

17
Ap. 30
LETTERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF MISSIONS.

TO THE REV. S. PECK, D. D., COR. SEC. OF THE AM.
BAP. MISSIONARY UNION.

LETTER 3.

Rev. and Dear Sir:

Having given a hasty sketch of what I conceive to have been the primitive mode of conducting Missions, I now propose to examine those of our own times, and to show that, in many important respects, they are opposed to the spirit and principles of the Gospel. For the purposes of such an examination, we must look at the practical operations of our system and not merely at the professions or intentions of those by whom it has been introduced. If the tree is good, the fruit will be good, if the fruit be evil, the source whence it sprung must be corrupt.

One important feature of a gospel mission, as I have already observed, is a recognition of the right of the churches to free and open intercourse with the Missionaries, and to the fullest information in regard to the manner in which their Missions are conducted. Probably few instances have ever occurred, in which this right has been more strikingly violated, than in the appointment of the late deputation, and in the measures adopted for carrying out their policy. It might have been supposed that a step of so grave import as the sending of a deputation, for the correction of errors in our eastern Missions, would not have been taken without the general concurrence of the members of the Union, and upon grounds that had been publicly and fairly presented. The denomination were entitled to know what the errors were, into which the Missionaries had fallen, and what were the changes to be effected by the deputation. It was certainly due to the churches, that their views should as far as practicable, be ascertained in reference to these changes, before entrusting the deputation with authority to carry them into execution.

18

In appointing the Deputation, it is well known that neither the Union or Board of Managers was consulted. It is stated in the Magazine, that the Executive Committee would gladly have availed themselves of the advice of the Board of Managers, had there been time for a reference to them. What sudden emergency could have arisen, in the interval between the annual meeting in May 1852, and the appointment of the Deputation in October, to justify such haste, it is difficult to understand. The re-opening of Burmah was known at the May meeting. In July, directions 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 competent to perform the duty assigned them. No persons could be better qualified to select the proper stations and the laborers to occupy them, than the Missionaries themselves. It does not appear to have been thought, at the time this conference 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 1855, when information had been received that pamphlets from the Missionaries were on their way to this country. But no such meeting was called; no occurrence had taken place which would justify such a call; and no one, I am persuaded, can be more fully aware than yourself, that the call for such a meeting, and a full and fair disclosure 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 denomination generally, to sanction their appointment.

It may be said that this statement is too strong, and that the measure was sanctioned by the Board at the annual meeting in Albany in 1853. But the question returns, Were the objects, for which a Deputation was sent, fairly presented before the Board of Managers, at the time the measure was endorsed by them? Did they understand the original grounds of

19

the appointment, and still more had they the remotest apprehension of the changes which were, at that moment, being effected among our Missions in the east? Up to the time of that meeting, so far as the churches had the means of information, the re-opening of Burmah was the prime cause of sending a Deputation. No one appears to have suspected that this was not the real reason. The object of the Deputation was announced in the Magazine for Dec. 1852, in the following terms;

"To devise the best methods of organizing, appointing and directing the Mission when it shall be thus enlarged, and to establish the enterprise on a just footing in relation both to our past and to our prospective efforts for the evangelization of the races of Burmah, a general meeting of the Burman and Karen Missionaries is to be convened at Maulmain; and a Deputation from the Executive Committee are now on their way, to sit with them, to aid their deliberations, and to communicate the immediate results to their brethren at home.

The same ground was maintained at the annual meeting in 1853. No indication appears to have been given of a change in the policy of the Missions, if we except the opposition to schools offered by Dr. Wayland. His remarks however, appeared to have no connection with the action of the Executive Committee; and it is probable that scarce an individual in that meeting, beyond the parties concerned, had any idea that while Dr. Wayland was proposing a resolution of inquiry, in reference to schools and the press, the work of revolution was going on in Burmah, under the sanction of authority committed to the Deputation by the Executive Committee. It appears probable, indeed, from some of the debates in 1854, 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 is an extract from a speech of Dr. Hague, reported in the Macedonian with Dr. Stow's reply;

20

"It now appeared there was a preconcerted intention of making great changes in the Missions, changes amounting to a revolution. The charge of preconcert having been denied and deprecated, he remarked that the individuals disclaiming might clear themselves, but the fact could not be denied. The coincidence of the motion of Dr. Wayland on this subject with the work which the Deputation were then doing on the other side of the world, was not accidental."

"Dr. Srow said that the Executive Committee were not responsible for Dr. Wayland's motion, nor at all concerned 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 at

least one of them entertained views on the subject of schools identical with those which Dr. Wayland had been urging for many years. They could not therefore have been greatly surprised to find that the ample powers with which the Deputation were clothed, had been exerted in favor of the new theory.

Before the meeting in 1854, it had become generally known that the proposed re-occupation of Burmah had created no necessity whatever for the appointment of a Deputation. It was plain that the designation of individuals to occupy the new posts, might have been safely left with the Missionaries; and that they were in fact, the only proper persons to make the selection. The Executives profess to have confidence in the Missionaries as a body; if such was the case, why should they not allow the selection to be made by a vote of the majority? Why did the Deputation withdraw the permission to nominate individuals, which had been given to the Convention 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 startled by a series of the boldest and most sweeping charges against

21

Missionaries, ever listened to by a religious audience. These charges made by the highest authority, and asserted with such confidence 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 anniversary, demanded the concealment of so important facts from those who had a right to the fullest information; a system to maintain which it was necessary to keep back the true reason for a great public measure, and substitute another, which was at best but incidental and comparatively unimportant?

Let us look for a moment at the different positions occupied by the official organs in 1853 and 1854. In the former year the language used in reference to Dr. Wayland's proposal for an inquiry concerning the time and labor expended on schools and the press, was as follows.

"The Home Secretary had no objection to investigation. They were agreed that preaching was the chief instrumentality to be used, and he was not aware that the system of any of the Missions was liable to just exceptions in this matter."

