

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Organization	
	Research Methodology	
2.	BACKGROUND DEVELOPMENTS.....	11
	Formation of the Southern Baptist Convention	
	Baptist Beginnings	
	Baptist Beginnings in America	
	Regular and Separate Baptists in America	
	The Baptist General Missionary Convention (1814)	
	The Southern Baptist Convention (1845)	
	Formative Influences and Trends	
	Antimissionism	
	Major Proponents and Their Ideas	
	Significance of Antimissionism	
	Landmarkism	
	Landmarkism's Prophet: Graves	
	Pendleton and Dayton	
	Landmarkism's Lasting Impact	
	Summary	

3. THE GOSPEL MISSION MOVEMENT (1892-1910).....54

Contemporary Milieu of the Gospel Mission Movement

Protestant Missions in China

Missionary Motivation

Southern Baptists in China

The Landmark Challenge

Crawford and Landmarkism

Historical Development of Gospel Missionism's Core Values

Tarleton Perry and Martha Foster Crawford in China

Gospel Missionism's Core Values

Shanghai Period: 1852-1863

Teng Chow Period: 1863-1892

1863-1869

1870-1879

1880-1889

Taianfu Period: 1894-1909

1890-1899

Herring's Resignation

Bostick's Board Battles

1900-1909

Summary Interpretation of The Gospel Mission's Core Values

Use of Paradigm Theory

Enlightenment, Postmodern, and Gospel Mission Values
Compared: Indigeneity

Enlightenment, Postmodern, and Gospel Mission Values
Compared: Incarnation

Enlightenment, Postmodern, and Gospel Mission Values
Compared: Responsible Independence

4. GOSPEL MISSIONISM'S LINGERING LEGACY AND
POST-MODERN TRENDS IN THE SBC'S FOREIGN MISSION
BOARD (1910-1997).....152

Introduction

Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board Values
and Practices (1910-1945)

Herring Sounds Retreat

The Subsidy System Continued

A New Generation Emerges

Old Paradigm Lost (1945-1986)

M. Theron Rankin Era: 1945-1953

Baker James Cauthen Era: 1954-1979

New Paradigm Gained (1986-1997)

R. Keith Parks Era (1980-1992)

Jerry A. Rankin Era (1993-1997)

5. CONCLUSION.....197

Summary

Conclusion

Appendix

A.	Tarleton Perry & Martha Foster Crawford: Chronology of Pertinent Events.....	206
B.	Shantung Mission.....	208
C.	Gospel Missionism's Core Values Comparison Chart.....	210
D.	Stages of Church Planting: Typical Missionary and Chinese Independent Methods Compared.....	213
E.	CSI Vision and Principles July 1995.....	214
	Selected Bibliography.....	216

Gospel Missionism (1892-1910) And The Southern Baptist
Convention (USA): Prelude To A Post-Modern Missiology

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

After over fifty years of experience in connection and out of connection with the system, I would advise our young ministers to avoid putting their necks in its halter, but to serve the churches as such and in so doing retain their precious freedom, manhood and self-respect.¹

Near the end of his life, Tarleton Perry Crawford (1821-1902) attempted to set forth the driving ideals that guided him through his missionary career, emphasizing the need for an autonomous direction to the work of missionaries and the churches they represent. At the time Crawford defended his missiological opinions, few could predict that some of his concepts would eventually capture the imagination of future Southern Baptist mission leaders and actually issue forth in policy revisions within the Foreign Mission Board's standard operating procedures that reflected his influence, and may have

¹T. P. Crawford, Evolution in My Mission Views or Growth of Gospel Mission Principles in My Own Mind, ed. by J. A. Scarboro, (Fulton, KY: Scarboro 1903), 150.

been an incipient post-modern missiological model.² Crawford's ideas did, nevertheless, stimulate one of the most provocative controversies in Southern Baptist mission circles. To some of his contemporaries, his missiological convictions threatened the established operation of the Foreign Mission Board. Crises increased and Crawford, along with others, finally formed a competitive organization in 1892 which became known as the Gospel Mission Movement, or simply as Gospel Missionism.³ Crawford's ideas challenged the Southern Baptist Convention's fledgling identity. Gospel Missionism was not the first movement to pose such an affront, however. Indeed, the

²The term "Foreign Mission Board" refers to the officially sanctioned mission sending agency of the Southern Baptist Convention (USA). For a description of how Crawford's ideas, as formalized in the movement associated with his name, eventually impacted the Board's actions in this century, see Michael E. Whelchel, "Gospel Missionism (1892-1910) and Its Effects Upon the Policies of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention" (Th.M. thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982), 86-92.

³See descriptions of Gospel Missionism in Robert A. Baker, The Southern Baptist Convention and Its People 1607-1972, (Nashville: Broadman, 1974), 278-280; Norman Wade Cox and Judson Boyce Allen, eds. Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists (Nashville: Broadman, 1958), s.v. "Gospel Missionism," by John F. Gibson; William R. Estep, Whole Gospel Whole World: The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention 1845-1995, (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), 139-144; Jesse C. Fletcher, The Southern Baptist Convention: A Sesquicentennial History, (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), 101-102; and H. Leon McBeth. The Baptist Heritage (Nashville: Broadman, 1987), 416, 453.

Convention was born of conflict. In 1845, the Convention emerged in the midst of broader social controversies over slavery. The struggle which prompted formation of the Convention was a reflection of the horrific sectional strife embedded deep within the soul of a nation that was on the brink of erupting into full blown civil war. Existing divisions between abolitionists, emancipationists, and segregationists in the social fabric of the United States, were also evident within the young Baptist Union in America.⁴ Sectional strife over the right of individual states to determine their own course, especially in regard to the issues surrounding slavery, influenced Baptists and formed the basis for Baptists in the South to separate from the Baptist Union in 1845. The break finally came when this clash of values directly threatened the *raison d'être* of the Baptist Union, "... problems related to the appointment and deployment of missionaries constrained Baptists in the South to develop their own denominational

⁴Until May, 1814 Baptist churches in America related to each other through local associational ties. With the prompting of America's first missionaries, Adoniram Judson and Luther Rice, after they transitioned into Baptist ranks, "a convention was called by mutual agreement of Baptist Associations throughout the country . . . to create a national missionary society [named] 'The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States for Foreign Missions'. The founding principle around which a Baptist Union in America formed was the collective use of means to propagate the gospel." Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists, 3rd ed., (Valley Forge: Judson, 1963), 249-250.

structures. Denominationalism, missions, and the heat of sectionalism were birthing a new connection . . . on Thursday, May 8, 1845."⁵

The formation of a new Convention may have settled some of the controversies among Baptists in America, but others carried over into the life of the new organization. At the dawn of the nineteenth century, proponents of a movement among frontier Baptists known as "antimissionism" contested the formation of any kind of centralized mission sending agency among Baptists, largely because of their peculiar form of "hyper-Calvinism."⁶ At the birth of the new Convention in the South, the issues along the frontiers were anything but settled. Soon another controversial trend, which heralded some of the same ideas

⁵Fletcher, The Southern Baptist Convention, 40-41. Fletcher notes that Baptists in the South, pressured by abolitionist influences among Baptists in the North, motivated Georgia Baptists when they, ". . . challenged the Home Mission Society with a slaveholding candidate. When the Society's board rejected the candidate, Alabama tested the Foreign Mission Society with a direct inquiry."

⁶John Taylor, Alexander Campbell, and Daniel Parker were the primary proponents of the antimission movement along the frontier areas of Kentucky. "Their opposition to Arminian Methodism led them to be extreme in the opposite direction . . . They could find no scriptural justification for missionary societies or any other man-made organizations and feared the power of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions to become a locus for the centralization of authority." Norman Wade Cox and Judson Boyce Allen, eds. Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists (Nashville:Broadman, 1958), s.v. "Antimission Movement," by A. W. Robbins.

regarding central control over local churches, emerged which was even more enduring and, to some extent, actually shaped the institutional character of the Southern Baptist Convention.

J. R. Graves, J. M. Pendleton, and A. C. Dayton were the "triumvirate" of the Landmark movement. Landmarkists challenged the degree to which local churches can or should surrender their responsibility for missions, and authority to engage in gospel activities, to federalized agencies.⁷

Crawford was a son of this heritage and certainly bore the marks of these formative influences. The extent to which he was a true Landmarker, or reflected antimission ideas, is certainly debatable. Historical analyses of the Gospel Mission movement have addressed its foundations and character from the standpoint of its American background influences. Some studies identify aspects of Crawford's field circumstances that, as this treatment indicates, were even more prominent in his ideas than those which flowed from the United States.⁸ Yet, no studies investigate whether the Gospel Mission Movement may have been

⁷Keith E. Eitel, "James Madison Pendleton," in Baptist Theologians, eds. Timothy George and David S. Dockery, (Nashville:Broadman, 1990), 188-204.

⁸For example see Adrian Lamkin, Jr., "The Gospel Mission Movement Within The Southern Baptist Convention" (Ph.D. dissertation, Louisville: The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980).

early evidence of a paradigm shift in the missiological thinking of some field missionaries which conflicted with the status quo of the home sending agency. This study is designed to determine the extent to which Gospel Missionism reflects elements of both enlightenment and post-modern missiological ideals, thereby indicating whether it was indeed a prelude to post-modern tendencies among Southern Baptists and their foreign mission efforts.⁹ This study contributes original insight and is not duplicative of other academic inquiries, since the only prior investigations deal with other issues emerging out of the impact

⁹The criteria used for assessing enlightenment and post-modern tendencies are those developed in David J. Bosch, Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission, American Society of Missiology Series, No. 16 (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1991), 262-367. Bosch indicates that he does draw upon philosophical and theological developments which have formed the social and intellectual milieu in which mission takes place. However, he means something distinct when he employs the term post-modern, "I use it, rather, . . . as a heuristic notion, as a search concept. . . . It is, nevertheless, an awkward term, which I shall later replace with the notion 'ecumenical'." 531. Hence, one of the topics discussed in conjunction with post-modernism is post-denominationalism (see chapter five).

