectfully,
S. DAVIS.

Dear and Dear Sir:

A few days since my eye chanced to light on the following passage in one of our papers for comparison, descriptive of the policy which it is expected will prevail in the Republic of the year Two Thousand:

"Everything now-a-days is done in pursuit of a system. We have commonly the best men in the Republic at work in search of the best mode of doing what has to be done; when they discover that best mode, a law is immediately passed to declare it the only mode, and all others are prohibited under a heavy penalty."

The writer probably little knew how far his anticipation had already been realized in the management of missions. For several years that feature of our missionary policy, which aims to reduce all our operations to a system of absolute uniformity, has been gaining ground. Rules and systems have no doubt their advantages, when not extended beyond their proper sphere. In matters of worldly business, they are indispensable; yet even business they have their limitations. Their application to religion, and especially to the duties of the Gospel ministry, needs to be guarded with much caution. How often, in the history of the Church, has the attempt to regulate the duties of religion by a system of rules resulted in a rigid, dead formalism? How often has it resulted in strife, and party, and the separation of those who, with a proper degree of individual freedom, might have labored in harmony and love? We know what have been the general consequences of councils in former days; we know that power has been acquired and ambition obtained, ostensibly for the purpose of preserving the principles and practices of a pure Gospel; but, in reality, as the evil has proved, we secure and restrain such as dare to exercise an independent opinion, and to reduce all dissentients to the alternative of submission or expulsion. If modern missionary societies fail to produce these bitter fruits, the friends of Zion will

have cause for thankfulness; but certainly the enforcement of their course does not warrant the expectation of any better results.

So diversified are the circumstances of different missions, that any system of rules adapted to one mission, would be liable to operate injuriously if applied to others. It would seem that, with the New Testament in their hands, the members of each mission might safely be left to pursue their own convictions, and manage their own affairs, provided always that the expenditure of money shall be confined within the limits of appropriations made by the Executive Committee. With this safeguard, it is difficult to see why different missions may not be allowed the liberty of pursuing their own modes of action, whether they happen to be in conformity with the modes of all other missions or not. The original contract between the Board and the missionaries made it the duty of every missionary, before engaging in any new or important undertaking, to obtain the advice and consent of the mission to which he belonged. This rule has ever been faithfully observed by the missionaries; and it remains to be seen whether more stringent rules, and the enforcement of a more rigid uniformity, will conduce either to the peace or the prosperity of the cause.

Had the Manchester convention been allowed to meet simply as a conference, for mutual consultation, arrangement, and advice, like our "associations," it would no doubt have been productive of good; but its character was not merely advisory, it was legislative. In your own language, we were there "to settle principles," and afterwards it would be "easy to apply them." This settling of principles, and the adoption of rules, "to be carried out in all the missions," was essentially a work of legislation. The decisions of the convention were not indeed final, their ratification depending on the approval of the Executive Committee; but the legislative character of the convention was in no sense affected by this circumstance. The difference between the action of the convention and the ordinary transaction of a single mission, will be seen at once; in the latter case a vote is taken on a particular question involving opposition or otherwise, showing the success of a particu-

... : in the convention, on the contrary, we were required to form rules of future action for the preacher of the Gospel, as well as rules of discipline for the native churches; rules that, once ratified, would be "carried out" through the whole missionary organization.

But supposing the desirability of perfect unity in all missionary operations was conceded, still, if the Executive Committee wished to avail themselves of the opinions of the missionary body it was certainly important that those opinions should be spontaneous and uncoerced. To secure an unwilling acquiescence is useless, which the missionaries did not heartily approve, would be of no service to the cause, unless their object was to relieve themselves of responsibility in making the desired changes. The plan adopted by the delegation was certainly not calculated to secure the spontaneous action of the convention. So far from this, the whole course of procedure was shaped by them; the topics for each of the principal reports on which the delegation desired a decision were indicated to the convention; and those reports which failed to coincide with their views, however manifestly in accordance with the general sentiments of the body, were strenuously opposed, and without exception recommended, in resolve such amendment or alteration as should render them, if possible, acceptable to the delegation. Thus the convention, while refusing to meet anything contrary to their own convictions, did not hesitate to cast, on a matter of compromise, important portions of their reports solely in deference to the wishes of those who sat there "as the representatives of the Executive Committee." Little did the members of the convention suppose that, after these concessions and compromises, the delegation would unceremoniously proceed to reverse their decisions, and in some instances to render nugatory the very recommendations which they themselves had proposed.

It has been strenuously asserted that the delegation exercised no prejudicial influence or constraint over the convention; that they merely entered into deliberations as brethren and equals. Such a relationship was rendered impossible by the very terms of their appointment. They were to "appear in the convention as the representatives of the

Executive Committee," and in no other capacity. *Precedent cooperation and authoritative control*, are terms that can never be made to coalesce. When one relation constrains the other will. To say that no pressure was exercised upon the convention, is simply to deny that which is patent to the approval or disapproval of every one. The very object of clothing the delegation with the whole power of the Executive Committee, was that they might enact a process. If it had not been intended that they should enact a process, no such authority would have been given; there could have been no possible object in giving it. Nothing in the convention as the representatives of the Executive Committee, the delegation were in a position similar to that of delegates from the President of the Senate of the United States, who should be sent to sway the debates in the House of Representatives. Whether such a proceeding would be allowable, even in a worldly government, we need not be at a loss to decide.

Under the circumstances of the case, there was evidently no inducement for the convention to adopt, but every inducement to resist, all amendments which were known opposition to the views of the delegation. As the latter possessed the power to set aside whatever they disapproved, the passage of resolutions they disapproved would have been at best an dignified protest; and it would have exposed the unsuspecting members to all the consequences of conscientious disapproval. When it is recalled that a large majority of that convention were recruited in regard to their location; that the selection of their future field was under the absolute control of the delegation; that further, all plans for usefulness hung on the approval or disapproval of the same authority; it is impossible that a halting of pressure should not have been realized by every one who felt it his duty to oppose their measures. If any additional proof is wanting, it will be sufficient to look at the proceedings subsequent to the convention, and to witness the unrelenting severity with which every missionary in Norway has been visited, whose conduct it is to be marked on your catalogue as one of the "disobedient." But these cases will form the subject of a future

Those who were so fortunate as to coincide with the plans of the deputation, may not have been sensible of the pressure which others felt; hence you have been able to bring forward resolute missionaries to testify before the Union that the discussions were perfectly free and fraternal, and that the deputation "showed no disposition to urge their views against the missionaries." Yet one of the missionaries who offered this testimony had, just before his return, written to a missionary brother as follows:

"The Kama English school is dead; we deeply deplore its loss. Our boarding-schools are all cut away and thrust off. One boarding school, named the Kama normal school, is to be established. The deputation are not yet through with their work. This is an exceedingly dark day in our mission, both Danish and Kama. Little is known yet what will be the final distribution of men and things. This, however, is certain: the present movements are not satisfactory to those most intimately concerned. The Executive Committee, through the deputation, are taking steps which will cause a most sad cessation in the progress of the cause in this land; steps that will be retraced with sadness."

There must have been some pressure in America as well as at Herculæ. Strong influences must have been operating to change so distinct a testimony of disapprobation into one of approval. The two statements may not be absolutely contradictory; but there was in the public testimony, to say the least, an important suppression of very material facts.