Here the Secretary appears to be ignorant that there was anything in the practice of the Missions, in the matter of schools and printing, that called for executive interference. But at the annual meeting in 1854, he made the following statement, which is copied from the New York Recorder.

"The Executive Committee found that in certain Missions their instructions were not complied with. They thought it was better to send a Deputation, and save the proclamation of these things. In this we have failed, and you shall have the whole, if that be the determination. In 1846 the Rev. Mr. Vinton was here, and spoke of the predominance of schools over preaching in the Missions. In consequence of this Dr. Wayland made objections, and a conference was called, at a meeting of the Board in New York; and the result

22

was to place preaching before teaching and bookmaking, and the Deputation were instructed to give information as to this point. The revolution they have made there is one that this Board and Executive Committee have sanctioned in almost every report, for five years past. *It could not have been done without them; it was that which the Board could not do, because the Missionaries refused to comply.*"

The following, from the same speech, is reported in the Macedonian.

"The whole subject of the proper proportion of Missionary labor was considered in 1849, and the Executive Committee were instructed to carry into effect the measures complained of. Why were not these instructions carried out? Because—he regretted to say it, but the avowal was called out by others—the instructions of the Executive Committee were a dead letter in some of the Missions. Ever since 1849, the Committee had endeavored to fulfil the instructions of the Board, but had been thwarted, and it was their conviction that a measure must be adopted adequate to that end, if such a measure could be devised."

"But why could not the missionaries do the needed work? Because missionaries are men, of like 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 assailed."

It is difficult to reconcile the language of the last extracts 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 reverse that order. They endeavored to do so, but in some of the Missions their instructions were a dead letter; the reversal could not be effected, because the Missionaries refused to comply. Up to July 1852, the sending of a Deputation had not been contemplated; but

23

from some unexplained developments, occurring between that time and October, the Committee came to the conclusion that some measure must be adopted equal to the end in view, if such a measure could be devised; which finally proved to be the appointment of a Deputation. And yet the Home Secretary, in 1853, did not know that the system prevailing in any of our Missions, was liable to just exception, in the matter of teaching and book-making.

If the plain unvarnished import of the statements 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 but one impression made upon the minds of all who listened to the explanations of the Home Secretary.

What now must be thought if the facts adduced in 1854, to justify a Deputation, should turn out to be purely fictitious? What if it should appear that schools and printing had never been 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 first relied on to justify the appointment of a Deputation was untenable, that which was subsequently adopted will be found still more unfortunate, because directly opposed to facts. Had there been a wish to disclose the real objects of the Deputation, it might have been done in the compass of a single sentence; but to this day, so far as official information is relied on, the supporters of Missions are as much in the dark as they were at the annual meeting in 1853. Respectfully yours.

N. BROWN.

Rev. and Dear Sir:

Not only were the churches ignorant of the objects of the deputation, but all real information in regard to the extent of the power with which they were invested, 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. In the announcement in the Magazine, the cautious phrase, "a just discretionary power," was softened by the specification of the services to which that power was confined viz, "aiding the deliberations" of the conference, and "communicating the immediate results to the brethren at home."

"Subsequent information, received from the missions, has constrained the Committee to believe that a deputation of faithful men, clothed with a just discretionary power, and charged with the two-fold service of aiding the conference in its deliberations, and of bringing home complete views of the measures discussed, would be acceptable to the missionaries, and greatly subserve the economy and efficiency of the missionary work through many successive years."

This carefully guarded language was not calculated to convey an idea that the deputation were clothed with episcopal power, but the contrary. No one on reading it would receive the impression that instead of aiding the deliberations of the conference, they were empowered to reverse its decisions; no one would suppose that such was the course spoken of as likely to prove "acceptable to the missionaries;" no one would suppose that instead of being deputed to consult with their brethren and bring home the results, they were clothed with the whole power of the executive, to be used at their discretion in controlling and coercing the missionaries.

25
The instructions given by the Executive Committee, including the act of authorization, by which the deputation were invested with absolute power, an act 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 Maulmain Convention, but in printing the minutes, the most important portion of the document was omitted. When you had convened the mission in Asam, and presented this paper as a warrant for your authority, you were requested to allow a copy of the paragraph under whose sanction you acted, to be inserted in the records of our meeting. To this you objected. After considerable discussion, you allowed a copy to be taken, but with the express injunction, *that it should not be published.* It appears, however, that during the investigation at Albany, this instrument was placed in the hands of a Committee of which Dr. Wayland was chairman; and at the special meeting in March, 1855, it was called for and read before the Board of Managers. Had it not been for the discussions which have arisen on the subject, it would never have seen the light. As this act of authorization has been publicly read, I consider that I am violating no obligation by giving it an insertion in this place. It is drawn up with all the formality of a legal document.

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

"7. The Deputation 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 therefore to deliberate with the missions together or severally; and where the Deputation agree in opinion that the interests of the missions require the immediate decision of any question or questions, they will consider themselves as authorized to act definitely 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

26
have acted under this authorization, they will be expected immediately to report their doings to the Executive Committee, with a detailed statement of the reasons therefor."

It will be noticed that the authority to effect changes is not limited to those cases in which the missions and the deputation are agreed, but to those 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 Assam.

It is said that some of the missionaries desired a deputation. Nothing could be more natural. It is probable there was not a laborer in the field, who would not have been delighted to see a deputation of unbiased, disinterested men, clothed with no authority beyond what the New Testament sanctions. Such a deputation would have been *fraternal*, not in word only, but in truth; their office 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 knew." The three-fold responsibility of *examination*, *counsel*, and giving a *report*, would, it appears to me, be quite as much as any sound 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 sent out a brother deputy clothed with this armour of Saul. But times are changed, and we change with them. The Macedonian for Sept. 1854, says:

"The Prudential Committee 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 men 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 could not be safely delayed."

"The Deputation of the American Board of Commissioners have gone to India to seek to introduce substantially the same principles of missionary labor in their missions, and a deputation, for the same object, leave London the present month on behalf of the English Baptist Board."