While there is some criticism of Bosch's model, it does provide a balanced description and set of analyses for the major epochs in the history of Christian missions. For a critique of Bosch's use of paradigm theory see Gerald J. Pillay, "Text, Paradigms and Context: An Examination of David Bosch's use of paradigms in the reading of Christian history", in Mission In Creative Tension: A Dialogue with David Bosch, eds. J. N. J. Kritzinger and W. A. Saayman, (Pretoria: S. A. Missiological Society, 1990), 109-123.

of Gospel Missionism.¹⁰ The aim is to glean helpful insights from these historic developments in order to assess present trends of Southern Baptist foreign mission work as the Convention faces the pressures of an increasingly post modern, post-denominational age.

Organization

The specific focus of the hypothesis tested in this thesis requires investigation of background influences that shaped the environment from which Gospel Missionism evolved. Chapter two is a sketch of the historical context in which the movement developed. In this section, the investigation is limited to causative factors which gave rise to the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1845, as well as Anti-missionism and Landmarkism, both schismatic movements that directly influenced the Convention's mission efforts.

Crawford's missiological practices were quite controversial, especially by the end of the nineteenth century.

¹⁰Prior academic research has been done that relates to the Gospel Mission Movement. See Robert Alton James, "A Study of the Life and Contributions of Henry Allen Tupper" (Th.D. dissertation, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989). Lamkin, "The Gospel Mission Movement." and Whelchel, "Gospel Missionism". James discusses Gospel Missionism as a combative issue during Tupper's tenure as the Foreign Mission Board's chief administrator, Lamkin demonstrates that the movement was not exclusively dependent upon Landmarkism's influences, and Whelchel shows the continuing impact of Gospel Missionism on the policies of the Foreign Mission Board in the early part of the twentieth century.

He, along with several missionaries he influenced, broke from the Convention's Foreign Mission Board and formed an organization known as the Gospel Mission in 1892. Primary evaluation of the letters, diaries, publications, and other writings of Crawford and his cohorts is essential in order to ascertain what convictions led to such cataclysmic action. Chapter three does exactly that yet focuses on the leading figures within the Gospel Mission Movement, Crawford and D. W. Herring (1858-1940). From the primary documents a portrait of the essential convictions and values emerges. Collectively, these values provide the basis for evaluating the missiological paradigm, or categorization, which the evidence indicates best suits the Gospel Mission phenomenon.

When the Gospel Mission movement ceased operations in 1910, its core values and influence were not diminished. Rather, those Gospel Missioners that reentered the Convention's structure carried with them a more mature assessment of those values and embodied them throughout the remainder of their careers. Gospel Missionism had a detectable influence on the Convention's ongoing missiological policies and practices at least to 1945. Now, at the dawn of the twenty first century, the Convention's missiological foci are in the midst of change. Cooperative Services International, a recently established subdivision of the Convention's Foreign Mission Board, embodies these changing core values and reflects missiological practices

similar to those espoused by their Gospel Mission forebears approximately a century earlier. Chapter four documents and itemizes these ongoing influences. It also compares and contrasts these values and influences in light of post-modern and post-denominational characteristics.

Finally, a concluding section draws the themes together and determines the degree to which Gospel Missionism reflects post-modern missiological values. Lessons may be learned through such analysis of both the Gospel Mission and Cooperative Services International phenomena. The Convention's missiological heritage will directly influence its future. Clearer understanding of the past will enlighten and shape the way the Convention does mission in the twenty first century.

Research Methodology

The mode of research is reflected in the assortment of sources consulted. Since the thesis is a critical analysis of Southern Baptist missiological literature, over a specific period, and involves particular motifs and developments, primary documentation of opinions and actions related to each period is of utmost importance. Hence, the bibliography reflects use of primary, secondary, and tertiary records. Primary sources are directly related to the people, organizations, or events which constitute written accounts of the historical periods and themes closely related to the hypothesis. The specific focus of this

thesis does not require a reading knowledge of Mandarin, or any other Chinese dialect, since the primary documents were originally written in English. Secondary sources are those which provide critical interpretative perspectives of the pertinent eras and themes. Tertiary references are items that are helpful in sketching out an understanding of corollary or background people and events which help inform the researcher's assessment of the eras and topics.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND DEVELOPMENTS

Art. II. It shall be the design of this Convention to promote Foreign and Domestic Missions, and other important objects connected with the Redeemer's Kingdom, and to combine for this purpose, such portions of the Baptist denomination in the United States, as may desire a general organization for Christian benevolence, which shall fully respect the independence and equal rights of the Churches.¹

The date was May 1845. The place was Augusta, Georgia in the United States of America. Something radical and controversial was happening among Baptists in America. A gathering of "293 individual 'delegates'"² decided to form a new denominational structure known as the Southern Baptist Convention. The background reasons for their actions are complex, but essential for understanding the Convention's developmental phases and assessing the impact of parallel movements it has spawned. In one sense, the religious institutions simply reflected the broader social spirit of the

¹Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session, Held in the First Baptist Church, Augusta, GA., May 8-12, 1845 (Richmond: Southern Baptist Convention, 1845):3.

²Jesse C. Fletcher, The Southern Baptist Convention: A Sesquicentennial History (Nashville: Broadman, 1994):10.

times that was rife with intense struggle over contrasting sectional aims and goals.

Secular politicians had shaped a young and often fragile national union that the ravages of civil war would test severely in the brief span of fifteen years hence. A catalytic issue that eventually forced a separation between the North and the South was slavery as lived out through debates over states' rights in relation to federalized governmental control. Many religious institutions and denominations had forged fragile unions, and they too became forums for debate over the way Christian values should relate to the cultural issues of the day, including slavery and states' rights.

Those gathered in Augusta that May likely did not realize that they were making historical decisions that would result in the development of an organization that would someday be the largest Protestant denomination in the entire country.³ Little did they know that their unifying missionary purpose would matriculate into the largest evangelistic organ in the United States.⁴ Such growth has come in spite of (and perhaps because of) many challenges, crises, and near calamities, any of which could have devastated the new organization. Yet, the root

³David B. Barrett, ed., World Christian Encyclopedia: A Comparative Study of Churches and Religions in the Modern World AD 1900-2000 (Nairobi: Oxford University, 1982):720-725.

⁴Siewert, John A. and John A. Kenyon, ed., Mission Handbook: USA/Canada Christian Ministries Overseas, 15th ed. (Monrovia: MARC, 1993):60.

convictions of those gathered in Augusta have sustained their Convention through a hundred and fifty years. Who are these people called "Southern Baptists" and what drives or motivates their global mission interest? Why did a seemingly insignificant group of Southern Baptist field missionaries in China near the close of the last century⁵ break away from the Convention's Foreign Mission Board, espouse and act upon what their peers deemed to be radical missiological convictions and values, only to eventually collapse as a movement, with the survivors reintegrated into the Convention structure without realizing that they had planted seeds of change that would blossom nearly a century later?⁶

The point of departure for addressing these and related questions is to determine how a folk called Baptist began, specifically in America. One should also assess their missionary nature (which is inherent to the Convention's self identity) as it developed in the midst of reactionary antimission movements. Each theme provides an essential background element for the specific interest of this thesis.

⁵This refers to the Gospel Mission Movement (1892-1910).

⁶See William R. Estep, Whole Gospel Whole World: The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention 1845-1995 (Nashville: Broadman, 1994):352-355 for information on the founding of Cooperative Services International in 1985. In part, this thesis assesses the extent to which Cooperative Services International now embodies many core values earlier espoused in incipient form by their Gospel Mission forebearers.

Formation of the Southern Baptist Convention

Baptist Beginnings

In the wake of the surging influences of the Protestant Reformation, there emerged a people of faith called Baptists. The origin of this confessional body, and its derivatives, is found in the convictions of a little band of believers that fled England to Holland in the early seventeenth century to gain simple religious freedom.⁷ The established church of England legally resisted those that did not conform to established dogma, especially ideas concerning baptism. John Smyth (1554-1612),⁸ a Cambridge educated clergyman, matriculated with the "Master of Arts degree in 1593" only to become an avowed Separatist. His primary point of contention with the Anglican tradition was its insistence on baptizing infants. Smyth is hailed as the founder of a formal Baptist tradition "because he

⁷Glenn E. Hinson, "The Baptist Experience in the United States," Review and Expositor Vol. 79, no. 2 (Spring, 1982): 217-218. Hinson shows that there are three major strands of Baptists that emerged in the seventeenth century, each reacting in some sense to English Puritanism.

⁸First references to significant individuals throughout this chapter have life span dates indicated in parentheses. Unless otherwise noted, the source for such dates is the article entry for the person in The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, 2d ed., (1974), the Concise Dictionary of the Christian World Mission, (1971), or the Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists (Nashville: Broadman, 1958).

adopted 'believers' baptism and formulated to a marked degree Baptist principles. . . ."⁹

Smyth had help leading his band of followers to Amsterdam in 1607, in the person of Thomas Helwys (1550-1616). Helwys was also a committed Separatist following the same general doctrinal convictions as Smyth. Shortly after their arrival in Holland, they met with, and came under the influence of, the "Waterlander Mennonites." They discovered great compatibility between the Mennonites' views and their own religious convictions. In "1608 or early 1609 Smyth . . . became an Anabaptist." Not yet fully willing to become a Mennonite, however, Smyth "baptized himself by affusion, then Helwys, and the rest of his congregation who so desired, a total of about forty persons."¹⁰

Upon deeper reflection, Smyth realized that he was likely a bit hasty in baptizing himself. He sensed the need to link his new set of principles with the historic church and advocated a rustic form of successionism. Thus, he petitioned for formal alliance with the Waterlanders in Amsterdam. The Mennonites ". . . cautiously agreed to accept the group. They did not require a new baptism, however."¹¹ Because of such erratic

⁹Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists, 3rd ed. (Valley Forge: Judson, 1963):33-34.

¹⁰Ibid., 34-35. See also Fletcher, The Southern Baptist, 22.