Respectfully, yours,

E. Harlow.

June 1839 Aug 27/39
New York Philadelphia
At Home, Westby N.Y.
Chas Carey, Wrentham, Ct.
Geo / Putnam Wrentham Ct.
Wm Chapman, Rochester N.Y.
S. J. Smith, Wrentham, Conn.
Wm Brown, Wrentham, Ct.
Dra G. Wrentham
Stoughton Ct.
Geo Putnam Wrentham Ct.
New York Wrentham, Ct.

Dr. Jas. Wrentham, Wrentham, Ct.

the 19th, which appears to
have been lost in the mail
showed what the vote was
and the paper referred
to by the committee as a
report of the committee
was accordingly presented to the
convention.

LETTERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF
SCHOOLS.
BY THE REV. F. W. WALKER, OF THE
CH. CH. SOCIETY OF LONDON.
LONDON: 18
No. and Dear Sir:

In regard to the charges affected in schools,
the department claims to have had a majority
of the convention in their favor. Let us look
at the passage in which that majority was ob-
tained; for it was a majority upon only one
point, and a majority of only one vote. This
vote was on the question of inserting in the
report, as recommended in the seventh section of the
report, "The directors of this convention en-
compassed four sittings of the convention. Of
the whole number present, only two, Bro.
Thomson and Leggett, objected to hearing
schools of all kinds. Bro. Knapp, Bro.
Thomson, and one or two others, though op-
posed to hearing schools for the Deaf and
Blind, were in favor of their being admitted among
the Deaf and Blind. Under those circumstances it
was plain that no resolution condemning those
schools in the main, could receive the vote of
the convention. And if the convention could
not condemn the views of the department on
general principles, it is difficult to conceive
what right they had to make a partial law,
affecting particular instances only. Yet it was
only by proposing such partial legislation that
the department succeeded in obtaining a vote
for the suppression of Deaf and Blind
schools, the Deaf and Blind schools being ex-
pressly exempted by the resolution which the
department introduced. It was on this occa-
sion that I made those remarks on the injus-
tice of bringing one resolution to legislate for
another, which have been considered as pro-
suspicious, and for which your colleague has
felt it his duty so often to call attention. In
the meeting of the Board in Mass., I think
according to the report given in the New-
York Standard, to feel that "after the sus-
pended charges from Amos, assailing the de-
partment, was or was not ought to be con-
sidered." One of these facts was, that in the
first book of the convention, Mr. Brown's reso-
lution was carried by a majority of the De-

information that it was to cost them and labor on the ground that they had been sent out, and that from this time he set himself against them." As reported in the Miscellaneous, your address commenced by stating a charge which we stated had been transmitted against the deputation on my authority the previous year, of breaking up the printing establishment at Tarry. Referring to my opposition in the convention, "he ought to know," said Mr. Stone, "on the third or fourth day of these meetings, made a vehement attack on the well-ordered purposes of the deputation, charged them with a design to lead letters on the mission, and turned his brethren against them. Though he retained his original language, he continued to oppose them throughout."

It would certainly be correct that when the delegate of a missionary society felt himself called upon to make a public statement of facts, he would take equal care that his statements were well founded; especially if they were such as certainly to excite or alarm others, who would have no opportunity to defend himself. As it is never too late to correct, I long have to state a few facts of opposite character.

1st. That none of my letters contained any complaint against the deputation for removing the Tarry press; I was myself one of the committee who joined in recommending its removal.

2d. That I did not state in the convention that I had received information as to the designs of the deputation, nor was it true that I had received a single letter from home respecting them.

3d. My language in doing so may or may not have been reprehensible, but it is not true that I have ever retained the "moment" part of it, or any part whatever.

I may also state that the remarks referred to were not made "on the third or fourth" day of the month day of our meetings. To afford an opportunity for judging whether the "working" given on this occasion was edifying, and whether the professions claimed in it have been retained by subsequent events, I will make a few extracts from the minutes of our discussions.

* Mr. Cook proposes to divide the work into two parts, the first having reference to boarding-schools, the second to normal schools. This being agreed to, the question arose on the adoption of the first clause.

* Mr. Sawyer opposes the maintenance of boarding-schools. They are not an appropriate means of evangelization. He objects to the part relating to special donations. It is a bad precedent to gather funds by appeal for individual objects. It has caused many deflections, and has been discussed at home, and been loudly disapproved at a meeting of the Union. He is opposed to having schools or any other one thing made a connecting link between missions and the churches at large. He thinks there never really special contributions except for one object, which they were supporting when he went there. By setting himself against this practice, in ten years he has had the contributions to his church for missions quadrupled. The Home Secretary has felt deeply on this subject, and has opposed all such contributions. It is necessary to existing; it only divides people at home; the Executive Committee give so much to each object, whether the same necessary are contributed for this object or not.

* Mr. Sawyer wishes to strike out what refers to special appeals.

* Mr. Sawyer is loudly opposed to the clause. He thinking it proposed to remove by adapting the following as a substitute, in the views of which the location of the deputation was stated.

* Without deciding what measures may be required for the organization of a hundred pages, who can be packed in their homes by the missionary only during a few months of the year, the attention is not proposed to the normal boarding-schools as an appropriate method of evangelization, that is, of leading the heathen to Christ, and sending up graduates of the Gospel.

* Mr. Kimball is opposed to boarding-schools as a means of evangelization.

* Mr. Fegley—Mr. Walker told him he had no confidence in schools as a means of evangelizing the heathen.

* Mr. Sawyer—had he not the board and the Home Secretary in the suspension of work shall we then set them aside?

"Mr. Thomas.—It does not follow that because there are numerous, therefore God cannot be used on those schools." He often brings good out of evil. Truths concerning God have made the names of bringing a seed to Christ. Yet we should not say that God had not his seed on profane swearing.

"Mr. Brown.—The resolution should it pass, will sweep away all the boarding-schools in Annapolis, except the Keesee, and all the boarding-schools in Annapolis, and not only so, but it will necessarily put it out of our power ever to establish such schools, even where the Executive Committee approve them. The original report merely leaves the door open, so that they may be established where the measure is approved by law. The Executive Committee would still have the right to veto every school which did not meet their entire approval."

[On putting the question, the share of which was nearly equal, most of the Keesee resolutions being for the amendment; but before the vote was taken, the discussion was resumed.]

"Mr. Moore feels some hesitation as to the way in which he should vote."

"Mr. Thomas, though in favor of the amendment, would not favor the principle of a restricted vote to do away with the Oyster School in Annapolis."

"Mr. Brown hopes there will be no restraint, so as to the real import of this amendment. What we do is to be viewed in the light of legislation. The members from Hagerston and District might hope that in Hagerston and District might hope that in Hagerston and District, they were assuming no danger of any interference with their modes of operation by other societies; but he would warn them that, sooner or later, the same principle would operate on them. The Executive Committee had already sufficient power, by the present organization of the Union their power was greatly augmented, both over the members and the churches at home. They had the control of the purse; and it was right they should do so; the power to withhold their support from any school which they did not approve. But now it was sought by

bringing together a number of schools, to pass a general rule abolishing boarding-schools. Neither this Convention, nor the Executive Committee, had the power to carry out these restrictions. The love may be bent until it snaps. If public opinion in Annapolis were so divided in favor of sweeping away schools as we had been told, the Executive Committee might abolish them with a stroke of the pen, and then the responsibility would not rest with them, as it should do. What we have to remember of it, that we should be compelled to deny letters for ourselves. We are called on to throw away the results of our expressions, in favor of those presented in Annapolis, by persons who have no practical knowledge of the subject. The members of different societies, met together as we are, have no right to interfere with the internal concerns of individual societies. He concluded that the persons brought to bear on this Convention, by bringing out schools to vote on the affairs of another, was unreasonable."