There can be no doubt that the Macedonian 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 train. The mutual understanding between our executives and those of the American Board, has long been manifest. It is understood that the officers of the principal missionary societies in London are accustomed to meet for mutual consultation on the management of missions. Before leaving these shores, as we learned from your statements in the Maulmain Convention, you were aware that the officers of the American Board had adopted the same principles in regard to schools as those advocated by yourself; and you were, doubtless, not unprepared 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 secured by yourselves, should also answer for them. It might be supposed that the English Baptist Missionary Society would have sent their deputation with a commission less repugnant to their original principles. But it has been stated by one of the officers of that Society, that they did invest their deputation with plenary powers, although they had not deemed it advisable to make this *part* public. How painful to find that Baptists are thus following in the wake of other denominations, and adopting a system of worldly policy, such as we have always been taught to suppose was confined to earthly governments and churches established by law.

fact

28

It is, however, very satisfactory to learn that the English deputation, Rev. Mr. Underhill, although clothed with such authority, has pursued a course marked with candor and moderation, and that the Home 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 Macedonian contend 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 predilection for episcopal authority, that they would not go to India, unless they could enjoy the right of enforcing whatever they thought best, irrespective of the opinion 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 deemed competent! We should suppose that a decent respect for the venerable fathers of our Zion might have secured them against such injurious imputations. Until we have evidence that the Macedonian has some 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 alike repugnant to their principles and their feelings, and that they would much sooner visit our mission fields for the purpose of inspecting our operations and giving advice, than they would go for the purpose of controlling our movements and breaking up our plans.

Suppose a *missionary* were to be appointed on a deputation, (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 missionaries, 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 delegation,

29

it would be to one composed of old and experienced missionaries, who, in addition to their sympathy for the trials of their brethren, would combine a ripeness of knowledge and judgment that could never be obtained by persons on a flying visit, however much they might have prepared themselves by previous study.

Our churches are urged to be reconciled to the late measures, by the probability that the necessity for sending a deputation will seldom occur. This is a delusion. On our present system, missions *cannot* be managed except by the frequent appointment of deputations, or the exercise of episcopal power in some other form. The necessities for interference will increase instead of diminishing. The frequency with which some societies already send their deputations, shows that it must ultimately become a permanent arrangement. And it will soon be found that a residence of two or three years, on the plan contemplated by the present deputation 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 deputies who reside in the field than by transient visitors. Indeed, if we *must* have a system of authoritative direction, the sooner 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 powers, by an act of authorization concealed from public scrutiny, and unsanctioned by the usages of the denomination. It is, at 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 deputation.

I remain yours, very respectfully,

NATHAN BROWN.

Rev. and Dear Sir:

The public have no means of ascertaining what were the objects of the deputation, except from the work they have actually done. Judging from the course they have pursued with all our missions, as well as from their expressed opinions and written documents, I feel that I am standing on sure ground, when I maintain that the leading objects of their mission were as follows:

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

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

To the former of these objects the efforts of your colleague were chiefly, though not exclusively, devoted; while the latter was, as I believe, the paramount object with yourself, and one to the attainment of which your labors have been long directed. It is undoubtedly the paramount question; it affects the very foundation of our ecclesiastical structure, and deserves the first place in all our discussions. Yet as the other subject was first in the proceedings of the Maulmain convention, it will be most convenient to follow the same order in these letters.

I do not wish to be understood as asserting that the *executive committee* had these objects in view, when they empowered the deputation to act. I am inclined to doubt whether the committee anticipated that so many radical changes would be introduced by the deputation. With Drs. Ripley, Stow, and Neale, and Deacon Lincoln, I had the pleasure of an acquaintance before leaving this country; and I feel quite sure that, with a full knowledge of facts, they would not have lent their sanction

to what has been done. On the present system, 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 mistake in 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 must 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 acting from erroneous views, it would be strange if the executive committee did not imbibe, to a greater or less extent, the same impressions. The representations against missionaries which have been scattered broadcast over the land for the last two years, alienating the ministers and churches from their brethren abroad, have no doubt been operating for a much longer time on the minds of the executive committee. Still, as the recent 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 already remarked that, so far as official information is concerned, the supporters of missions are still in the dark as to the changes which the deputation sought to effect. A person attentively perusing the files of the Macedonian and Magazine, would fail to discover the real points at issue between the deputation and the missionaries who differed from them. The general impression conveyed by the publications of the executive is that they regard the preaching of the gospel as more important than schools or the operations of the press, and that it was to bring the practice of the missionaries into accordance with this principle, that the deputation were sent out. This is distinctly asserted by the Home Secretary in his remarks already quoted, and is brought to

32
view in a variety of forms in the papers on the Work of the Deputation. One or two quotations will suffice.

"The deputation availed themselves of every means within their reach to learn precisely in what way and to what extent the missionary work in Burmah should be modified, so as to secure to the preaching of the gospel its rightful position and effectiveness, and to other agencies a just subserviency to it."

"1. With respect to securing to the work of preaching its rightful position and effectiveness, the ground was taken by the deputation, and in the end concurred in by most of the missionaries, that every ordained missionary should give himself to this work during the whole of every dry season, and at other times to the extent of his ability; that his connection with auxiliary 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 tongues in which they were born,' and, as far as practicable, in *zayats*, the places of common resort."—*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 desirous to give it 'the widest scope,' advocated and pursued measures providing 'that every ordained missionary during the whole of every dry season, and at other times to the extent of his ability,' should preach directly to the heathen in the tongues in which they were born."

Magazine, May, 1855.

The intimation, conveyed in these papers, that missionaries, or at least *some* of them, do *not* consider preaching the gospel of more importance than schools and other auxiliary agencies, is a most grievous injustice. Yourself

33
and colleague well know that not a single member of the Maulmain Convention ever advanced an opinion of this kind. You cannot have forgotten that when charged with such opinions, members of the convention arose and repelled the insinuation. *Not one* of our missionaries has ever placed schools above the preaching of the gospel; and yet this stigma upon our labors has been stereotyped and re-echoed through the land. The ears of American Christians "tingle;" ministers at home send out affectionate remonstrances to their missionary brethren, warning them against *substituting schools for preaching the gospel*; missionaries in Germany, Siam, and China are amazed that their brethren in Burmah should hold views on this point different from the deputation; and the official publications teem with testimony, against the supposed heresy, from every quarter of the globe.