¹¹Fletcher, The Southern Baptist, 23.



actions, and because he saw differences between the Mennonite affirmations and their own, Helwys led a dissenting group back to England "to bear witness there to their new faith."¹²

Smyth, Helwys, and their little band of followers held a belief regarding the nature of Christian salvation that was peculiar for that period. To them, ". . . salvation was anchored in a doctrine of free grace to all who would receive it, . . ." This position was out of step with other Separatistic contemporaries because Smyth flavored it with Arminian ideas.¹³ Smyth had taught these views. Helwys continued teaching such affirmations even after Smyth and Helwys parted company. Helwys' church, founded upon his return to England, became known as a "general" Baptist church. The term suggests that ". . . they saw the atonement (Christ's saving act) as 'general' and not limited, . . ."¹⁴ Helwys' views

¹²Ibid. and Torbet, A History, 37, notes that this transition led to the founding of the first organized Baptist church "on English soil which dates from 1611 or early in 1612" The differences referred to were regarding the degree to which church state interaction should be limited. The Mennonites were more separatistic in that regard than Helwys' dissenters.

¹³Ibid., 24.

¹⁴Nancy Tatom Ammerman, Baptist Battles: Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention (New Brunswick: Rutgers University, 1990):20-21. Ammerman notes that a contrasting type of Baptist congregation soon emerged that was ". . . more strictly Calvinist in their teaching. Known as Particular Baptists, these posited a God who not only knew who would be redeemed, but limited redemption to those chosen ones." These same ideological distinctions between general and particular views of the atonement surfaced later in American expressions of the Baptist tradition.

attracted attention and he ended up languishing in prison, finally to die in 1616.

Baptist Beginnings In America

The events surrounding the founding of the first Baptist church were played out again barely two decades later when Roger Williams (1604-1683) established the first Baptist church on American soil.¹⁵ In 1631, Williams migrated to Massachusetts escaping from Puritan control over religious ideologies in England only to encounter the same restrictiveness from Salem Puritans. By 1639 the colonial authorities expelled Williams, driving him to a neighboring area that eventually became Providence, Rhode Island. Williams insisted that the new colony be one where ". . . religious liberty was guaranteed . . .," and in ". . . 1639 Williams founded the First Baptist Church in America in Providence."¹⁶

Regular and Separate Baptists in America

General Baptists in England tended to cluster their churches together and engage in joint efforts to offer mutual accountability to one another. This practice emerged out of formal associations of local Baptist churches. Occasionally it

¹⁵Fletcher, The Southern Baptist, 23 and 15.

¹⁶Ammerman, Baptist Battles, 22.

led to "connectionalism," an attachment of collective authority over the local body of believers reducing the autonomy of a specific church.¹⁷

Baptists in America during this era were immigrants and were prone to carry with them the same basic practices of church polity and doctrinal differences that their European counterparts held, namely connectionalism or not in parallel with their respective Arminian or Calvinistic presuppositions regarding the nature of Christian salvation. In the early eighteenth century, yet another divisive but overlapping issue, emerged which was uniquely American, to begin with, and was likely born out of the unusual religious experiences of frontier revivalism.

The Great Awakening, an outburst of renewal, changed Baptist status as markedly as it added to Baptist numbers. . . . Baptists also experienced the split between "new lights" and "old lights," that is, between those who favored and those who opposed revival methods or the use of "means" to effect conversions. In the case of Baptists the groups took the names "Regular" and "Separate" to differentiate the opposing positions.¹⁸

The first association of Baptist churches formed in America was in Philadelphia in 1707. By 1742 this association of churches moved to establish a firmer basis for affiliation and joint ventures, so it "adopted the Second London Confession of 1689 as its doctrinal standard. . . . The slightly revised

¹⁷Fletcher, The Southern Baptist, 29-30.

¹⁸Hinson, "The Baptist Experience in the United States," 221.

confession was called the Philadelphia Confession."¹⁹

Migrants from New England founded the first Baptist church in the southern section of the emerging nation in the last decade of the seventeenth century. This initial church was located in Charleston, South Carolina and was closely aligned with the Philadelphia Baptist association of churches. These southern Calvinistic Baptists characteristically reflected the "regular" style of Christian faith and practice. "Their congregations were warmly evangelical, though somewhat suspicious of the emotional excesses of revivalistic technique. Their worship services were simple but ordered in the traditional Reformed pattern."²⁰ They were also known as "old lights."

In 1755, Shubal Stearns (1706-1771) and Daniel Marshall (1706-1784) founded the first "new light" or "Separate" Baptist church in Sandy Creek, North Carolina. Stearns' groups had

¹⁹James E. Tull, "Theological Issues in The History of Southern Baptist Evangelism," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 22, no. 1 (January, 1987):4. The Confession suggests a decidedly Calvinistic stance. For example, statements concerning the atonement are epitomized by the following, "God did from all eternity decree to justifie [sic] all the Elect, and Christ did in the fulness of time die for their sins, and rise again for their Justification. Nevertheless they are not justified personally untill [sic] the Holy Spirit, doth in due time actually apply Christ unto them." A copy of the Confession, and the revisions made by the churches in Philadelphia, are found in William L. Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith (Valley Forge: Judson, 1969): 241 and 350 respectively; for the above citation see 266.

²⁰Bill J. Leonard, "Southern Baptists and Southern Culture," American Baptist Quarterly Vol. 4, no. 2 (June 1985):205; and Hinson, "Baptist Experience," 221.

distinctive doctrinal affirmations and practices. Their worship practices reflected their theological convictions. A typical service was "bold, [with] enthusiastic preaching, spontaneity in worship, the use of simple gospel hymns, and an increasingly modified Calvinism with greater stress on the role of free will."²¹ Separate Baptists emphasized that there must be a thoroughly evident "conversion experience"²² whereby one would visibly display the presence of the Holy Spirit by both physical and emotional effects. As time passed, the physical effects grew less evident within the movement, but displaying the emotional impact of deep contrition over personal sin still marks many Convention churches that root themselves in this heritage. The early Separate preachers were of an "indigenous ministry," meaning "home grown" or not from the New England area. Most were without much, if any, formal education. This placed them on an equal footing with many of those to whom they preached in those pioneer settings. Ironically, they had a profound respect for the individual's choice in responding to God's appeal, but used a type of "mass psychology . . . to effect a decision."²³ The emphasis on free will eventually led

²¹Leonard, "Southern Baptists," 206.

²²Hinson, "Baptist Experience," 221.

²³William L. Lumpkin, Baptist Foundations in the South: Tracing through the Separates the Influence of the Great Awakening, 1754-1787 (Nashville: Broadman, 1961):150-151.

to such a modified form of Calvinism that it is hardly distinguishable from Arminian convictions. These two traditions, both originally Calvinistic, were to shape the character and demeanor of frontier and urban Baptist lifestyles respectively.

The Baptist General
Missionary Convention (1814)

In the mix and blend of the Separate and Regular Baptist traditions, the idea of missionary activity seems remote. Yet, there were stirrings in England that would prompt the Baptists of America to choose between collective missionary activity or isolationism. William Carey's (1761-1834) "Enquiry" launched what has become known as the Protestant missions movement. Word of the successes and challenges he and his team members experienced spread throughout the English speaking world via various mission publications. In 1806, at Williams College in Massachusetts, a group of students, planning on praying together, sought shelter during a storm and chose to hide under a stack of hay. This informal student conference was eventful in that "What began as a routine prayer meeting turned into a decision service."²⁴ Samuel J. Mills Jr. (1783-1819) became a leading advocate of the Christian duty to be involved in missionary activity. Mills and Adoniram Judson (1788-1850), a colleague he met later at the Andover Theological Seminary,

²⁴Estep, Whole Gospel, 28.

inspired the formation of the first American missionary sending agency. Judson was one of those that led the way and departed for Asia under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (formed in 1812). En route to India, Judson and Luther Rice (1783-1836), an associate sailing in another ship but sent by the same board, both spent their time during the long voyage studying the New Testament focusing on one item that they anticipated would be an issue as they arrived in India to work with Carey. Judson and Rice were Congregationalists while Carey was a Baptist. So the question of adult baptism was logically to be an item of discussion. Both men came to similar conclusions regarding what they perceived to be a biblical mandate for adult baptism based on an informed profession of faith in Christ. Their new convictions, and the corresponding doctrinal differences that existed regarding baptism, led them to conclude that it was unethical for them to continue under the auspices of the board that sent them out. Because of Rice's ill health, he was the logical choice to go back to America "to sever connections properly with the American Board of Commissioners and to secure recognition and support from the Baptists." Judson "was the living link between the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (1812), . . . the Triennial Convention (1814) whose formation

his baptism had inspired, and the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention."²⁵

Judson and Rice spurred the infant Baptist associations in America to hasten their level of associational cooperation. What seemingly more logical and commonly agreeable basis of functional cooperation and interdependency might there be among Baptists than the missionary mandate? Rice's clarion challenge regarding the missionary need issued to the Baptist churches coincided with existing associational level tendency toward collective action among Baptist churches. Formation of a convention showed that local churches had a ground for existence that was as large as the "tasks of evangelization which the kingdom of God required."²⁶ The General Convention's mission activity was different from what had been happening in and through local Baptist churches. It provided a vehicle through which a national union of Baptist churches could function together to fund and promote an agreed upon set of mission projects that otherwise may not have been possible, especially if assets were limited to the resources of individual churches, or even local associations. The first three triennials funded the Judsons in Burma, the outreach efforts of Lott Carey (1780-

²⁵Ibid., 34. Note that the term "The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination" was the same institution as the "Triennial Convention."

²⁶William H. Brackney, "The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination, 1814-1845: An American Metaphor," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 24, no. 3 (July, 1989):13.

1828), the first American Baptist missionary to Africa, and domestic evangelization on the American frontier.²⁷

The vision for and the success of the Triennial, or General Convention, was largely due to Rice's tireless efforts. He traveled by land and water through city and frontier village to preach and teach about the biblical bases for Christian obligation to take the gospel message into the uttermost parts of the world. His speaking tours in the frontier sections of Kentucky, however, prompted an unexpected reaction in that several churches split over whether to support the federalized form of mission administration that Rice advocated. Emergence of the Anti-mission movement among frontier American Baptists, and its impact on Landmarkism, are discussed in a later section of this thesis. For now it is necessary simply to note that "He [Luther Rice] was in Kentucky three or four different times, and succeeded in infusing into his brethren here a considerably [sic] portion of his own Missionary spirit, . . ."²⁸ Certainly development of an institutional foreign mission agency among Baptists in America would have been delayed, if not completely neutralized, without Rice's diligence.