"Mr. George, on the part of the delegation, disclaimed having exercised any undue influence over the Convention. He denied that they were sent out with any concealed plan; they had received no instructions beyond what had been read before the Convention. He thought the brother would be sorry for what he had said."

"Mr. Barnett opposed the passage of the amendment. It was two Keesee which were opposed, and brethren might suppose they would be allowed to go on, but he suspected they would find themselves mistaken. He considered it right to be as far as the same freedom of expression in this Convention that we should do if the delegation were not present."

"A motion to adjourn having been made, the spot and time were taken on the amendment, as follows:

"Aye—Messrs. Hilliard, Ingalls, Kinsaid, Knapp, Moore, Thomas, Varnister—8.
Nays—Allen, Barnett, Bryant, Brown, Howell, Hanny, Stevens, Stevens—2.
Messrs. Hays and Vinton declined voting.
The Chairman, Dr. Peck, gave the casting vote in favor of the amendment."

"Mr. Horn asks leave to record his protest against the resolution, so far as to operate that they affect the Assent motion."

"Dr. Peck would like to have the vote reconsidered, on the passage of a resolution by a bare majority did not give it sufficient weight to make its substance desirable."

"Mr. Mason, answering to the suggestion of Dr. Peck, makes a remonstrance."

"Mr. Granger objects to revisiting the question again."

"Voted to reconsider the resolution and lay the subject on the table. Aye 100."

At the next sitting the assent motion received a few verbal attentions from persons, and was allowed to pass without opposition, the dissenting members generally declining to vote.

By examining the votes and steps above recorded, it appears that there were but two of the Harniss missionaries who voted for, and but one Karem missionary who voted against the amendment of the proposition. Balancing these votes against an equal number of their brethren in the same mission, and adding the vote from Assent over against the vote from Ghiss, we have left for Karem missionaries twenty against five Harniss missionaries, in the election of Harniss boarding schools. In other words, the members of the mission performed an act of legislation, affecting serious changes in similar missions, where such changes they themselves were opposed to. I must confess that such a measure is not in unison with all my ideas of justice and propriety.

I know it will be said, the delegation had authority to suppress boarding-schools without any vote of the mission. Then why did they not do it? Why attempt to evade the responsibility, by proposing to act in unison with the vote of the mission? I can always disagree with the Executive Committee, why represent them as originating the measure themselves?

But did those changes originate with the Executive Committee? Did they give the opposition their commission, with the expectation that they would use their power for the closure of schools? Did the delegation actually represent the sentiments of the Executive

the Committee, in the restrictions they imposed on education and the operation of the press? Is the policy of the Executive as dangerous as this suggestion would insinuate? It is well known that in former years missionaries have been repeatedly and earnestly

urged on in the work of education; this was the case during the few years of my residence in Borneo. One of the especial objects of the first expedition, Dr. Mackay, was to lay the foundation for an institution of an elevated character, and under his auspices the plan of a university was drawn up, with a more extended course of instruction than the missionaries have ever yet attempted to carry out. If at any time there has been an excess of effort in the educational department, or in that of printing, it is to be ascribed more to human infirmities than to the tendencies of missionaries themselves. "Missionaries," says the Home Secretary, "will make mistakes. No doubt they may; but the charge cannot with an ill grace be made on a mission on the return of a delegation who had gone out to execute the very measures which a previous delegation had been sent to encourage." On this subject I cannot but say, quoting the authority of Mr. Girard, which has the same weight as coming from one who cannot be suspected of over-estimating the value of schools and the press.

"In order to clear away the logs that have gathered around the subject of teaching English, book-making and newspaper printing, it will be necessary to go back and examine the facts of history. In 1834 there were four mission presses in Borneo, and sent out from Borneo within about five years to examine the operations of the press. At that time there were no Karem books in circulation, and very few Karem churches, and not above two hundred Harniss Christians. All the official letters from Borneo urged the enlargement of printing operations. "Push the press" was a standing official order. Books and tracts were called home from the time of our return, and presses were compared to the open-air ovens, scattering wide over the world the kernels which were for the feeding of the nations. It is wonderful that large presses and

...instructions, should be issued by the
mighty stream? Early in 1858, a delegation
was sent out with a power press, and a con-
vention of missionaries was called to meet in
Mantoloking. One of the subjects taken up in
that convention, was the enlargement of
printing operations. A proposition was
brought forward to print an edition of the
New Testament of one hundred and fifty
thousand. An earnest discussion sprang up,
and lasted for many hours. Dr. Jackson, the
delegation, and a few others, argued in favor
of printing the edition. All, or nearly all,
the other missionaries took strong ground
against it, and finally voted it down. Not-
withstanding this unexpected hostility to
enlarging printing on the part of the mis-
sionaries, early in 1858 five thousand copies
of paper were sent out from Boston, and
without delay a new illustrated edition of a
Herman grammar Bible was put to press.

"Let us now return into the orbit of the
Herman school, in which English, as well as
Korean was taught. About 1851, Dr. Jack-
son and the English commissioners projected a
school, to be supported by government. Mr.
and Mrs. Bennett were urged to take charge
of it. They hesitated, but after much con-
sulting and no little anxiety, and after Dr.
Jackson told them that if they did not go into
the work, he must himself govern it, they
took charge of the school. In no long time,
two or three of the pupils became Christians.
This raised a storm on the part of the govern-
ment. Mr. and Mrs. Bennett left the school.
Dr. Jackson then got up a school to be sup-
ported by the mission, and Mr. Bennett was
urged to take charge of it, in opposition to
the views of many of the missionaries. Dr.
Jackson was censured by the Board in Boston,
and the school continued till after his death.
It was taught by a minister. Such are the
facts. Besides this, a Korean normal school
was opened a few years ago, in which Eng-
lish, as well as vernacular was taught, but was
closed by a minister. In view of these historical
facts, how is it that such a course of reproach
and misrepresentation has been pursued?"

I must reserve the further consideration of
this subject for my next letter.

Very respectfully,
N. DENNIS.

LETTERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF
MISSIONS.

TO THE REV. A. F. FOX, D. D., COR. SEC. OF THE
AM. BAPT. FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Letter 12.