It is true that the statements put forth by the executives are guarded, and in some instances concessions 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 "regarding 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 evangelization*, but that there were wide differences of views both as to what should be considered as embraced within our Lord's commission to preach the gospel, and the relative importance of co-operating agencies."

In the supplementary paper, presented March, 1855, the charge is still further limited:

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

34
Dr. Williams' report on the same paper is yet more explicit:

"All are united in allowing that the example and law of Christ, the great fountain of wisdom, and the centre of all power in heaven and earth, have made preaching—the oral utterance of his gospel—the foremost instrumentality for the conversion of the world."

The following admission was made by Dr. Granger, at the special meeting in New York, as reported in the Macedonian:

"He must, in justice to his brethren who differed from the deputation on some points, say that *they* did not approve of such schools as the India press and Dr. Duff advocate."

If, then, the missionaries who were opposed to the deputation, did regard preaching as the *prime agency* in converting the world; if they were *all united* in holding that oral preaching was the *foremost instrumentality*; if they did *not approve* of so extended a system as that of Dr. Duff; what was the difference between them and the deputation? That those missionaries who were *most* dissatisfied with the deputation should have held those very principles which it is asserted the deputation were sent out to advocate, is somewhat remarkable. No wonder the friends of missions are perplexed, when they hear that "all are united" in regarding oral preaching as the "foremost instrumentality;" after having been told, the year previous, that the work which the deputation had effected, was "to place preaching before teaching and book-making;" a work "which the board could not do, because the missionaries refused to comply."

I remain, yours very respectfully,

NATHAN BROWN.

May 21
LETTERSON THE MANAGEMENT OF MISSIONS.

35
TO THE REV. S. PECK, D. D., COR. SEC. OF THE AM.

BAP. MISSIONARY UNION.

LETTER 6.

Rev. and Dear Sir:

I return to the question, What was the real point of difference between the deputation and the missionaries? This question, I believe, can be answered definitely and satisfactorily, notwithstanding the false issues that have been raised, and the confusion thrown over the whole subject, by the manner in which the peculiar theory of the deputation has been interwoven with principles known and acknowledged by all, but of which the deputation claim to be the especial advocates. The following extracts exhibit traces of the new theory. Those passages which correspond with the peculiar views urged by the deputation, I have given in italics, to distinguish them from those held in common with the missionaries.

"The two elementary principles which seem to have had decisive control over" the deputation, "were, first, that '*schools are not a wise or scripturally appointed agency for propagating Christianity among a heathen people; that they are not the scriptural mode of evangelization*;' secondly, that, whatever be their value, it is subordinate to that of preaching the gospel to the adult population; that they are in no respect to be regarded as a substitute for, or a mode of preaching; and that the measure of demand for them is in proportion to the success which attends the preaching of the gospel."—*Work of Dep.*, p. 238.

"The second exception, having respect to village schools among the heathen, designed for children of both sexes, was taken on the ground that if a mission school education was an approved mode of evangelization, its adoption should not be limited by the phrase "to no great extent;" and if such education was not an approved mode of evangelization, but designed for Christians and their families, it

36
was doubtful whether it should be prosecuted to any extent among the heathen."

Work of Dep., p. 237.

"If the school teaching 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 divinely appointed missionary labor."

Wayland's Report, May, 1854.

These extracts furnish a partial view of the operation of a principle, extended by the deputation to all the departments of missionary labor. In order to bring out this principle more fully, I will transcribe a few passages from manuscript notes, taken down at the time of our discussions in the Maulmain 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 *preach* was specific, yet that the commission recorded in Matthew, *did* allow other modes besides preaching. I expressed my gratification to hear this admission; but Mr. Granger arose and offered an explanation, showing that I had misapprehended your position. In this explanation you expressed your entire concurrence.

"Mr. GRANGER explains the statement of Dr. Peck in regard to the great commission. It was not that the great commission in Matthew was different in signification from that in Mark; the word *preach* in Mark defined and limited the term *disciple* used in Matthew; it shewed how this discipling of all nations was to be accomplished, viz: by preaching. Matthew indicates the *end* to be accomplished; Mark the *means*. And *after* they are disciplined, then comes the teaching, which includes tracts, schools, &c., so far as they come at all. The executive committee do not wish to impose any new ideas, only to guard against such a perversion as has prevailed in India."

37
"Mr. STEVENS takes the commission in Matthew on the broad platform. The second form, used in Mark, is not intended to contract 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 communication 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 proclaim the word only through an interpreter, the commission calls upon him to do it in that way. He has as much liberty to stand upon the broad platform of Matthew as any brother has to call him down from that platform to the narrower one of oral preaching. In regard to the original word *kerusso*, translated preach, its first meaning is to make proclamation. This was usually accompanied by a written decree. It was sometimes done by posting up the decree or proclamation. The noun *kerugma* also sometimes means an edict."

"Mr. GRANGER. *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 *preach*; and that is the only way indicated by the commission. In regard to *kerusso*, it was well known that it meant to proclaim by word of mouth, in classic Greek. In the New Testament it meant to proclaim or declare the gospel. *Kerugma*, in every instance where it was used, meant proclamation, exhortation, preaching.

"*Coming down—being cramped*—he had heard these things at home, he did not expect to hear them here. *Cramping them?* Shall we say, because Christ tells us to preach, that we won't be cramped?"