²⁷Ibid., 15-16. Estep says that Lott Carey was a black American Baptist.

²⁸Robert H. Bishop, ed., An Outline of the History of the Church in the State of Kentucky, During a Period of Forty Years: Containing the Memoirs of Rev. David Rice, reprint, 1824 (Cincinnati: Art Guild Reprints, 1968):300.

The Southern Baptist Convention (1845)

In spite of the antimission sentiments that Rice's tours spawned, a strong missionary effort emerged among Baptists in America between 1814 and 1845. What could possibly cause the Triennial Convention to fracture and break apart in only thirty-one years? Missionary causes formed the foci around which the union was formed, and ironically they also shaped the trends that broke it apart. In May of 1845 Baptists in America's southern region met to discuss forming a different sort of organization. There were simmering political issues exacerbated by sectional strife at play among Baptists that caused no small amount of tension. The right of individual states or territories to control their own political affairs came into direct conflict with the federal government's attempt to move away from institutionalized slavery. In some states, mostly in the North and parts of the central West, the idea of banning slavery was popularly accepted. However, in the South, where slave labor provided the driving force for some people's livelihoods, and the region's economic engine, there was resistance. Generally, Southerners wanted each state to be free to decide the issue while Northerners wanted it decided on national levels through federalized government control.²⁹

²⁹See C. Vann Woodward, Origins of the New South 1877-1913, ed. Wendell Holmes and E. Merton Coulter, History of the South Series, Vol. 9 (Shreveport: Louisiana State University, 1971):23-50, for details of the political tensions that divided the young nation. Also, note that the political convictions reflected the

Extremists were active on both sides of the issue, but the rise of the abolitionist movement had direct bearing on formation of the Southern Baptist Convention. In the last few meetings of the Triennial Convention, militant abolitionists pressed to add antislavery criteria to the process of appointing missionaries to its domestic mission society. There were efforts to forestall an impasse, but inevitably it did occur. Those that valued the established organization understood the need to refocus Convention members and delegates on the founding rationale for their union, namely missions. Those that preferred the value of freedom for those held in slavery argued along the lines of the higher moral ground needed to hold the union together, the abolition of slavery within the sphere of their influence. "Since it now became evident to all parties that missionaries who were also slave holders would not be appointed by either the Home Mission Society or the Triennial Convention, a test case was offered by the Georgia Baptist

way Christians interpreted and lived out their faith. ". . . The sectional strife presented a nearly irresistible temptation to express Christianity in terms of a particular region and its principles. . . . [denominational concerns] were increasingly defined in terms of North or South but not both. The intensity of antebellum political debate and then the traumas of the War [American Civil War] itself reinforced regional expressions of the faith." Mark A. Noll, A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992):330. All of this eventually led the Southern Baptist Convention to draw in on itself in the years after the Civil War. It became a "Sect-type" rather than a "Church-type" (exclusive rather than inclusive) sub-culture. Samuel S. Hill, Southern Churches in Crisis (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966):141-144.

Executive Committee in 1844."³⁰ An application from a southern slave owner was not acted on by the Home Mission Society in a last attempt to avoid division. In Alabama, a similar test followed. When pushed for a ruling on whether missionary applicants would be considered equally, even if they owned slaves, the General Convention finally issued a negative decision. Therefore, Southern Baptist leaders called for a consultative session in Augusta, Georgia during May 1845.³¹

Those attending the consultative session grew increasingly convinced that there was a strong consensus for forming a freestanding Baptist organization, consisting of Baptist churches in the South, and were set on reestablishing the original missionary purpose of the Triennial Convention. Since forming their own convention was a radical step, the leaders issued an open letter explaining the rationale for their action addressed "To the Brethren in the United States; to the congregations connected with the respective Churches; and to all candid men." The letter argues for formation of the new Convention because of a breach in the missionary purpose of the former union of Baptists in America. Originally, the Triennial Convention deemed missionaries qualified for service if they reflected Christian piety and were zealous for the cause of Christ throughout the world. The founders noted,

³⁰Estep, Whole Gospel, 54.

³¹Ibid., 53-55.

But an evil hour arrived. Even our humble efforts in the conquest of the world to God excited the accuser of our brethren to cast discord among us; and in the last two Triennial Conventions, slavery and anti-slavery men began to draw off on different sides Were we asked to characterize the conduct of our Northern brethren in one short phrase, we should adopt that of the Apostle. It was 'FORBIDDING US TO SPEAK UNTO THE GENTILES'.³²

Differences over revisions in the criteria for missionary appointment were only part of the whole picture regarding the difficulties between the Northern and Southern churches. Sectional issues loomed largely, as well. There were strong disagreements over definitions and administration of home mission efforts, and whether to have a strong central denominational structure or a loosely connected societal structure.³³ The cluster of issues all merged to create the circumstances for the Convention's beginnings and, to a large extent, decided the developments that followed. Those in

³²Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention May 8-12, 1845:17-18. Emphasis is indicated in the original and has not been added.

³³For discussion of the sectional issues see William Wright Barnes, The Southern Baptist Convention: 1845-1953 (Nashville: Broadman, 1954):98-99 and H. Leon McBeth. "The Broken Unity of 1845: A Reassessment," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 24, no. 3 (July, 1989):24 and 31. Baptists were particularly apprehensive about surrendering a local congregation's authority or responsibility for carrying out the Great Commission to other organizations or entities. Protecting the integrity of the local church's mandated functions became paramount in later developments leading up to the formation of the Gospel Mission Movement. See Robert A. Baker, "Reflection on 'The Southern Baptist Convention and Its People, 1607-1972'," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 9, no. 4 (October, 1974): 226-228 for discussion of the decision to form a central Convention.

Augusta that spring day could hardly envision how the future could, or even might, develop.

Formative Influences and Trends

Northern Christian traditions that formed in America were characteristically socially minded and inclusivistic while Southern religious experience was more exclusive and individualistic.³⁴ Among Baptists in the South, four predominant ecclesiastical patterns reflecting definitive theological traditions emerged. These four traditions are descriptive and not intended to reflect universal church polity in the regions or sectors with which they are associated.

The Charleston Tradition developed first about 1751. It was closely associated with the formation of the First Baptist Church in Charleston, South Carolina. "It was rooted in the Particular Baptists of England, who in turn were rooted in English Calvinistic Puritanism."³⁵ There was a strong sense of ecclesiastical order in the worship experience of these Charlestonian Baptists. They affirmed the need for an educated clergy and ministerial order. A connectional affiliation between the churches that tended to be much more authoritative

³⁴J. Wayne Flynt, "The Impact of Social Factors on Southern Baptist Expansion, 1800-1914," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 17, no. 3 (July, 1982):20-22.

³⁵Walter B. Shurden, "The Southern Baptist Synthesis: Is It Cracking?," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 16, no. 2 (April, 1981):3.

than contrary traditions among Baptists was evident. These were also known as "regular" Baptists.

Secondly, the Sandy Creek Tradition emerged in and around Guilford county in central North Carolina about 1755. These folk were directly influenced by the revivalistic fervor that arose out of the First Great Awakening. New believers proved their conversion experience by changing their lives and conforming to what peers considered biblical standards of morality and piety. The clergy did not choose to become pastors, they were "called" of God and felt it not to be a profession but a divine duty. Sandy Creek Baptists were less concerned about how churches could function together than they were declaring emphatically that Baptist congregations should be ruggedly independent and should work to protect their local church autonomy. "The Separate Baptist concept of connectionalism did not contribute to a later Southern Baptist centralized denominational structure. Rather, you find here some roots of later Landmarkism."³⁶

The Georgia Tradition blended together denominational and sectional ideas. Sectionalistic issues surrounding the larger crises over slavery were at play. Theological differences were minimal between the Northern and Southern Baptists, but attitudes and beliefs about the legitimacy of the slave holding enterprise were hot beds of controversy. A strong desire for

³⁶Ibid., 5.

federalized strength needed some sort of consensus to hold it together. "They forsook the decentralized, societal approach of the North and formed one Convention with two boards, the Domestic and Foreign mission Boards, which were accountable to one Convention."³⁷ Cooperation for missionary activity formed the backbone of this tradition.

Finally, the Tennessee Tradition emerged in near paradox to the Georgia Tradition. J. R. Graves (1820-1893), the most outspoken leader of the Landmark movement, formalized the rugged independent frontier spirit in his style of leadership. "The Tennessee Tradition yielded an ecclesiological identity resulting in a narrow sectarianism. In doing so, however, it overlooked the older and continuing Charleston ecclesiology that affirmed the universal church. However, the Tennessee Tradition gave a sense of pride to nineteenth-century Southern Baptists."³⁸

The first serious challenge to the cooperative missionary efforts of the Southern Baptist Convention came from Graves in 1859. His Landmark ideas contested the legitimacy of a federalized controlling structure.³⁹

³⁷Ibid., 7.

³⁸Ibid., 8.

³⁹See Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session, Held in the First Baptist Church, Richmond, VA., May 6-10, 1859. Richmond: Southern Baptist Convention, 1859:90-96 for actions taken by the Convention in the face of Graves' most serious attack on the Foreign Mission Board. More details of the Landmark ideology will follow.

Antimissionism and Landmarkism emerged out of the same social mix. While the Gospel Mission Movement primarily formed from field circumstances in China, it did bear certain characteristics regarding ecclesiology that made it similar to some features of the Landmark movement. To appreciate the complexities of Gospel Missionism, as perceived within the Convention, one must lay the ground work by first examining Antimissionism and Landmarkism.

Antimissionism⁴⁰

One of Luther Rice's deepest convictions was that Baptists all across America needed to become involved in the unified, and unifying, effort to spread God's kingdom throughout the world. This conclusion is evidenced by the fact that he traveled extensively and dedicated all his energies to speaking on behalf of missions throughout the country. One of the areas where Rice originally found open-minded attitudes about the need for joint missionary activities was in the emerging state of Kentucky. In Rice's first report to the Triennial Convention since its formation, he suggested that frontier Kentucky Baptists gave to the cause of missions "more, it is believed, than has yet been furnished by any other State, except Massachusetts, to the

⁴⁰The reader will note that this movement actually predates the founding of the Southern Baptist Convention. It is placed here to demonstrate that it is linked closely with the later, more influential, Landmark movement that emerged within the Convention.

general fund."⁴¹ What went wrong? Why did the strongest challenge to collective mission administration emerge out of several counties in Kentucky after Rice's first visits to the area?