Rev. and Dear Sir:

I return to the subject of boarding schools,
and the measures taken for their suppression.
It was to have been expected that the dele-
gation, after presenting their own resolutions,
in so abundant a report on schools,
and after having secured its adoption, would
have faithfully and scrupulously observed its
provisions. Notwithstanding my prediction
that the Korean missionaries would find them-
selves intimately tutored by the resolutions
imposed on other schools in Harman, I had
not the remotest apprehension that it would
be done so soon, and by the same delegation
who in 1858 the Korean case, had made a
formal reservation in their favor! The Korean
missionaries maintained so stoutly that this
exception was made in good faith, and that
it would be observed by the delegation, as a
compromise to which they were solemnly
bound by their own participation in the act.
These just expectations were not realized. No
matter what the convention decided, then the
delegation proceeded to carry out, not the
views of the convention, but their own, dis-
regarding or the resolutions to which a suc-
cency of the missionaries had assented. On pre-
siding the session of the convention, they issued
an advertisement, stating that "the dele-
gation returns to themselves and to the Ex-
ecutive Committee, the adoption or otherwise,
of the opinions and recommendations pre-
sented in the proceedings." The reports of
the delegation were thus converted into waste
paper. For six weeks, at an expense of more
than one hundred dollars per day, a body of
missionaries had been called aside from their
apparent work to discuss the theory and
reasons of most every labor, and now they
were left to find that the only use made of their
discussions would be to select or reject them,
according as they were in agreement or dis-
sonance with the views of the delegation? No
wonder that missionaries felt themselves in-
jured. That the delegation should have made
a reservation in favor of the Executive Com-

might not have wanted expression that they should reserve to themselves the right to amend the acts in which they had made a prominent part, and some of which, as in the instance before us, they had themselves proposed, was an exercise of power that we had not expected. The reservation, as far as it related to the Executive Committee, was little more than a mere matter of form; no objections to our reports were entertained from that quarter; it was the "deputation themselves," whose power the advertisement was intended to guard.

I am aware that exceptions may be taken to the statements I have made, as they are in contradiction to those of the deputation, who say that they broke up *any* schools, or that they made *any* changes not authorized by the convention, with the single exception of expelling English from the schools. At the meeting in Philadelphia, Dr. Granger made the following statement:

"He then stated a point on which strong misapprehensions had arisen. He read in a newspaper that the deputation had broken up the mission schools. Whence the information was derived he could not conjecture. Their action was founded on that of the convention, with only a single point of difference, and so far from breaking up schools, they had provided for their maintenance—four normal schools for use. They sought to increase the facilities for Christian education."

Notwithstanding the earnestness with which the deputation, in their public speeches, repudiated the charge of "breaking up schools," the testimony of missionaries in the contrary will, I apprehend, be considered decisive. In fact, your colleagues himself, when speaking of the deputation of the American Board, does not hesitate to refer to their work in the same terms which missionaries are blamed for applying to your own. Writing to a missionary in Baruch, he says that Dr. Anderson and Mr. Thompson had gone to see if it were possible to bring back their missions to evangelized ground; to break up the irruptions, and their English work, and get the men spreading. In proof that the deputation did "break up schools," I pointed to make a few extracts from the letters of missionaries in Baruch. Bro. Boyson, writing to me on the 10th of August 1834, says:

"During the meetings of the deputation with the Korean missionaries, I was very far from being satisfied of a reward of yours in one or year quarters in the early part of the convention. However, these things will soon draw upon you." I fully agreed with you at the time, but really I did not then imagine they would be sent down with such a tremendous crash on our infant Korean mission! I cannot now enter into particulars, but one extract of Bro. Peck's, in answer to some objections of mine in regard to Korean schools, has been a load on my mind ever since, viz.:

"We must have definite rules, to which there can be no exception, or we cannot get along." That remark referred particularly to rules for the admission of people into the normal schools, strictly so called. I agreed to be willing to confine them to Christian families, but I was not willing to make besides an absolute prerequisite to admission into a preparatory school, especially in this infant state of our mission. There are many bright hearts of Christian families who ought to be in training several years before we would be willing to baptize them, unless we go to sprinkling infants! But hereafter an individual, not a member of the church, can be admitted to our mission schools. Now, I do not believe in having a company of missionaries on the opposite side of the globe, for the conversion of the heathen, who have not sufficient means and talents enough to carry on their work without "definite rules, to which there can be no exception," and these rules too, made by men of no previous missionary experience, and in direct opposition to the practical wisdom that shows, *i. e.*, a majority of them. But whose old missionaries do not dare speak without liberty from the deputation, what can we expect?"

In Bro. Boyson's letter to the Executive Committee, of September, 1834, he says:

"In our conviction, while on the subject of heathen schools, though they were sent down in reference to the Baruch, because that people are to a certain extent civilized men, yet in reference to the Koreans, on account of their singular prejudices as a people, their situation, &c., there was an exception, and I am quite sure a reasonable one, made in their behalf."

the deposition went to work and demolished all Kinn boarding schools, that is, so far as they could do so, by procuring their removal. Still, they showed what they could do. Several schools, one at each station. But Church membership was necessary for admission, and no school could attend in number five pupils. Now there was at that very time a Christian population in both Hingham and Boston, were there ought and ought to be more than twice that number in our mission schools. And yet "the deposition went in favor of schools every one?"

"In reference to those two or three ministers, who adopted and refused their own views in these, the deposition went in favor of the most unbecoming considerations. But placed in the mass, that confidence seemed to be easily won. Hence the expression which was made and repeated to me by the Foreign Secretary with much emphasis and consciousness of manner. It was made on the occasion of our discussing the subject of the present normal schools. I objected to the restrictions made by the deposition, and insisted that the different classes were competent and ought to be left to decide themselves who was the proper individuals to be admitted into our normal schools. Let the amount of money, said I, be limited by the Executive Committee, but let the minister say who are to be members of the normal school. "No," said the Foreign Secretary, "that is just what we wish to prevent. The mission we open, in these, one has this way, and another that, and we must have definite rules, to which there can be no exception, or we cannot get along?"

"In order that the Executive Committee may see the entire impossibility of such definite rules, let them refer to Mrs. Bennett's normal school in Marlboro, at the present time. The rule, as provided by the deposition, was, that no one, not a member of the Church, could be a member of such schools. Now, if such a rule could be carried out anywhere, and by any power, we should certainly look for it to be done in Marlboro, the oldest Kinn Mission under the pres-

ent superintendency, and more especially in such those right by the side of Professor Wade. But Mrs. Bennett is willing to try with you. "There are several of the normal school schools asking for admission." And even Mrs. Wade herself, in a letter to Mrs. Everett, of August 11th, 1854, says, "In the normal school here, several are asking for baptism." Thus, you see, the very first term of the first normal school, after the deposition, both the definite rules are violated in Marlboro, where of all other places we expected to see the strictest conformity. Surely other such examples of violating rules, who will consider such rules binding?"

"It would appear from the explanations offered by your colleagues at Philadelphia, that the deposition did contemplate some slight relaxation of their rules in reference to the possible intelligence of the children of Christian parents growing up unconverted.

"The purpose of these schools directed the legislation as to the character of the pupils that they should be Christian, giving promise of usefulness. It had been asked, Why not provide for the heathen children of Christian parents? This would be legislating where there are none to be affected by it. As a general rule among Kinn—and it is a familiar matter of with great interest by the missionaries—the children of Christian heathen parents are Christians; a child of Christian parents, that has passed the age of twelve or fourteen years, is very rarely to be found. When they exist, they can be proved to be an essential condition."

"The argument against making a rule 'where there are none to be affected by it,' is certainly conclusive, provided the fact to be an just message has stated. But I apprehend that it will require very strong evidence to convince Baptists that a nation has been found as very different from all the other nations of Asia, that a provision for the unconverted children of Christians "would be legislating where there would be affected by it," or amongst whom there is any general rule, that "the children of Christian parents themselves Christians," before the age of twelve or fourteen." Let such a principle be adopted among the Kinn, and how

to use money was fitted for its place in either of the schools."

The correctness of these statements is not admitted by the missionaries. The following extracts from a published letter of Mr. Weston's refers to the statement of the deputation that the school was visited on examination day, and was found to be deficient in the knowledge of the vernacular.