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

38
"Dr. PECK claims the privilege of speaking very deliberately, as he has not had time to arrange his thoughts. He came out to India with his mind free; he came with the idea that the question of schools as a means of evangelization was an open question. He has since arriving tried to obtain all the information in his power bearing on this question. He considers that the commission authorizes 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 disciple all nations, Christ meant that preaching should be the means. He says *preach*, and a man who leaves preaching for any other means, *comes down*. There may be good reasons for coming down, but it is coming down. He does not think a preacher should turn aside from preaching till he has as clear a call to do so as he had to preach in the first place. But, granting this, has a man appointed to do a certain work by his employers 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 is at liberty to turn aside from 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 not of right, but of practical expediency, he might verge towards those who to a limited extent advocate these schools. He feels embarrassed by the course of those who advocate them as a means of evangelization."

It is not my purpose, in making this quotation to remark on the injustice done to missionaries by these severe 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; not even

39
in regard to the Scotch missionaries, who were not sent out as preachers, but for the express purpose of teaching. My only object now is, to show what was the point in dispute between the deputation and their own missionaries. As we learn from the Macedonian, in an article to which I have already referred, that the American Board have adopted the same principles of missionary labor as our own, it may not be amiss to quote, in this connection, a passage from the special report presented by the prudential committee at their meeting in Hartford, in 1854.

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

20
We have now a distinct view of the point at issue between the deputation and the "three or four" missionaries whom they represent as opposing their measures. The difference was not in regard to the comparative importance 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 Maulmain Convention 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 prudential committee of the American Board. The doctrine advocated is, that the commission in Matthew is no broader than the one in Mark; that neither of these authorizes any other means of evangelization than oral preaching; but that *after* individuals are evangelized, schools and other agencies are to be used for instructing them in "all things commanded."

40 (use this) Part II
Here, then, we are at issue. You regard the command, "Preach the gospel," as the missionary's specific warrant. You deny that his appointed work extends beyond the limits of oral preaching, so far as the heathen are concerned. Others are of a different opinion. Others take the broad commission, "Go, teach all nations," as the appropriate, special direction, in accordance with which they are to labor for the conversion of the heathen. I am one of those who embrace this view. I do not regard the commissions in Matthew and Mark as being, in all respects, identical. I consider the commission in Mark as having especial reference to the apostles; that in Matthew as being more particularly designed for the whole church, in every age and clime.

Schools & Press
In the first place, 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 at or near Jerusalem. Robinson, 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 subsequent to the meeting in Galilee, and shortly before the ascension. Robinson is probably correct, but the question is not material. Along with this commission were given those miraculous powers exercised by the apostles and their immediate followers. In addressing the twelve apostles, the specially appointed preachers or heralds of the gospel, it was natural that our Lord should employ terms corresponding to their official calling, and hence he uses the word *herald*, 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 his numerous followers could most easily assemble; and this was no doubt the occasion on which he met "above five hundred brethren at once." Here

41
he gave the special commission under which his disciples, generally, were to labor for the conversion of their fellow-men to the end of time. He now conferred no miraculous powers or gifts of healing; he addressed his disciples without any distinction of office, as preachers or otherwise; he used a term of universal application—*teach, make disciples*; a term broad enough to include all the energies 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 alway, even unto the end of the world."

W
Such is the commission under which we act; who shall restrict for us that which Christ has left broad and expansive as the wants of humanity? We hold, and have ever held, that oral preaching is the readiest, 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 unscriptural and unauthorized, we protest against

the doctrine as an innovation unsanctioned by the New Testament.

The Gospel
Even if we had nothing beyond the command in Mark, to preach, or rather, to *proclaim the gospel as heralds*, still we should consider that the spirit and intent of the precept fully justified us in using schools and other kindred agencies, not merely for enlightening converts, but for evangelizing the heathen.

I remain, yours very respectfully,

NATHAN BROWN.

42 June 4

LETTERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF MISSIONS.

TO THE REV. S. PECK, D. D., COR. SEC. OF THE AM.

BAP. MISSIONARY UNION.

LETTER 7.

Rev. and Dear Sir:

I have shown in the preceding letter that the restriction of Christ's commission to a single mode of evangelization, was the real point of difference between the deputation and the missionaries. We have seen that the effort to shift the ground of dispute, by charging the missionaries with exalting schools above preaching, is confuted by admissions of the deputation and by official documents. But an endeavor is made to show that the charge is substantially true, by asserting that missionaries, while admitting the pre-eminence of "preaching," do not use that term in its ordinary acceptance; that although they acknowledge preaching to be the prime agency, they yet maintain that the work of "school teaching, book-making," &c, is "preaching." I will first insert the statements of the deputation, and then inquire how far they are sustained by facts.

"The Foreign Secretary rose to correct some misapprehensions as to the work of the deputation. He confessed that he had found himself much older than he had supposed himself. He had entertained and acted upon no views of missionary duty that were not universally entertained forty years ago. The deputation had introduced into the missions nothing new, but had merely removed certain innovations, and sought to bring the missions into the old paths. He found on getting abroad that there was an ambiguity in the use of language; the words *preach* and *teach* were used in diverse senses. In the first years of the Karen mission, the missionaries went into the jungle in the dry season and preached and taught the people. In the rainy season the people came to the missionary, parents and children, when the same work was

45

done. These gatherings were called *schools*, but were in fact congregations. More lately, other and different schools had been established. A similar verbal duplicity existed in the word *preach*.—*Macedonian*, June 1854.

"While all concurred in the pre-eminence of preaching, some maintained that to make books, to distribute Scriptures and tracts, or to teach a school, was to preach the gospel.—*Macedonian*, July 1854.

"It was the conviction of the deputation, and in the end, of most of the missionaries, that the use of these agencies was not preaching the gospel." *Work of the Deputation*, p. 231.