History reveals a cluster of reasons that help explain this phenomenon. William Warren Sweet, noted American religious historian, identified four categories of causes for the rise of Antimissionism.⁴² Three reflect certain convictions regarding the nature of local churches and their leadership, and the fourth is doctrinal.

Kentucky pioneers usually migrated from Eastern sections of the country like Virginia and North Carolina. As already mentioned, there were separatistic, revivalistic attitudes in that sector of the country. These pioneers took their

⁴¹Luther Rice, "Letter from the Agent of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States, to the Corresponding Secretary of said Board," in Second Annual Report of The Board of Foreign Missions for the United States, (Philadelphia: The Board of Foreign Missions, 1816):71. Rice provided detailed itemization of all his travels and collections made to the Triennial Convention for the support of missions worldwide. The fact that Massachusetts gave more is mitigated by the fact that population density there would outweigh that of Kentucky in the early nineteenth century. Among the frontier states, Kentucky led the way.

⁴²William Warren Sweet, Religion on the American Frontier: The Baptists 1783-1830. A Collection of Source Material (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1931):72-76. See also Robert A. Baker, The Southern Baptist Convention and Its People 1607-1972 (Nashville: Broadman, 1974):150, for two other reasons; namely antagonism toward hostile American Indians by frontier people (since some of Rice's appeal was for domestic missions toward them) and a general malaise of the churches in the frontier areas due to the dying embers of revivalistic fires by the time of Rice's travels.

convictions with them and generally held a suspicious attitude toward any form of centralized controlling authority between churches that might erode the autonomy of those congregations. Rice's appeal was for local churches to entrust to a central fund monies that would go to support missions in far off places where frontier folk could not observe the results of their investments. Therefore, the first reason for the rise of an antimission sentiment in Kentucky was resistance to collective authority.

Additionally, the role of the pastor was not as fully developed in the frontier churches as it was back East. There the clerics were usually well trained and eloquent, having a living from their labors for the church. Yet, in the pioneer areas, hard manual labor was still the norm. Paying a pastor for only church related work was somewhat of a novel idea. The missionaries that Rice said should be supported by the funds raised would, in effect, be hired ministers.

Forming societies to act on the mandate Christ gave to fulfill the Great Commission was also new to these rural folk. The suggestion sent them to the scriptures to seek out precedents. Finding none that they sensed reflected the model Rice had proposed, some of them viewed his appeal to form such societies as unbiblical.

Finally, these westward travelers brought with them a peculiar revivalistic form of Calvinism rooted in their home areas. Kentucky Baptists with an antimissionary spirit viewed

missionary societies, and their logical corollaries like training institutions, as avenues through which Arminian ideals and appeals could flourish. God had foreordained those who should be saved, why would anyone overtly pursue the lost? This was especially true if one believed that communicating the gospel to the lost could be blasphemous, as some Antimission prophets declared.⁴³ In summary then,

Anti-missionism, the opposition to organized missionary activity, divided Baptists during the early 1800's. Among the chief complaints of the anti-mission advocates was that missionary societies were un-Biblical [sic]. They also believed that missionary societies infringed on local church autonomy. This forced Baptists to consider the question of where final religious authority rested, a main question of Landmarkism.⁴⁴

The Antimission movement was one step in the long journey toward defining what it meant to be a Baptist in early America, which was especially pertinent in frontier areas.

Major Proponents and Their Ideas

Luther Rice became the ambassador for the cause of missions, foreign and domestic, of the Triennial Convention. After its formation in 1814, he set out on his sojourns through the various sectors of American Baptist life. John Taylor

⁴³Sweet, Religion, 75-76.

⁴⁴Louis Keith Harper, "The Historical Context for the Rise of Old Landmarkism," (M. A. thesis, Murray State University, 1986):51. Landmarkism reflects concern over issues similar to those of the Antimissioners but emerged later.



(1752-1835)⁴⁵ was early aroused by the presentations Rice made. The following is a record of the impression Rice made on him by his appeals for mission giving.

Though I admired the art of this well-taught Yankee, yet I considered him a modern Tetzal, and that the Pope's old orator of that name was equally innocent with Luther Rice, and his motive about the same. He was to get the money by the sale of indulgences for the use of the Pope and Church. Luther's motive was thro' sophistry and Yankee art, to get money for the Mission, of which he himself was to have a part.⁴⁶

Taylor attributes Rice's motive to self-centeredness and greed by making a play on words using Rice's first name, Luther. He directly compares him to Johann Tetzal (1465-1519), the very one that enraged Martin Luther (1483-1546) some three hundred years earlier with fund raising techniques that were less than scrupulous.

There were two major concepts in Rice's appeals that Taylor militantly contested. First, he strongly disagreed with the idea of a society doing what the churches should be responsible for fulfilling. He feared proliferation of administrative organs outside the church and by that a disintegration of the church's authority. "They begin with missionary societies; . . .

⁴⁵Dates for the three proponents of Antimissionism treated in this section (Taylor, Parker, and Campbell) are given in H. Leon McBeth, A Sourcebook for Baptist Heritage (Nashville: Broadman, 1990):232 and 241.

⁴⁶John Taylor, Thoughts on Missions, n.p., 1819, as cited by Frank M. Masters, A History of Baptists in Kentucky, (Louisville: Kentucky Baptist Historical Society, 1953):193.

. to create more societies of different grades,"47

Secondly, Taylor disliked the fact that Rice "begged" for funds to establish societies and boards that would come under the control of folk outside their purview.⁴⁸

Between 1820 and 1840, Taylor's little pamphlet sowed the seed of discontent among the Baptists in Kentucky, Tennessee, Illinois, and Missouri. He later changed his mind on missions and rescinded his opinions published in 1819.⁴⁹ It was too late, however, because the whirlwind of discontent was making its way throughout the frontier churches. Taylor's ideas were controversial, but other Antimission prophets arose that provided even more radical ideas to the mix and aided in further dividing churches and associations into missionary and antimissionary alignments.⁵⁰

Daniel Parker (1781-1844), lived and worked in the border regions of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky (having migrated there from Tennessee). His opposition to missionary activity

⁴⁷Ibid., 193.

⁴⁸McBeth, A Sourcebook, 233-234.

⁴⁹Sweet, Religion, 67-68.

⁵⁰Ibid., 66-67. Sweet notes that by 1846 there were "about 45,000" antimissionary Baptists mostly in the "frontier" states "where educational facilities were lacking and where the people were out of touch with the usual cultural influences." Since the trend toward collective missionary activities was generated back in New England, the less educated frontier folk perceived it as an unwelcome importation.

was even more pernicious than others in that it was based on a distorted doctrinal assumption regarding God's election of the saved. By 1816 he began preaching that missionary work, and corollary benevolent societies, were not biblically founded because they ran afoul of his belief that became known as "Two-seedism." Historians in Kentucky acknowledge Parker as the founder and the most obnoxious prophet of an antimission spirit in the frontiers of early America.⁵¹

Parker wrote several widely distributed pamphlets and tracts. In 1826 he set forth the essence of his ideas in a booklet entitled Views on the Two Seeds and by that generated such controversy that there was "much dissension among the churches and associations on the frontier."⁵²

His thought resembles that of ancient Manichaeism in that it is based on the assumption that there is a dualistic struggle between light and darkness, good and evil. Parker saw all of humanity as divided into two types of "seed," good and bad. Good seed derives from the offspring of God while Satan is the source of the bad seed. One is predestined to flower after one's own seed type. Therefore, "If the Lord's portion of mankind has been predestined since before creation for heaven

⁵¹Leo Taylor Crismon, ed., Baptists In Kentucky, 1776-1976: A Bicentennial Volume (Middletown, KY: Kentucky Baptist Convention, 1975):13 and William Dudley Nowlin, Kentucky Baptist History: 1770-1922 (Chicago: Baptist Book Concern, 1922):105-106.

⁵²Sweet, Religion, 68-69.

and those begat by the devil for hell-- . . . there is nothing that a man in his feebleness can do to change the situation, and in fact attempting to save the children of the devil would be offensive while saving God's children would be both redundant and foolish."⁵³ Parker built on the text of Genesis 3:15 that describes God's decrees of judgment in the aftermath of the Fall of Adam and Eve. To Parker,

The Serpents [sic] seed here spoken of, I believe to be the Non-elect, which were not created in Adam, the original stock, but were brought into the world as the product of sin, by way of sin, by way of a curse on the woman, who by means of sin, was made susceptible of the seed of the Serpent, through the means of her husband, . . .⁵⁴

Parker presupposed that the two types of seed are none other than God's elect and Satan's nonelect. This became his point of departure for deductions that have no other scriptural support. The logical end of such thinking was that missionary activity was then, and forever will be, pointless.

Having established the theological foundation for rendering missionary activity meaningless, Parker went on to contest boards for pragmatic reasons similar to those of Taylor, namely that such "would usurp the authority Christ gave to his churches . . ." and because "the New Testament gave neither precept nor

⁵³Terry E. Miller. "Otter Creek Church, Indiana; Lonely Bastion of Daniel Parker's 'Two-Seedism'", Foundations Vol. 18, no. 4 (October-December, 1975):362. See also H. Leon McBeth, The Baptist Heritage (Nashville: Broadman, 1987):373-374 for a helpful description of Parker's thought.

⁵⁴Daniel Parker, Views on the Two Seeds, n.p. 1826 as cited in McBeth, A Sourcebook, 235.

example of missionary societies. Hence, all such organizations were to be avoided."⁵⁵ If Taylor provided practical reasons to oppose missions and Parker contributed theological grist for the Antimission mill, then Alexander Campbell (1788-1866) continued the theme by adding ecclesiological definitions that undermined not only missionary activity but the legitimacy of Baptist churches in general.