"Happily one who was present at the examination, the statement of Mr. Granger is a gross misstatement, for there was no examination whatever on that day of the vernacular. As to their ability to read, spell and write the Karek language, I feel bound to say that I can but regard the statement of Mr. Granger as a gross slander upon that school. I had, for more than a year, the general supervision of that school, and no less than eight of its members are now members of my theological class, and truth and justice compel me to say that in writing the Karek language, I have never had writing it so beautifully as some of those boys, and in reading and spelling I have never known any that could excel there. As to their knowledge of the Karek Scriptures, I have never before taught a class of Kareks that had so thorough a knowledge of the Bible as they."

Mr. Weston further says, "In immediate connection with the above is another statement from Mr. Granger, that is only not true, but directly the reverse of the truth. He says, 'The object of the boarding-schools in Massachusetts was to take up teachers and preachers.' For this not less than \$75,000 had been expended on them, and with what results? With one exception, not a teacher or preacher was found to have come from there." I have this evening (Sept. 12, 1844) reckoned up by name, more than forty living Karek preachers in Rangoon and Malacca, besides a very considerable number from Bantia, who were educated in the Massachusetts boarding-school. Besides these, there are native preachers who lived to do good service for the cause, but are now in heaven, were also members of that school. Mr. Granger adds, 'The pupils had gone into government, or mercantile, or other useful pursuits, with the education we had given them as a valuable capital to trade upon.' I know of no Karek that has ever been a member of

the Massachusetts Karek boarding-school, that is now in the government employ. But I know of two Kareks, who were in government employ upon a salary of 20 rupees each per month, and who voluntarily resigned their appointments, and sought employment in the mission upon less than half that salary. I know too another, who is now employed by the mission, and who has recently been offered an appointment with a salary of 40 rupees per month, who has refused to accept the appointment, and still continues in the service of the mission upon less than one-third of that amount. I know of a few engaged in mercantile pursuits, but they are our joy and crown, and in contributing to the support of the cause, are examples worthy of the imitation of all the Karek Christians, and would put to the blush, in this respect, a large majority of the professed friends of missions in America. It is with no desire to fulfill the predictions of an honest missionary that I write these things, but with a deep and painful sense of what is due to the majesty of truth and justice, and I do most devoutly pray that Mr. Granger will be able to retract these things so to relieve himself from the imputation of intentional misrepresentation."

The following are extracts from Mr. Bush's letter of Dec. 1844.

"The deputation say, 'One would suppose that preachers in Karek ought to be familiar with the Karek Scriptures, but these people only were familiar with the English Scriptures.' Did the deputation ever see any American who was familiar with the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures, who was ignorant of the English Scriptures? But were the pupils of the school deficient in reading, writing and spelling their own language, and were they only familiar with the English Scriptures, or is the above representation of the deputation a gross misstatement? Let us look at a few facts in the case. Five of the pupils of that school were from Danville, and have all been with me from two to six months since the school was broken up. I have had occasion at times to employ each of them, or to see them employed by Kareks as writers in their own language. Four of them at least have written for me. During my connection with the mission, more than twenty Kareks have been in my employ, at different

... than the others, instead of being more deficient, they were wack the more correct in all respects, and I have no hesitation in saying that they can read, write and spell their own language as correctly as a similar number of New-England pupils would read, write and spell the English language."

Mr. Vialar, who has taught a Bible class formed of these pupils, is confident that they had a much better knowledge of the Koro Scriptures than the precess and preachers in the service of the Methodists and Baptist missions.

"Of the fifty preachers of the Bureau mission, six have received instruction in the Theological Seminary, after having enjoyed the advantages of boarding-schools. Of the remaining forty-four, all that have received any instruction, excepting heavy learning to read in the village schools, (perhaps a few learned at the catechism,) have received it in the boarding-schools. Several of these are in the double capacity of preachers and school teachers, and besides these there have been fifteen young men engaged in teaching village schools during the past year, all of whom received their education in the boarding-school."

Sufficient, I trust, has been said to show that the changes of the department regard to the principal boarding-school at Maitland are substantial. In regard to the Bureau boarding-school which instead of being well supported, was entirely proscribed in the end, after the time of Dr. Howard's severe, and it was thought in 1828, it would have been surprising if the results had been equally favorable. Large sums of money expended in building for a school which is to be forthwith abandoned, or left to die a natural death, furnish a very forcible, but at the same time, a very effective argument against schools. From the reports given at Maitland, it appeared that the total expense of the Bureau boarding-school from its establishment in 1817, had been \$17,000, of which \$12,000 were drawn from the mission treasury, and \$5,000 from non-Bureau made on the ground. This school continued to flourish till the agitation of the educational question in 1844. "In five years," says Mr. Howard, "there had been an average of about six conversions a year." The school origi-

... with Mr. Jackson, whose views on the subject of education were very different from what has been usually represented, as appears by the following extract of a letter from Mr. Howard, dated June 1, 1823:

"For the last thirteen years of Dr. Jackson's life, he had a pretty large school connected with his own church at Maitland, which was originated and perpetuated by himself, that is, he was the chief agent in establishing the school, which was sustained only by his own aid. This school was conducted upon a plan which he shows down out at length, upon paper, and embraced not only the native language, but also the English, with such sciences as are taught in this, and not found in the native; in a word, all and much more than has been taught in this school."

"Nothing but Dr. Jackson's solid and vigorous resistance to undertake this school, at the employment was, at that time, opposed alike to my purposes and wisdom. I could not have sustained it long with any success without his support, for it was intricately connected with his church. This he uniformly gave me, offering me repeatedly a choice of one or two of his best native preachers, provided they were disposed to teach in the schools. He did this as he said, under the conviction that the youth and children in these schools, were the hope of the Bureau church. On this subject he expressed to the missionaries his strongest convictions and encouragements, when he returned from America; and added his testimony to the same effect before the commissioner of the Tennessee provinces and his subordinates, and a large number of visitors at the annual examination of the boarding-school."

"Dr. Jackson, as well as others, very at times have preferred some changes in the school, but till the last he uniformly expressed his high sense of their importance, to the mission."

Mr. Howard's remarks in Philadelphia are thus reported in the *Mercurian*.

"The object of the school was to win the confidence of the people, to give over them the influence of a Christian parent, and to excite in their sentiments the those of the child of such parents. That object had been

school, and its ever-during more efficient
limbs children than those of the school.
The religious influence had been good.
About an average of one-fourth of those
were hopefully converted, and their evidence
of Christian character is of the best. The
advantages made to the disadvantage of the
school might all be true, and yet in some of
their estimates untrue. The expense, for
example, might be correctly estimated, but it
would be wrong to judge of the future by the
estimate; this included the first outlay for
buildings, &c., which was considerable. So, in
what was said of the inefficiency of the school
as feared by the deputation, he believed they
judged by the appearance, and so misjudged.
The school was not what it was when he left

it. It had been drifting through neglect.
He looked for what had happened when he
saw the report of the Board in 1853.