We shall, by and by, cease to regard anything as extraordinary. Here is a large convention of missionaries, with the chosen representatives of the Executive Committee, gravely discussing the question, whether making books, is preaching? whether distributing Scriptures and tracts is preaching? whether teaching school is preaching? And after long discussion, a majority of the missionaries, but *not all*, fell in with the views of the deputation, and became persuaded that such a use of terms was not correct. Allow me to ask, who, of all the members of the convention, has rendered himself liable to this charge of "verbal duplicity?" Who of them was it, that maintained the identity of school-teaching and preaching? Was it Br. Stevens? His remarks above quoted show the contrary. Was it Br. Haswell, or myself? We both distinctly repudiated any such use of terms. Br. Haswell remarked as follows:

"He never calls anything *preaching*, but declaring the gospel orally. Yet he understands the great commission to mean publishing the Gospel in every possible way. Still, preaching is the great means of doing it, and to this he cheerfully devotes his life."

It is true the opinion was maintained that to communicate gospel truth, whether by the press, the pen or schools, was *obeying our Lord's commission*, as in the remarks of Bro.

46
Stevens: but I have yet to learn that any missionary of the Union has ever applied the term *preaching* to schools, book-making or translating. It was also maintained that the gospel *might* be preached in a school, as well as in a *zayat*, or by the wayside; but certainly this is not saying that school teaching is preaching.

Persons at home may have used the term preach in an improper manner; and I am not sure that you yourself might not, to some minds, appear chargeable with the same confusion of terms which you attribute to missionaries. I find the following paragraphs in the instructions drawn up by yourself on the designation of Mr. Stoddard to the Nowgong Orphan Institution, and published in the Magazine of Jan. 1848. You here say that "preaching among the heathen is emphatically and pre-eminently *teaching*," and that "*teaching* is one of the most efficacious forms of *preaching*;" that "the religious teacher *preaches*," and that "the *preacher* must in effect, if not in form, act as *teacher*." I would by no means intimate that your language, on a fair construction, is liable to objection; but if it had been uttered by missionaries, how quickly would it have been seized upon as an evidence that they had imbibed erroneous notions in regard to the missionary work.

"Much has been said, abroad and at home, of the *relative* importance of preaching and teaching; and many excellent hearts have been troubled lest in the founding and multiplying of schools, the great work of evangelizing should be departed from, and ministers, called to the apostleship of the gospel, 'should leave the Word of God and serve tables.' This solicitude, highly commendable in itself, has partly arisen, doubtless, from a misconception of what preaching or teaching is, in missions among the heathen; transferring to those terms *there* the meaning which they bear *here*. But preaching among the heathen is emphatically and pre-eminently *teaching*; it is instilling knowledge, elementary religious truth, drop by drop, into minds with difficulty and by patient

47
skill laid open to receive it. It is, at first, disciplining these minds, teaching them to think, distinguish and reason, and furnishing them with new means and facilities for right acquisition and impression; and then communicating and iterating this elementary truth, even as they are able to bear it. And *teaching*, at least as it is conducted among the missions of our own connection, is one of the most effective forms of *preaching*, if by preaching we mean so to exhibit truth as to 'make wise unto salvation.' The whole history of our mission schools is a blessed exemplification of this.— They have been signally nurseries of piety, and, in its noblest sense, of sound learning.— The Word of God has dwelt in them richly, and the Spirit of God has quickened the Word with a regenerating and sanctifying power."

"A principal hindrance to the saving operation of divine truth, whether in Christian or heathen lands, consists in the things which prevent its ingress into the understanding and the heart, and its abiding there. Give the truth a lodgement and it will, ordinarily, in some form or other, assert its power. The heaven will disclose its presence, if once hid. And hence a primary question with all missionaries is, How reach the understanding and the heart? how deposit the seed of the word, and keep it there, till it germinate and grow? The answer is, Preach the word. As said our Lord, who knew what was in man and how to enlighten, and move, and save man, 'Preach my gospel to every creature.' Publish the glad tidings orally, ~~face to face~~; where eye shall meet eye, and heart heart. Preach in the house and by the way, in the solemn assembly or by the river side, in the chariot or in the prison. And why preach? Because the voice and the eye are God's appointed ministers to reach the understanding and the heart; and because, being so appointed, and adjusted to each other, they are faithful fellow-helpers, and cannot, one or the other, forego their mutual aid without virtual self-despoliation. But does not the religious teacher preach? Does he not with voice, and

Does he not with voice, and eye, and heart, labor to convey to the understandings and hearts of the little group around him the facts and principles of 'the life eternal?' And does

48
he not labor to do this in circumstances most eminently propitious to success? Apart from the heathen world around and all its corrupting abominations, with nothing pandering to the eye or ear that shall clog 'the entrance of the word that giveth light,' or 'catch away' the bountifully scattered seed, he plies his work day after day and week after week, with line upon line and precept upon precept, upon the same understanding and the same hearts,—and those minds and hearts least overrun with noxious weeds, and least scorched and blackened with the raging of heathen lusts—till the waste becomes a garden, and buds and blooms of richest promise and the early ripening fruit begin to appear."

"Substantially the same process, to be successful, must be diligently prosecuted by the *preaching* missionary, though with inferior advantages. His pupils are abroad in the busy haunts of men, worldly, heathen men, and in the midst of sights and sounds unspeakably abhorrent and unimaginably vile. The hear-

ers may be numerous, but of all ages and occupations; and they are ever shifting. He preaches the Gospel, but they are listless; the seed falls by the wayside, or on the rock, or among thorns and thistles. Birds of the air gather it, briars and thorns choke it. He needs to prepare the soil. The preacher must in effect, if not in form, act the teacher. He must call aside the arrested inquirer, must teach him day by day, and gradually upraise his mind from the stupor and feebleness of heathenism by gradually infusing into it, in their simplest elements, the light and power of the Gospel. This is the ordinary method; and if there are exceptions, it is when God in some marvelous measure has already prepared the way before him."