Campbell firmly held to baptism by immersion as the only scriptural means of administering believers baptism. Upon hearing that his church held to this position, neighboring congregations urged them to join the Redstone Baptist Association in Pennsylvania. Between 1813 and 1830, Campbell was a Baptist. Originally he worked as a teacher, but from 1820 on, he actively engaged a "reforming" ministry chiding the churches for not practicing the faith by keeping to a full and complete reformation. He engaged the debate via every then contemporary media. In essence, ". . . every denominational practice for which he found no scriptural authority, Missionary societies, Bible societies, associations, synods, presbyteries, creeds, confessions, church constitutions, bishops, reverends, doctors of divinity and a multitude of other innovations fell

⁵⁵Harper, "Historical Context," 53. See also H. Leon McBeth, "The Texas Tradition: A Study in Baptist Regionalism (Part I)," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 26, no. 1 (January, 1991):40-41 for details of how Parker migrated to Texas near the end of his life and sowed two-seedism there as well. Some same antimission sentiment resurfaces there at the end of the nineteenth century and may be connected to Parkerism.

under his displeasure. . . ."⁵⁶ It may be said that Campbell's method was not new to Christianity. Certainly the series of adiaphoristic debates since the Protestant Reformation are evidence of that fact.

This "reforming" crusade resulted from a stilted approach to the Bible. Campbell used an extremely literal hermeneutic that led him to condemn any truth in any creedal expressions of the Christian faith, advocate only the necessity of an intellectual assent as the basis of saving faith, and baptism as necessary to complete the process of salvation.⁵⁷ His specific attacks on missionary societies were similar to those of his contemporary Antimissionaries; namely, that such bureaucratic structures were not evident in scripture, expensive, and tended to grow increasingly corrupt over time.⁵⁸

Eventually Campbell was so out of step with most Baptist churches that there had to be a formal parting of the ways. He formed a separate denomination known as the Disciples of Christ in about 1832 with a cadre of followers. His influence was strong in the central and southwestern sections of the country. Numerous churches divided over the issues Campbell raised and no small number of Baptist congregations drifted into his new

⁵⁶Sweet, Religion, 70.

⁵⁷McBeth, A Sourcebook, 378-380.

⁵⁸B. H. Carroll, The Genesis of American Anti-Missionism (Louisville: The Baptist Book Concern, 1902):137-143.

denomination. Even "State bodies felt the influence of the movement. . . ." ⁵⁹

Significance of Antimissionism

The Antimission movement took a heavy toll on Baptist structures throughout the country. The lasting legacy of the movement was not, however, in the initial damage done to the young and developing denomination's sense of identity. Churches and associations departing from fellowship could be replaced by new church planting efforts. Lingering ideas, the residue of resistance to collective missionary efforts took root among some leaders in an emerging generation of Baptists, especially in the young Southern Baptist Convention. Incipient wrangling over ideas very similar to those of the antimissionary trio began to blossom in the late 1850's. N. M. Crawford (1811-1871) ⁶⁰, President of Mercer University in Georgia, wrote a letter to the editor of the Tennessee Baptist state paper in 1858 pinpointing the connection between the Antimission movement and the rising movement known as Landmarkism that was soon to rock the foundations of the Convention. In that letter he stated the following:

⁵⁹Baker, The Southern, 149-150.

⁶⁰No relation to T. P. Crawford who is dealt with extensively in the next chapter and featured so prominently in the founding of the Gospel Mission Movement.

In the split between us and our brethren whom we call 'anti-missionary' there was [sic] right and wrong on both sides. We were right in supporting missions; they were right in maintaining that our mission machinery was unknown to the gospel.⁶¹

The editors of that paper were the "triumvirate" of Landmarkism; J. R. Graves, J. M. Pendleton (1811-1891), and A. C. Dayton (1813-1865). The editors' responses to Crawford's comments show the ideological link between the two movements. Graves wrote the following:

We do not believe [sic] that the Foreign Board has any right to call upon the missionaries that the Churches send to China or Africa, to take a journey to Richmond [headquarters for the Convention's Foreign Mission Board] to be examined touching their experience, call to the ministry, and soundness in the faith. It is a high-handed act, and degrades both the judgment and authority of the Church and Presbytery that ordained him, thus practically declaring itself above both.⁶²

Baptists that dissented from collective missionary efforts laid the groundwork for Landmarkism between 1820 and 1840. Other Baptist leaders drew lines due to sectional differences and

⁶¹N. M. Crawford, "Shall Polygamists be Admitted into the Missionary Churches?," Tennessee Baptist, with an Afterword by Editors J. R. Graves, J. M. Pendleton, and A. C. Dayton, vol. 15 No. 1, September 4, (1858):1.

⁶²Ibid. See the following for further description of the significance of Antimissionism and the emergence of Landmarkism: Barnes, The Southern, 99-100; W. Fred Kendall, A History of the Tennessee Baptist Convention (Brentwood, TN: Executive Board of the Tennessee Baptist Convention, 1974):44-46; and James E. Tull, "A Study of Southern Baptist Landmarkism in the Light of Historical Baptist Ecclesiology" (Ph.D. diss., New York: Columbia University, 1960):430-435.

formed the Southern Baptist Convention in 1845. Landmarkism became a full scale challenge to the whole idea of a Convention from 1859 through till the end of the century. Lingering effects of them all impacted the way the Convention reacted to the Gospel Mission Movement and still shape the Convention's identity even today.

Landmarkism

Buried in the backwoods of the early American frontier, in the midst of religious revivals running throughout the towns and hamlets, was a mix of religious ideologies that were strange to some, especially those that had come from the staid sophisticated halls of New England's finest academic institutions. Rugged individualism blended with little education, bred novel approaches to religion as it encountered the realities of frontier life. Graves, Pendleton, and Dayton, the shapers of Landmark thought, emerged in those frontier sections of Kentucky and Tennessee. They each, in their own way, reflected the rugged spirit of the times drawn from those risky life circumstances. Landmarkism, as much as anything else, was an attempt to show that Baptists were linked to the historic development of the Christian faith. Newcomers on the frontier questioned the authenticity of the Baptist heritage so Graves, and others, felt it their duty to defend Baptist polity and reputation.

Landmark leaders attempted to define the Baptist phenomenon

in reaction to other denominations' truth claims by establishing what they perceived to be the biblical exposition of the true nature, authority, and functions of a New Testament church.⁶³

Antimissionism raised questions regarding the biblical foundations for a federalized, collective method of engaging the missionary challenge. Landmarkism expanded on those questions by focusing attention on the supreme ministerial authority of local churches, especially ministry actions related to carrying out gospel functions prescribed by Christ, the "bridegroom" or "head" of the Church. Analyzing the ideas of those that led Landmarkism helps define the movement itself and aids in understanding its long term impact.

⁶³Tull, "A Study", 257-321, 322-398, and 399-452, respectively. See also Hugh Wamble, "Landmarkism: Doctrinaire Ecclesiology Among Baptists," Church History Vol. 33, no. 4 (December, 1964): 430 for a summary of Landmark emphases. The term "Landmarkism" dates to 1852 and came from a series of articles Pendleton wrote after revival meetings Graves had held at the former's church in Bowling Green, Kentucky. Pendleton questioned whether "pedobaptist" ministers were biblically able to serve as clergy. Graves wanted to use the idea that the church was to reflect established boundaries that were then not being appropriately honored. He titled the booklet that grew out of the articles Pendleton had written, An Old Landmark Reset. Keith E. Eitel, "James Madison Pendleton," in Baptist Theologians, ed. George, Timothy, and David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman, 1990):191.

Landmarkism's Prophet: Graves

Graves is hard to describe. It seems that some admired him, others reviled him. The written evidence reflects both attitudes. He was either a great reformer or destroyer.⁶⁴ What the evidence does show is that he held strong opinions regarding the definitions and functions of a local church that functions according to New Testament standards. On the surface, this may not seem so controversial. Yet, Graves viewed preaching, baptism, and performance of the Lord's Supper as the only normative functions of New Testament churches. Therefore, it seemed logical to conclude that only local congregations rightly comprise the body of Christ. There is then no "universal church." Naturally, questions arose regarding the right methods for doing each of these church acts. With challenges from other types of traditions in the frontier settings, there was need, or so Graves thought, to clarify who could be a worthy candidate for baptism, how it should be done, and by whom it can be rightly administered.⁶⁵

⁶⁴Compare the accounts given by O. L. Hailey, J. R. Graves: Life, Times and Teaching (Nashville: n.p., n.d.) and W. G. Cogar, "Letter Attesting to the Character of J. R. Graves," in A Sourcebook for Baptist Heritage, ed. H. Leon McBeth (Nashville: Broadman, June 18, 1858 [1990]):317. The former portrayed Graves in glowing light while the latter viewed him as a scoundrel.

⁶⁵J. R. Graves, Old Landmarkism: What Is It?, 2nd ed. (Texarkana: Baptist Sunday School Committee, 1880, 1928). See also, James E. Tull, Shapers of Baptist Thought (Macon: Mercer University, 1984):129-151.

Through the publishing organ of The Tennessee Baptist, Graves waged war against all within the Convention that differed from a Landmark ecclesiology. By extrapolating his views of the absolute authority of local churches, he concluded that no organization beyond a simple cluster of local churches could act on behalf of the whole. Therefore, Graves attacked the entire Convention structure by using his potent pen. He marshalled the forces and attended the May 1859 Convention meeting along with Pendleton and Dayton.⁶⁶ Graves forced the issue and focused the brunt of his attack on what he perceived to be the Foreign Mission Board's use of authority rightly belonging to local churches, especially as pertains to regulating the actions of field missionaries.