Such is the history of a school which, like
too many missionary enterprises, has been
commenced and vigorously prosecuted for a
few years, only to be abandoned in the end.
Such has also been the fate of the African
Orphan Institution. The circumstances con-
nected with the establishment of that school
are well known. The mission deemed it desir-
able to have one school of a superior order,
and to establish, for the whole province, and to
have the labor of one missionary permanently
devoted to this department. It was believed
that this would be better economy than to
employ missionary to be harassed with the care
of raising up and instructing a few natives
for himself; and it was thought that
average six or eight missionaries, the appoint-
ment of one to this special service, would not
be regarded as giving undue prominence to
the work of education. The Executive Com-
mittee fully responded to the views of the
mission, and the Rev. Mr. Stoddard was spe-
cially appointed to this work. Mr. Stod-
dard accepted this appointment, though it was
not in accordance with his own predilections;
he notwithstanding the opinion so strongly
expressed by yourself and others, that it "is more
the duty of a missionary to teach than to preach," all the
time in the case there, that so the time being
spent to some other proper work for teach-
ing, missionaries have, in nearly every in-
stance, assumed the charge of schools with

reference, and only by the urgent advice of
the Institute or the Executive Committee.

But the deputation considered it too much
to allow the services of one missionary to be
devoted to the education of native Americans
for all Assam; hence, in connection with
other charges, you released Dr. Stoddard of
his charge and placed the school in the hands
of Dr. Doan, with permission to devote to
the institution separate from its general su-
perintendence, one hour each day, including
the time occupied in religious worship. The
mission had deliberately and unanimously
decided, that the adoption of your plan would
be "fatal to the prosperity of the institution;"
that "the withdrawal of the services of a mis-
sionary superintendent would be equivalent
to the abandonment of the institution as a
missionary enterprise." Yet rather than abandon
the school, they accepted your arrangements
for remodeling it, in the hope that a year's
delay might bring such a change of opinion
on the part of the Executive Committee, as
would allow our opinions again to receive
their wonted freedom. Your professed ob-
ject was to preserve the school, to improve
and render it more effective; but although
your instructions have been strictly followed,
and the changes effected gradually as you de-
sired, and notwithstanding the strenuous efforts
of Dr. Doan to preserve it, the accom-
plishment of the mission have been more than
realized. During the first year after it was
remodeled, the number of the institution,
was reduced from thirty-two to twenty; an-
other year reduced them to twelve; and at
the close of 1853, the number was seven.

As you have called in question the correct-
ness of my statement in reference to the Or-
phan School, I will quote a few paragraphs
from the closing report of the mission on your
first plan for remodeling the institution,
which was accepted after several ineffectual
attempts to obtain more favorable terms.

"In the first place your committee consider
that the Executive Committee have fully indi-
cated their purpose in regard to the objects
and maintenance of the institution, by repeat-
ed and definite acts from its commencement;
such as sending out a missionary family as
expediently as possible; by appointing the best object
of the mission to be referred to it; and by the

views coincided in the instructions of the committee at the time of sending forth the present superintendent of the school. The mission having, up to the present date of the deposition, received no different instructions from the Board, but that for the present organization and character of the institution, the Executive Committee are responsible equally with the mission.

"In the next place, the mission are sensible in regard to the crossing great importance of sustaining the mission. When called upon to report, they stated the most holy and strong, that it ought to be sustained; that it contains powerful evangelizing elements, which we consider admirably adapted to the present state of the people, and to the rising up of the native agency we so much need. At this point the deposition stated to the mission that those views do not coincide with his own, and that he has strong apprehensions that the Executive Committee will not be prepared to sustain them, or to sustain the school on its present basis. He therefore laid before the mission the modifications, which, in his opinion, would accord with the views of the Executive Committee. These modifications the mission, after consideration, deemed most injurious to the institution in every respect; nevertheless, being desirous of effecting, as far as possible, harmony of action between the deposition and the mission, a committee was appointed to draw up, if practicable, a basis of compromise. This was done with a sincere desire to secure the co-operation of the deposition; and on the part of the mission important concessions were made. The result was that as several as had been anticipated. The concessions made by the mission in the place of compromise were not accorded to. The deposition felt that he could not justly stand before the Executive Committee, should he concede all the principles involved in the proposed compromise.

"Under these circumstances the mission felt embarrassed. They could not conscientiously accede to the principles and modifications proposed by the deposition. They believed that the testimony would be to wholly injure the institution, and to put back the mission many years. The mission, therefore,

granted, and leaves the responsibility of carrying out these modifications to the Executive Committee. Here the mission considered that their action and responsibility is a measure closed."

After these efforts on the part of the mission and on the presentation of your final proposition, the committee state that they "have found themselves exceedingly embarrassed," but recommended, "as the best thing under existing circumstances," the acceptance of the plan offered by the deposition.

In reference to the statements which you repeatedly made to us, that we could not obtain from the Executive Committee more favorable terms than you were prepared to give; and that you "could not sustain your

self before the Executive Committee if you should accede to the proposals of the mission," it appears from the report in the *New-York Herald* that you complained of your language having been misqu Coastal.

"The Rev. Dr. Park explained that he said he would be unable to sustain the action of the mission before the Executive Committee."

This cannot but occasion surprise when taken in connection with the report of the mission, in which they say, "the deposition felt that he could not justify himself before the Executive Committee." That report was discussed and adopted in your presence; all the statements in which you objected were either unrecalled or stricken out; but in this statement you made an objection. Your expressions were, in fact, much stronger than the language used in our report, and such as could not possibly be mistaken.

It has been said: Let the members of the deposition have a fair trial of two or three years, and time will show the wisdom of the changes that have been made. For three years the fighting influence of this anti-educational policy has been allowed to operate, and what is the result? In the case of preparing Associations, the means of preparing a native agency is taken away, and the mission itself is brought to the verge of extinction! Among the heathens, with Jackson spent his life, there is no institution in operation for preparing missionaries or teachers, while the number of missionaries laboring in that be-

gangs is less than it was twenty years ago! The Kares missions alone have maintained their ground, but it has been done only by undertaking the support of their own schools, unfettered by the restrictions of the Sepu-
tation.

Reserving the subject of Kaptid for my next letter, I remain,

Respectfully yours,
S. Brown.

the great mass of the very un-
cultured, uneducated, unenlightened
and unimproved masses of unlettered
and unlearned natives. Let the means
of their education be adapted to
their condition. Let the studies be
such as to be profitable to them.
Let the studies be such as to be
profitable to them. Let the studies
be such as to be profitable to them.
Let the studies be such as to be
profitable to them. Let the studies
be such as to be profitable to them.

But still the mass would not be parallel
Our theological student must be deprived of
his previous mental training. We must take
away his Commentary, and the Church His-
tory that stands upon his shelf; his History
of the Reformation, and of the Martyrs; the
illness to which he has daily access, and all
the knowledge he has gained from reading
in his early years. Like his Hymns or Ro-
man brother he must be satisfied with a library
that he can carry upon his shoulders.
Were it possible to fill our churches with a
ministry educated in this manner, and to re-
strict the auxiliary agencies to the limits pre-
scribed by the despatch, how long before
this country would return to paganism, idolatry,
superstition?

It will not be sufficient to say, We need
money to preach the gospel truly; we have
no objection to the promotion of education
as a separate work. The policy of discourag-
ing all contributions for schools, and pre-
venting the friends of education from taking the
support of schools into their own hands. Let
the churches be free for the contributions to
flow in whatever direction the contributions
desire, and we have no fear that the institu-
tion of learning will be suffered to decline.
It is because the churches are not allowed to
do their own work, that schools soon estab-
lished, and giving promise of usefulness, are
stuffed in the mud. The building up of
schools is not the work of the denomination;
it is the work of a few individuals. One of
our most experienced missionaries, writing
on this subject, says:

"Perhaps you will recollect that I resided
in the denomination that during my visit here,
though I had traveled much and addressed
the churches wherever I went, and always
saying that schools were one means we need
for the conversion of the heathen, yet only

in one place, and there only by two men,
and I should not have supposed as to schools
being a legitimate means to be used for con-
verting the heathen. That plan was Previ-
dence, and the two men were Mr. Wayland
and Mr. Grogan. It is now desired there
was any proscribed plan, but everything
looks naturally like it."