These instructions were given in reference to the Nowgong Orphan Institution, a *boarding school*, the object of which was to *evangelize* heathen children, and train them for usefulness. That school stood on the same foundation when these instructions were given as it did in 1854,

49
when you came to remodel it and exclude the evangelizing element. The Orphan Institution, as well as the girls' boarding schools, was never more "strictly evangelical," never blest with more conversions, than in the period immediately preceding the appointment of the deputation. And yet you seek to invalidate your previous testimony in favor of such schools, by asserting in the Magazine of Feb. 1855, that since the occasion referred to, "the words *teaching* and *preaching* have come to be used in somewhat different acceptations and relations;" that "mission-schools have taken or have *been tending to take* (!) new forms; and that to apply your language to these schools would be to compel it to a service for which it never was designed, and to which it is susceptible only in consequence of the new use of terms!" You will pardon me, dear sir, for expressing my belief that notwithstanding all these alarming transmutations of *teach* and *preach*, the meaning of those two plain, simple words, has not undergone the slightest change, outside of the official publications for the last ten years.

But with yourself, dear sir, there has been a change. It is impossible to maintain your assertion that "the deputation have introduced nothing new." The fact stated in *The Work of the Deputation*, p. 250, in reference to "the changes suggested or made by the deputation in the modes of missionary operation," that "in some respect *those changes are fundamental*," is too obvious to be denied. The rule for abolishing boarding schools, and for restricting the benefits of education to the Christian population, although it may be considered by you as merely an effort to "remove innovations," and "bring the missions into the old paths," will not be so regarded by the public. To the statement that you "had entertained and acted upon no views of missionary duty that were not *universally entertained* forty years ago," I will simply append an extract from one of your speeches in the Maulmain Convention. It bears date April 15.

52
DR. PECK: We are here to settle principles. After this is done it will be comparatively easy to apply them to the different nations and tribes among whom we labor. The subject of schools has been before his mind for many years, and there has been some change in his views. For more than thirty years he had thought more highly of schools as a means of evangelization than he does now. He had his eye on the schools in Ceylon. The Roman Catholic schools attracted his attention, he felt their influence. He thought, too, that we might learn a lesson from them. They had made schools a very efficient instrument; might we not find them equally useful? But he has since thought that it did not follow, that because a scheme or instrumentality was successful in the propagation of error, it would be equally useful in the propagation of truth. He is happy to say also that his fears of Roman Catholic schools have not been realized. He would not follow them in anything. The plan of Boardman, his bosom friend, for boarding schools, served to continue him in his opinions. But his views have since changed. He trusts he is a wiser man. He would present a few statistics illustrating the working of the school system in Ceylon."

Enough, 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 forsaking of "the old paths," it is by those who have sought to introduce "fundamental changes" into our missions.
I remain, yours, very respectfully,
N. BROWN.

From the Christian Times.
LETTERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF MISSIONS.

TO THE REV. S. PECK, D. D., COR. SEC. OF THE AM. BAP. MISSIONARY UNION.

Letter 8.

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 means 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 firmly 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 triumphs by other means than the preaching of it in its simplicity and fullness; but the deputation and a majority of missionaries, claimed for the means prescribed 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 as 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 excellent 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 preparation work consists in infusing 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, idolatry will fall of itself. The Gospel of Christ will then be built on its ruins."

*Rev. M. Bronson.

244 To refute the doctrine enunciated in the latter part of this paragraph, Dr. Wayland proceeds to bring a series of lengthened and formal arguments. I am happy, however, to say that no such doctrine has ever been advocated by any member of the Assam mission. The clause to which exception has been taken should have been quoted with its context:

"In view of all these spectacles, united, tell us what people on the face of the earth present a more powerful opposition to the Gospel than the deluded votaries of Hindooism. In heathen as well as Christian lands, no one sees cause 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 precedes 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 Orphan institution, in reference of 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 public mind," but of removing error from individual minds; 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 commencing the Christian edifice. No one would separate the dislodgement of error and the inculcation of truth, as distinct and independent processes; the two are ever to be conjoined as parts of the same work. Paul followed up his argument against idolatry by preaching Jesus and the resurrection, and missionaries consider it safe to copy his example.

But it is denied that the refutation 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

burden 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 men," 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 one, 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 discoursing or arguing." The exact position of the deputation will appear from a single passage in the debate on that report.

"Mr. GRANGER, while ignorant, practically, of the missionary work, contends that the principle on which the work is to be carried on, may be known unmistakeably from the New Testament ecclesiastical history. Ministers 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 subscribing 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 fullness, 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, conducted on 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

very first of a missionary's duties to commence 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 Maulmain 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 deputation, and was withdrawn at your special request, the report under consideration being recommitted for revision.

Such are the grounds on which missionaries have been charged with "forsaking 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 EXPERIMENT, which in the language of Dr. Williams's report, HAS BEEN INAUGURATED. Lest there should be any doubt as to the manner in which the missionaries in Burmah regard these assaults upon themselves and their labors, I quote a few extracts from their published letters. The following is from Mr. Kincaid, dated Prome, Sept. 20, 1854:

"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 astounding to Bro. Simons and me. How they may strike brethren in the several missions in Burmah, and the old provinces, I do not know; but it seems to me they must be more than men or less than men, not to feel something like indignation at the state-

ments made by the deputation 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 in the missionaries, and at the same time approve the doings of the deputation. 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 cruelly slandered, and the slander published in an official paper, to be seen and read by all men over the Christian world, and thus 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 painfully impressed with this fact. Every man that is now preaching, was preaching before the deputation came to Burmah. 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 deputation's coming has wrought no change in this direction. In the very nature of things, no rules, regulations, trammels 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 thunders 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 accused of being no friend to *preaching*, and some of our most distinguished pastors were obliged to defend themselves from the charge of heresy. How was it possible to work up such a feeling in America? When some of the most eminent ministers had to stand forth and defend themselves as true and orthodox, how can missionaries on this side of the globe ever

hope to redeem their character as ministers of the Gospel? What a pity there had not been an honest bold man in Philadelphia, who knew the facts, to get up in the Assembly and tell the simple truth, that there was but one single school in all our missions in Burmah taught by a missionary, and that he had acted under authority from Boston. Some years ago two other missionaries had schools for a time as a small part of their work."