. . . a full day was given to discussing Graves' objections to the FMB. When the meeting adjourned, he was still not satisfied. Hence he continued the discussion . . . all night long in the mission rooms of the First Baptist Church Richmond. The next day, a committee, appointed the day before, brought a recommendation that retained the board plan but also made provision for handling the finances for any missionary that should be appointed by a local church,

⁶⁶The "Triumvirate" leaders are individually listed in the Convention's proceedings as representing the "General Association of Middle Tennessee and North Alabama." Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session, Held in the First Baptist Church, Richmond, VA., May 6-10, 1859, (Richmond: Southern Baptist Convention, 1859):13.

or churches and associations, provided all necessary funding was supplied by the sending body. This satisfied Graves and saved the FMB from dissolution.⁶⁷

Pendleton and Dayton

Pendleton was likely the most profound thinker in the "Triumvirate." Yet, his thinking, especially after 1862, reflects a more moderate form of Landmarkism that emerged independently from Graves. Pendleton disagreed strongly with Graves' political views and advocated emancipation of slaves. This was not a view widely held in states like Tennessee and Kentucky right in the middle of the American Civil War. Pendleton "moved to the Northern United States" during the war to avoid persecution.⁶⁸

In the years he spent in the North, he wrote extensively articulating a different brand of Landmarkism. Indeed, even Graves later felt compelled to clarify what an "Old Landmarker" was really like and in doing so proved that Pendleton was not one.

Pendleton believed that the only physical church is a local one, but he was willing to admit the existence of a spiritual church. The church in aggregate or universal existed in Pendleton's system because non-Baptists could indeed be regenerated believers.

⁶⁷William R. Estep. "Course-Changing Events in the History of the Foreign Mission Board, SBC, 1845-1994," Baptist History and Heritage 29 (October 1994):6.

⁶⁸Eitel, "Pendleton," 192-193 and 198.

Pendleton could not endorse the idea that the kingdom of God is coexistent with all Baptist churches of all times. He refused to subscribe to the extremes of Baptist successionism and thought that disallowing intercommunion between Baptist churches was trivial.⁶⁹

Dayton died during the Civil War, and contributed some writings that helped shape Landmark views. He was, however, not able to contribute long due to his untimely death. He excelled in writing religious fiction and used this medium to expound Landmark ideas regarding baptism and especially "alien immersion."⁷⁰

Landmarkism's Lasting Impact

Frontier life was rugged and lured individualistic, tenacious folk to take on the hardships of such life in pursuit of happiness. Odd religious emphases caught on among this mostly uneducated people. There arose a need for religious leaders to show connections with historic Christianity. Older, more traditional ecclesiastical bodies brought establishment ideal with them. Leaders of younger religious expressions, especially those claiming a higher degree of authority, developed and articulated what they perceived to be biblical justification for their claims.

Landmarkism inherited the earlier Antimission struggle over appropriate means for doing missionary work that eventually led

⁶⁹Ibid., 198.

⁷⁰Tull, "A Study," 134-135.

to a radical reassessment of church authority for such work. In one sense, Graves was the Landmark movement, although there were other contributors along the way. His ideas provided frontier Baptists with a counter to Campbell's claims of apostolic successionism and exclusive biblical authority. At this point, it is fair to say that Landmarkism was a reactionary movement answering the challenges of Campbellism, and the broader antimission spirit.⁷¹ The immediate effects of Landmarkism, especially Graves' version of it, were an exclusive claim to, and localization of, ecclesiastic authority.⁷² The identity of the Southern Baptist Convention, even to this day, is still affected by these values.

Summary

A people called Baptists emerged out of religious dissent in seventeenth century Britain. Freedom to engage in worship and religious practices that seemed biblically correct was the motivation of Smyth, Helwys, and others who migrated to Holland. Differences of opinion, theological or otherwise, are part and parcel of the Baptist experience as it developed both in Britain and America.

Calvinism, Arminianism, revivalistic, and high church

⁷¹Harper, "Historical Context," 69.

⁷²Keith Harper, "Old Landmarkism: A Historiographical Appraisal," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 25, no. 2 (April, 1990):35-37.

traditions all converged throughout the southern American states during early nationhood. Four major definitions of the emerging Baptist faith paralleled these foundational theological matrices giving birth to a blended set of religious emphases. Sectional political strife, coupled with an expanding frontier life, placed stress on each of these traditions until finally there was a rupture between Baptists in America along southern and northern lines.

Missionary activity, though seriously challenged by frontier antimission attitudes, was the catalytic value around which American Baptists first united with each other, and which gave grounds for their rupture in 1845. Soon after its founding, the fledgling Southern Baptist Convention faced yet another challenge, this time from within by an even stronger force; Landmarkism.

Landmarkism's influence has lingered long after the deaths of its "triumvirate" of leaders and their disciples. Three movements fed off Landmarkism's vitality. Haydenism, in the late nineteenth century, so emphasized local church authority over collective convention authority that the movement caused "the adoption of the view that general bodies are sovereign and autonomous organizations made up of Baptist individuals, not simply gathering of delegates from sovereign churches who

control the constituency."⁷³ After the turn of the century, a segment of Landmarkist churches in Arkansas departed from the Convention and formed a new fellowship based on a purely local church oriented system of representation.⁷⁴

Gospel Missionism is usually identified with the Landmark movement as well. There is no doubt that parallels regarding local church authority are evident at specific times between Landmarkist ideology and that espoused by T. P. Crawford, particularly in his little pamphlet entitled Churches to the Front!⁷⁵ However, it is not necessarily true that Crawford's Gospel Mission Movement was a direct outgrowth of Landmarkism.⁷⁶

⁷³Robert A. Baker, "The Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1970," Review and Expositor Vol. 67, no. 2 (Spring, 1970):134. Haydenism is named for its leader Samuel A. Hayden.

⁷⁴Ibid. For discussion of the divisive actions of a group of Landmarkist churches led by Ben Bogard see John E. Steely, "The Landmark Movement in the Southern Baptist Convention," in What is the Church?: A Symposium of Baptist Thought, ed. Duke K. McCall (Nashville: Broadman, 1958):138-143.

⁷⁵T. P. Crawford. Churches To The Front! (China: n. p., 1892). In this paragraph, Crawford's full initials are used to distinguish him from N. M. Crawford mentioned earlier.

⁷⁶Baker, "The Southern Baptist Convention," 134 and Jesse C. Fletcher. "Shapers of the Southern Baptist Spirit," Baptist History and Heritage Vol. 30, no. 3 (July, 1995):8-9, reflect the tendency to categorize Gospel Missionism as Landmarkism evolved onto the mission field. There is, however, strong evidence that Gospel Missionism was essentially born because of strategic needs arising from field missionary experience. When Crawford expressed a more formal statement of Gospel Mission ideals to Southern Baptist constituencies in America, Landmarkers seized the movement for their own ends. It is important to note the direction the influence flowed, foreign field to American constituency, not the reverse. Demonstration of this and other details regarding Gospel

If Gospel Missioners attempted to assert new missiological values derived from field needs, then similarity with Landmark thought is mostly coincidental. This possibility alone justifies reassessing the movement in light of its own assertions and values with a view to determining whether it was an exclusivistic harbinger of the past or a progressive attempt to engage the future.

Missionism are the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE GOSPEL MISSION MOVEMENT (1892-1910)

In the post-Cold War world, the most important distinctions among peoples are not ideological, political, or economic. They are cultural. Peoples and nations are attempting to answer the most basic questions humans can face: Who are we? And they are answering that question in the traditional way human beings have answered it, by reference to the things that mean most to them. People define themselves in terms of ancestry, religion, language, history, values, customs, and institutions. They identify with cultural groups: tribes, ethnic groups, religious communities, nations, and at the broadest level, civilizations. People use politics not just to advance their interests but also to define their identity. We know who we are only when we know who [sic] we are not and often only when we know whom we are against.¹

Since the demise of the Soviet Union, the world is undergoing a series of radical changes. Scholars are now trying to piece together the past in order to chart the most reasonable understanding of the future. The citation above illustrates the degree to which learned observers are looking backward to face the future. Samuel P. Huntington, a political scientist at Harvard University, indicates that a paradigm shift is occurring. The old structures that gave meaning to

¹Samuel P. Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order (New York:Viking Penguin, 1996):21.

geopolitical circumstances of the modern world are in decline and, oddly enough, older medieval or even ancient cultural, religious, and linguistic loyalties are reemerging as the foundational grounds for alignments of peoples around the world.²

Huntington uses the basic constructs of paradigm theory, as developed by Thomas Kuhn, to assess modern political trends. Historical observers cannot divorce Christian missionary activity from the flow of secular history. It naturally occurs within the broader contexts of human developments. David J. Bosch also erected structures similar to Kuhn's for interpreting the ebb and flow of missiological trends throughout the eras of the Christian church.³ In so doing, Bosch provided a set of models that help missiologists look back to begin the process of sorting out the future. As the world is undergoing radical changes in the geopolitical arenas, similarly modern mission trends are showing signs of equally drastic change. At the end of this century, one is increasingly aware that there is a distinct difference in the way Christians ought to perceive the mandate for mission, design strategies for engagement, and apply

²Ibid., 29-31. Life dates are not given unless the chronology of an individual's life is directly related to the development of the Gospel Mission Movement.

³See especially David J. Bosch, Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission, American Society of Missiology Series, No. 16 (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1991) and David J. Bosch, Believing In the Future: Toward a Missiology of Western Culture (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995).

the same as the Church enters the next century. Yet, the nature of the changes is elusive unless one backs up and views current circumstances from the vantage point of the larger context of long term developments.

In an analysis of Bosch's work, John Kevin Livingston notes the delineation of a period that Bosch called the "Constantinian era" of the Church's missiological development. This epoch roughly runs from the time of Constantine, 325, to the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference in 1910.⁴ This was the period when the Church predominantly reflected customs and values of the Western world. Western expressions of the Church controlled the sending and receiving processes through which Christianity expanded. Yet, a shift has come and the Western Church now shares in a much larger process, one whereby the younger churches throughout the two-thirds world are increasingly becoming partners and leaders.⁵

One undergirding explanation for this shift was the gradual, and sometimes begrudging, affirmation of other cultures

⁴John Kevin Livingston, "A Missiology of The Road: The Theology of Mission and Evangelism in the Writings of David J. Bosch" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1989):109-112.