Let us turn to the subject of instruction in
English. This was a question, on which the
deputation especially required the decision of
the convention. The report of the convention
on this subject, has been given in a former
letter. The ground was taken that it was
not possible, nor even desirable that all the
native preachers should be educated; but
it was maintained that a portion of them
must be thoroughly educated. Such an edu-
cation, without a knowledge of English,
would be manifestly impossible. Nothing
that deserves the name of a theological edu-
cation, nothing corresponding in any degree,

to the advantages enjoyed by theological stu-
dents in this country, could, under present
circumstances, be imparted to heathen or
Kafir youth, except by giving them the
languages which would open to them our
various religious books. The rule of the
deputation prohibiting English in our theo-
logical schools, I regard as nothing more or
less than saying that we shall have no theo-
logical schools. At least it is concluded
that a thorough education cannot be obtained
without a knowledge of one or two, or per-
haps three languages; what have we for our
native students as an equivalent? Shall
their native languages be allowed at least,
and not one abroad? The denomination profess
to be in favor of theological institutions for
the training of native preachers, but I submit
that such a school as their rules allow, can-
not be called a theological institution, nor the
education thus received a theological educa-
tion.

And what are these native churches to do
without a class of men that shall be able to
transfer to the native languages the know-
ledge obtained from English books? If we
use against the works of Bunyan, and Bar-
ter, and Doddridge and Feller; the histories
of the church; doctrinal and practical treatises;
we cannot the native mind

... is a waste; if we expect that a Christian literature is to be given to the newly converted nations in their own tongues, we must be conscious of the necessity of qualifying talented natives for this work; and such qualifications they can obtain only by an acquaintance with the English language. Alas! there are numbers of native Christian youth who desire this; who are even eager to obtain that knowledge which will enable them to be more useful to their countrymen. How cruel the attempt to repress this reasonable ardor; to crush their aspirations and force them back into the darkness from which they are struggling to escape; how criminal the endeavor to isolate them. Seize their hands, and shut out from them the light and sympathy, and communion with their brethren in America, which a perusal of our religious publications would afford.

It would have been strange if a reform like this had not met with decided opposition on the part of the missionary convention. Although the attempt to obtain a vote against the teaching of English was made and rejected the second and third times, it did not stand. The convention were willing, in deference to your opinions to withhold from their report all reference to the subject, but to express your views they respectfully declined. In the supplementary Work of the Deputation, in the Magazine for May 1834, the paper drawn up by yourself against the teaching of English, is inserted at length, and indeed by the convention, that "the rule, or general policy, as originally adopted by the Convention, was in the following words: After the question, the convention is again asked, "The convention are already standing upon the above as an expression of their views on the general subject of the education of English; but wishing to express as if a provision for emergency cases, in which some of the advocates of the motion were dissatisfied, the whole subject was struck from the report, as finally adopted, by unanimous consent."

It is of little use for missionaries to attempt the expression of an opinion adverse to the measure if those who hold it their hands are not only the power of absolute control, but

the means of controlling over the Union, as for the want of official authority, statements like these. After having previously and cordially received your proposals, after having expressed to ourselves your views, the churches in America are unable to believe that the convention did "originally adopt" your paper, "as an expression of their views on the general subject of the education of English." It is too late to remedy the injurious effects of these and similar misstatements which have already done their work in prejudicing and embarrassing the public mind against the proposed "rule or form of instruction" which is bred from the deputation; yet I deem it my duty, however late, to protest against the injustice, and to show that your paper on the subject of English never received its original sanction in the convention of the Convention. At the risk of being tedious, I must again quote from the relations of our debates. After you had brought your proposition before the convention, Bro. Benjamin proposed, as an addition, the following amendment:

"Yet we would not discourage the teaching of English to a few pupils of trial purity and rare capacity, whose talents and habits give fair promise that they will make attainments useful in the mission."

Mr. Stearns expressed his hope that if your paper did pass, it might be with an amendment; but was interrupted by Mr. George, who remarked that there should be no further debate, the question having been sufficiently discussed already. Mr. Stearns stated that he had no opinion on the subject before. It was remarked by another member that the previous discussion had all been on one side; with one or two exceptions, those in favor of English had not spoken at all.

Mr. Thomas—The students whom we might wish to have taught English, might be taught in the Government schools.

Dr. Park—The paper was only intended to discourage the teaching of English in Africa generally; it would not cut off worthy individuals. He had drawn it up supposing it would meet the views of the convention in general; and had offered it supposing that all, with the exception perhaps of

was said
was said

said

to acquire English without the establishment of mission schools for that purpose. The amendment leaves everything open; it could entirely nullify the paper if opposed to it.

* Mr. Kepp thinks the amendment would defeat the object of the paper. A missionary might take advantage of the amendment to spend his time in teaching English schools, or in teaching mission schools.

* Mr. Mason—such a construction negates all the laws of language.

* Dr. Dorr thinks the amendment nullifies the paper, and shall therefore vote against it.

* Dr. Wade says the amendment and the original paper are directly opposite.

* Mr. Barren thinks the paper would be considered as giving the general rule, the amendment the exception.

* The amendment passed; nine voting in favor, and six against it.

* Mr. Granger hopes the brethren in the majority will now propose a paper, expressing their views. He expresses this form of putting an amendment directly opposite to the doctrine of the mover, was only done out of courtesy.

* Mr. Brown suggests that a paper being read that of Dr. Peck and the amendment together, so as to make them harmonious, might be proposed by a committee, consisting of the mover of the amendment and others.

* Dr. Peck throws himself on the convention, and hopes they will allow him to withdraw his paper.

* Mr. Thayer thinks it is in the hands of the convention, and cannot be withdrawn without a vote.

* The President decides that the mover can withdraw it, unless some one objects.

* Mr. Granger inquires whether, if the paper is withdrawn, it does not also draw along with it the amendment?

* The President decides that it does.

* Such was the disposal of your paper, instead of being adopted, either "originally" or subsequently, it was never voted upon; but was withdrawn by yourself, rather than allow the convention to act upon it.

Having obtained this desired proof of the

repugnance of the missionaries to your plan, it was natural to expect that you would at least pause, before proceeding to enforce them on the missions by the summary exercise of authority. This would suggest that mission-work was had been on the ground fifteen or twenty years, might safely be left to decide on the terms of admission, and the studies to be pursued in their schools. If they are not able to do this better than a dissertation, on a flying visit, and with no practical experience they are not fit to be excluded as missionaries. Inform the laborers that you have no confidence in them and wish to dissolve the connection, but do not insult them by submitting questions for their decision, and withdrawing them the moment you find that their views are not to be controlled.