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

"Every one, and all of us, have held, and do still hold, and that most strongly too, that preaching the Gospel is the first and foremost work of the minister of Jesus Christ, whether in Christian or heathen lands. Hence it grieves 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, mourning over this heresy as much as though it were an *established* though lamentable fact."

The Foreign Secretary said, "the deputation 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 pre-requisite for admission into our mission schools, is something that I am quite sure no Karen 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 years of the Karen mission, he said 'more lately others and different schools had been established.' Not school, but in the plural schools. Now the only single instance of the kind I know of in the whole Karen mission, is that of the Normal school in Maulmain, which received the unqualified support of the Executive Com-

mittee, for some eight years, and bid fair to be one of the most useful schools which has ever been known among the Karens."

In his review of the work of the Deputation, as described in the July number of the *Macedonian*, Bro. Brayton says: "As it is called '*the work of the Deputation*,' and as it is the only description of that work which we have seen officially published, we take it for granted that the work thus described is '*the needed work*,' which missionaries could not do because they are men, and hence the need of the deputation. Let us then examine in detail that very important work."

"First, then, the general principle laid down. It was their leading object to advocate 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 deputation 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 unmoved and unshaken even to the present day."

"It is well known that Br. Judson was the first on the list of American missionaries to Burmah; and that he distinctly held 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 simple historical fact, that every single missionary, from Bro. Judson to the present time, has held and carried out the above principle just as sincerely and practically as did Brother Judson himself. We also believe it to be a simple fact that he was quite as strong an advocate and firm supporter of

schools, as any other brother 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 brother who spent several years in teaching, it was by the urgent request of Bro. Judson, (contrary to the brother's own conviction and strong opposition of several brethren,) that he was induced to commence the school, and Bro. Judson was the continued and main supporter of the school. These are simple historical facts. Now after missionaries have spent some forty years in carrying out the very principle there laid down, we ask a candid public to decide whether the 'advocating of such measures' can be legitimately called a part of that *needed work*, that required a deputation to be sent off in such haste 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 practised a different

doctrine, and thus a foul stigma is fastened upon our missions and missionaries.

"It was provided: 1. That every ordained missionary give himself to preaching during the whole of each dry season, when alone it is possible to traverse the jungles, 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 scoffer had intended to write a burlesque on our mission. 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 salvation should be constantly proclaimed to the heathen in their native tongues. Can it be possible! Really, we are almost disposed to doubt the correctness of our own vision. Do we actually see it published in the official organ of our Executive Committee, that they sent out a deputation to Burmah in 1853, to

'provide that the way to salvation should be consistently proclaimed to the heathen *in their native tongues?*' 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 those missionaries have been doing these forty years past? We certainly supposed they had been preaching to the heathen in their own tongues; 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, can the first single instance, in the whole history of our Burmese and Karen missions, be pointed out, where an individual has ever made an attempt to preach to the heathen in any other than their own tongues? 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 respectively,

N. BROWN.

LETTERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF MISSIONS.

TO THE REV. S. PECK, D. D., COR. SEC. OF THE AM. BAP. MISSIONARY UNION.

Letter 9.

Rev. and Dear Sir :

A FEW days since my eye chanced to light on the following passage in one of our popular magazines, 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 pursuance of a system. We have constantly 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 anticipations 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 here they have their limitations. Their application to religion, and especially to the duties of the Gospel ministry, needs to be guarded with more 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 cold, 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 majorities obtained, ostensibly for the purpose of preserving the principles and practices of a pure Gospel ; but, in reality, as the end has proved, to coerce 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 councils fail to produce these bitter fruits, the friends of Zion will

have cause for thankfulness ; but certainly the commencement of their career 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 moneys 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 subserve either the peace or the prosperity of the cause.

Had the Maulmain convention been allowed to meet simply as a conference, for mutual consultation, encouragement, 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 nowise 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 practical question involving expenditure or otherwise affecting the interests of a particu-

lar mission; 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 desirableness of perfect unity in all missionary operations conceded, still, if the Executive Committee wished to avail themselves of the opinions of the missionary body it was evidently important that those opinions should be spontaneous and uncontrolled. To secure an unwilling acquiescence in measures which the missionaries did not heartily approve, could be of no service to the executives, unless their object was to relieve themselves of responsibility in making the desired changes. The plan adopted by the deputation 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 deputation desired a decision were indicated to the committees; 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 recommitted, to receive such abridgment or alteration as should render them, if possible, acceptable to the deputation. Thus the convention, while refusing to *insert* anything contrary to their own convictions, did not hesitate to *omit*, as 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 deputation 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 deputation exercised no preponderating influence or restraint 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. *Fraternal co-operation and authoritative control*, are terms that can never be made to coalesce. Where one relation commences the other ends. To say that no pressure was exercised upon the convention, is simply to deny that which is patent to the apprehension of every one. The very object of clothing the deputation with the whole power of the Executive Committee, was that they might exert a pressure. If it had not been intended that they should exert a pressure, no such authority would have been given; there could have been no possible object in giving it. Sitting in the convention as the representatives of the Executive Committee, the deputation 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 omit, all resolutions which were in known opposition to the views of the deputation. As the latter possessed the power to set aside whatever they disapproved, the passage of resolutions on disputed points would have been at best a fruitless labor; and it would have exposed the non-compliant members to all the consequences of executive disapprobation. When it is considered that a large majority of that convention were unsettled in regard to their location; that the selection of their future field was under the absolute control of the deputation; that further, all plans for usefulness hung on the approval or disapproval of the same authority; it is impossible that a feeling 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 unremitting severity with which every missionary in Burmah has been visited, whose misfortune it is to be marked on your catalogue as one of the "disaffected." But these cases will form the subject of a future letter.

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 returned 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 Karen English school is dead; we deeply deplore its loss. Our boarding-schools are all cut away and floated off. One boarding school, named the Karen normal school, is to be established. The deputation are not yet through with their work. This is an exceeding dark day in our mission, here, both Burman and Karen. 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 reaction 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 in Burmah. 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.

N. BROWN.