As you have chosen to rely on the arbitrary power with which you were invested, instead of the judgment of the missionary body, you have the satisfaction, if such it can be, of witnessing the results; you have seen your plan fully carried out in one of our once flourishing missions; which is a thing that has become a reality, which was not so when the Home Secretary asserted that "the instructions of the Executive Committee were a dead letter in some of the missions." There can be no doubt that since the time of the deposition, some of your rules have become a dead letter. Among these is your prohibition of English instruction among the heathen of Hawaii; and it will probably remain a dead letter, as long as Kereke's theological institutions exist. The missionary which you have constituted for the management of Hawaii is a powerful one; but over the strong arm of ~~the~~ executive challenge is not adequate to the work of arresting light and knowledge, and inaugurating the reign of ignorance. Missions can never be carried on in this country against education. They cannot shut their eyes to the pressing wants of the most destitute, and their great estimation for thoroughly educated men. Other missions most sensibly follow the example of Kereke's mission, who by establishing a high school at Hangoon, to supply the place of the one broken up at Hangoon, have rendered themselves obnoxious to the reproaches of the Executive. As an illustration

of the trees which ministered sustenance to the necessity for institutions of this kind, I quote a portion of Mr. Kennell's appeal in behalf of the Karen High School, published in the *Christian Secretary*, of Sept. 21st, 1884.

Early in 1844, Mr. Hasey came out for the express purpose of going to the natives to give them a thorough biblical training. Few men ever entered a more important work, few ever contended with greater difficulties, and to one perhaps ever addressed himself more warmly or arduously to the work he had in hand. He had to do it with untrained pupils and had but few books to put into their hands, and even the art of reading was but imperfectly known. The work, however, went forward, and a goodly number were so trained as to preach with great fervor and expound the Scriptures with ability. Few men in our history have ever made a deeper impression or earned a wider influence. He had, as he deserved, the constant and warm support of all the Karen missions. The churches, as well as the government, began to feel the importance of education, and a thirst for knowledge was awakened. Mr. Hasey took account of these wants and necessities of the Karen race, and projected a school in which a select number of both sexes should be so trained as to become teachers among their own people. With this conviction every Karen missionary warmly sympathized with him in his vision, and hence arose the Karen normal school in Mankana. At first it was limited to thirty, ultimately to fifty pupils, and was taught by the labor of the mission. This was the first and only school that seemed to give anything like a thorough mental training; and this school was broken up by the depredation in 1852, under the mistaken apprehension that the pupils would become civilized and refined to be work among their own countrymen. To the school the churches and country looked with the fondest eyes. The more enlightened and thoughtful among them had begun to inquire, "Why may we not have maintained up among ourselves, who shall be qualified to take the place of our teachers?" There are great and urgent reasons why they should have one school, where a regular education

may be obtained, as a constant stimulus to meet the wants of the churches, and desires of the churches with reference to the natives.

"We must have a school in which men can be trained to read and reason, write and speak; that is one of the necessities of the Karen race. There can be no real progress without it. An enlightened ministry and a well qualified class of instructors are needed to carry forward and perfect the great work now begun. In a few years this school will subsist and grow without foreign aid. Here now the churches will support, here or fifty pupils is such a school. At this very moment we need fifty well qualified assistants to go into as many new churches, to preach Christ and teach the people to read the Scriptures, and probably the same number will be needed every six months past to supply new fields rapidly opening on every side. Evangelists, preachers, and school teachers are needed, and they can only be qualified for their work by such a school as we propose. Can we shut

our eyes to the obvious necessities of Divine Providence in reference to this great people? Can we satisfy ourselves that we are acting up to the letter and spirit of the great commission, when we preach the Gospel and baptize those who believe, and then have no men to act as pastors, and go and leave them in the confusion of heathenism, untaught in the things of the Kingdom? Are we not bound to 'ask in order things that are wanting?' To 'ordain elders in every church?' But where are we to obtain pastors among our people without schools? If these they are to be, they must be taught; they must learn to read, and thus have some biblical knowledge. From the middle of the eleventh century onward, dare not admit the papal system, that 'ignorance is the mother of devotion.'"

Mr. Harris, in his letter of Sept. 12, 1864, says:

"What is the result of excluding English from the Karen normal school? Of the number who have left the school on account of the prohibition, I have not the exact data, but I think I may safely say that—further more

...in the... those who have
taught the school, (of course I am giving my
opinion in these remarks) but a sort of in-
describable discouragement that they have
spent many days' hard labor, supposing that
they had the full and entire approbation of
the Board; and they had spent many almost
sleepless nights watching over the work, after
looking after the temporal and spiritual wants
of the people.

"If the Rev. J. G. Denny would have
consented to remain and labor on the same sys-
tem as the government had sanctioned, the de-
partment would have been refused to see him
again on the head of the missionary." It ap-
pears to me the speaker makes a mistake. If
he had said, the same system the department
had sanctioned, he would have hit the nail on
the head. I believe Mr. Denny would heartily
subscribe to all the convention said it re-
gards to what further provision for training is
required. See report of the convention, pp.
84 and 85. As to teaching English, the con-
vention did not vote to discontinue it, either
in the Korean normal school, or anywhere else,
officially. Near the close of the convention,
officially. Near the close of the convention,
a resolution was moved to be
offered a resolution to discontinue the teach-
ing of English. The convention did not
pass it. He afterwards remarked, "I
thought I was presenting the sense of the
convention, but it proved to be the sense
of the convention." The department did, non-
withstanding, give orders that the teaching
of English should be discontinued."

The following remarks are from Mr.
Bassler's letter of December, 1855:

"How can the Koreans ever to have an ade-
quate number, except as it shall be given
them by thoroughly educated men of their own
race? The idea that a barbarous people are
to receive their literature from the hands of
foreigners, is not unprecedented in history,
and was properly reprehensible to be un-
derstood.

"What do the department, and those who
oppose the teaching of English to this people,
expect they will become? What does their
system, if they have any, indicate respecting
the education, the future religious and literary
character of this people? When they lay

without reach upon a sound Christianizing edu-
cation, or something that would, in a few
years more, have set forth a class of thoroug-
ly educated teachers, who would see it done
true because translators and writers, what
do they give us in its stead? They say that
they have gone to normal schools, but what
are the normal schools of the department?
Nothing more, but on the contrary something
a good deal less, than the boarding schools
which have long been in operation, with a
good success."

The assertion of the department, that in-
struction in English will injure the vernacular,
must meet with an emphatic denial from every
missionary who has any experience on the
subject. Says Mr. Vroman:

"The department insist upon the exclusion
of English, and say that if it is not excluded,
it will exclude the vernacular. It is impossi-
ble to combine them. As well might the intro-
duction of a collegiate education in America say,
We must exclude Greek and Latin from our
colleges, and introduce the study of those dead
languages to the young ministry, or they will
exclude the English, and we shall never have
men only competent to give an instruction in
those dead languages. The reply, however, is,
that Mr. Grouser should say 'this was admit-
ted by the convention in Seoul'. Let Mr.
Grouser name the man, and I pledge myself
either to get a certificate from that conven-
tion that he never intended to say anything
of the kind, or to obtain evidence from ten
other missionaries expressing directly the op-
posite opinion." Respectfully yours,
K. Bassler.

revised

Extra ~~to~~ company - July 20

1st page blank. 130 lines x 18 lines = 2340
(full vol. lines) 130 " " 2394

3rd 137 }
6th 137 }
12th 137 }

7th col 149 " " 2610
2682

Blank pages

1st col. 48 x 22 = 1056 }
2nd col. 102 x 18 = 1836 } 2892

3rd col - 152 lines 18 - 2916

4th (full vol. (old)) 173 18 3114

5th 173 " 3114
175 " 3150

total of company
C. 40 M. 8. 10. 08

23214

4016
10708560