⁵Ibid. In Transforming Mission, published after Livingston's dissertation, Bosch subdivides the "Constantinian era" into several smaller segments based on nuances of change in theological and missiological trends. Yet, there is one unifying motif that runs throughout the subdivided epochs, namely the controlling influence of the West in relation to other areas of the world. After 1910, this changes noticeably, even if gradually at certain times.

and peoples by the Western world. Methods used by Western missionaries throughout most of the last century tended to reflect more of the "Constantinian era" or an "Enlightenment" understanding of truth than is seen in the modern shifting scene.⁶ The shift has not come about suddenly. It developed bit by bit, person by person, idea by idea until a new set of perceptions and values changed the way things are done. Individual denominations experience change in varying degrees, depending on the given set of founding convictions, outside influences, and willingness to accept or adapt to innovations. The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention (USA)⁷ has usually been slow to accept change. One case in point is the specific topic of this dissertation. The Gospel Mission Movement (1892-1910) developed due to the collective field experiences of the veteran missionary, Tarleton Perry Crawford, and a host of younger missionaries.⁸ Was this simply

⁶Bosch, Transforming Mission, 351-362.

⁷The Foreign Mission Board officially changed its name in June 1997. It is now the International Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. This change comes after 152 years and suggests its traditional resistance to change. It only now is beginning to reflect "a new pattern of cooperating and networking internationally." Jerry Rankin, "The Rankin File," The Commission Magazine of the International Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, June 1997, 53. This writer has chosen to retain the historic name for the purposes of this research.

⁸Adrian Lamkin Jr., "The Gospel Mission Movement Within The Southern Baptist Convention" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980). This is Lamkin's primary thesis. More is said of this in a later section of this chapter.

a renegade movement that reflected insubordinate attitudes because of anti-board sentiments, or is there evidence that the Gospel Mission field personnel reflected values, albeit in incipient and perhaps unconscious forms, like those of an emerging shift in mission methods that was more in keeping with what Bosch later called a post-modern mission paradigm?⁹ This chapter attempts to answer that question.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Baptist historians have tended to see Gospel Missionism through the lens of another movement that developed earlier, namely Landmarkism.¹⁰ In order to determine the degree to which their conclusion is warranted, one must set Gospel Missionism in the broader contexts of nineteenth-century China, and the Protestant mission milieu of that time. The first section addresses this issue.

The heart of the chapter revolves around determination of the core values of the Gospel Missioners. Since the elemental ideas surfaced in and through the field ministries of Crawford and D. W. Herring, their lives are integral to this study. They are studied in order to detect the field forces that influenced and shaped their understandings and practice of mission. Where pertinent, this thesis also examines other Gospel Missioners and their expressed ideas.

Finally, there is a section that compares the core values

⁹Bosch, Transforming Mission, 349.

¹⁰See Chapter 2, footnote 77.

of the Gospel Missioners with those identified by Bosch as indicative of the Enlightenment era and the emerging post-modern mission paradigm. Incipient forms of post-modern ideals, expressed by the Gospel Missioners, will not necessarily bear the model's mature traits, but they should show some marks of later developments. Attention is now directed to the historical setting of the Gospel Mission Movement.

Contemporary Milieu of the Gospel Mission Movement

Protestant Missions in China

The encounter between East and West captivates both the literary imaginations of those possessed of wanderlust and the more austere research interests of historians, sociologists, or anthropologists. Exactly why two generally variant sets of cultures, each with ancient development patterns, vie for each other's attention is a bit of a mystery. Yet, when and where East and West meet, there is sure to be mutual concerns and competitions.

Nineteenth-century Protestantism was full of adventure and its emissary missionaries sortied forth bearing what they perceived was unique truth that they needed to graft into the cultures of the world. China represented a particularly strong challenge. She had proven resistant throughout most of the Qing Dynasty (which lasted from 1644-1912) to outsiders. The Manchu rulers had a strong hand and generated episodes of both prosperity and upheaval during their nearly three hundred year

reign. After 1790, European powers were continually encroaching on the Middle Kingdom's ability to police its borders, both geographical and cultural. The flash point issue was the importation of opium.¹¹ The Qing rulers wanted opium out of China, especially if they were not able to control its flow. A series of wars ensued, the first ended with the signing of the "Treaty of Nanjing by which Hong Kong was ceded to Britain, and China opened five ports to foreign trade. They were Shanghai, Ningbo, Fuzhou, Ziamen, and Guangzhou."¹²

Western imperial powers gained what the Chinese perceived to be a forced entry and opened China to reluctant trade and cultural interaction. Missionaries arrived along with the entrepreneurs, albeit with generally different motives. Nonetheless, nationals also perceived them as intruders, especially the established Chinese gentry who wished to maintain the status quo. Economic expansionism sometimes had mutual benefit, but cultural imperialism fostered by those peddling novel religious ideologies was much less tolerable, especially if they posed any threat to those benefitting from the established order of the day. So Christianity, particularly the newly arriving Protestant forms, was of great concern to the gentry. "Watchful Ch'ing officials at Canton had stopped this

¹¹Jonathan Chao, ed. The China Mission Handbook: A Portrait of China and Its Church (Hong Kong: Chinese Church Research Center, 1989):11.

¹²Ibid.,19.

foreign religion's proselytizing more successfully than they could check the inflow of opium. Evidently they considered the propagation of alien doctrine more dangerous than the sale of a mere drug. . . . If China's traditional order felt itself under foreign attack, surely the missionary was its spearpoint."¹³

The advent of Protestant Christianity in the midst of such antagonistic upheaval did not foster wholesome development of their form of the church in China. To make matters worse, many incoming missionaries had more than propagation of the gospel on their agendas. It was an era in which echoes of "manifest destiny" were heard. The West, some assumed, was expanding and flowing throughout the known world because it was somehow blessed by God with a mandate for a mission to subdue other cultures and bring them to the point of sociological development enjoyed by Western countries. The presupposition was that other cultures were somehow less developed or sophisticated due to ignorance, or poverty stemming from lower ranking on the social evolutionary scale. Western insights, including religious ones, could rectify this situation. Such attitudes, coupled with foreign aggression, aided the forces that were resisting incoming Protestant beliefs. "The fact that Protestant missionaries were allowed to propagate their faith due to

¹³John K. Fairbank, "Introduction: The Place of Protestant Writings in China's Cultural History," Christianity in China: Early Protestant Missionary Writings, ed. Suzanne Wilson Barnett and John King Fairbank, Harvard Studies in American-East Asian Relations no.9 (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1985):3-6.

China's defeat under Western expansion further stimulated the rise of Chinese anti-foreignism. . . . Thus, Christianity as an institutional religion was held in low regard by the Chinese people."¹⁴

As one might expect, the barriers to the development of an autonomous form of the church, at least in the early stages, were almost insurmountable. Many Protestant missionaries were captive to the *Zeitgeist* by which their ideas were formed. Euro-American expansionism was in vogue. As they arrived, they tended to start work with the assumption that the nationals could not be empowered with responsible church leadership because they were so underdeveloped spiritually. Hence, the missionary was a necessary "father" figure. These attitudes hindered healthy indigenous church development. One researcher notes, "Of the many factors which prevented the missionaries from establishing a native church, two were of the utmost importance. One is Christianity's continuing link with foreign aggression and the other is the missionaries' system of employing assistants for the ministry."¹⁵

¹⁴Jonathan T'ien-en Chao, "The Chinese Indigenous Church Movement, 1919-1927: A Protestant Response to the Anti-Christian Movements in Modern China" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1986):33.

¹⁵Ibid., 34 and 54. See also E. B. Atwood, "Outlines of a History of Missions in China," (Th.D. diss, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1911):32, 98, and 156-158. Note that Atwood wrote in the early part of this century. From the vantage point of a more contemporary perspective, his conclusions are similar to Chao's in that he noted the slow, but in his opinion, increasing

A case example of the abuse and folly of the subsidy system is seen in the life and ministry of Karl Friedrich August Gützlaff (1803-1851). He "was a missionary entrepreneur par excellence--flamboyant, talented, and indefatigable. Assuming a Chinese clan name, he sailed the China coast on an opium clipper and distributed religious tracts to all comers."¹⁶ His "flamboyant" spirit notwithstanding, the Gützlaff episode was an embarrassment to the Protestant community in the middle of the last century, yet it did have some lasting benefits.

Gützlaff's parents were from a craft class in eighteenth century Prussia. He grew up deeply influenced by the Pietistic emphases of the day. It was a context where "Sectarian differences faded before the paramountcy of individual conversion; theological disputes over predestination and justification by faith were subordinated to experiencing rebirth in Christ. In this Christocentric Protestantism, the essential doctrine was God's gracious sacrifice of His Son, which offered hope to all who were willing to become servants of the

development of an indigenous church after a century of Protestant work in China. Chao criticized the methods used which retarded indigeneity. Interestingly, Atwood criticized the movements that Chao viewed as healthy developments in the Nineteenth century, namely the methods of John L. Nevius and J. Hudson Taylor.

¹⁶Jessie G. Lutz, "Karl F. A. Gützlaff: Missionary Entrepreneur," in Christianity in China: Early Protestant Missionary Writings, ed. Suzanne Wilson Barnett and John King Fairbank (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1985):61.

Savior."¹⁷ He was intelligent, energetic, and willing to venture forth under the banner of a worthy cause. He reached China in 1831 and began a career that may be described as a mixture of innovative genius and embarrassment.

Learning the language, cultural adaptation, and energetically recording everything in logs and journals absorbed Gützlaff's energies, especially during his first eight years in China. The treaty agreements confined Gützlaff to the vicinity of Hong Kong. Gützlaff felt restricted and frustrated that he could not engage the teeming masses in the interior of China. Eventually he struck on a plan that, he hoped, would capture all of China for Christ. The essence of the plan was twofold. First, he could break through the geographic restrictions by hiring Chinese helpers. As Chinese, they would be "Free to circulate in every province and responsible only to him, a few hundred itinerant Chinese preachers, assisted by several thousand colporteurs distributing tracts, would carry the Gospel message to all China."¹⁸ Additionally, he envisioned a "Sinification of Christianity." To Gützlaff this was not a process of mutual compromise between Christianity and the Chinese religious traditions. Rather, it was an early Protestant attempt at what today scholars would term indigenization. "His plan was to have Chinese present the

¹⁷Ibid., 62.

¹⁸Ibid., 67.

essence of Christianity in local dialects, compose tracts that were Chinese in tone and style, and supervise the proselytizing. Chinese would win China for Christ."¹⁹

The plan was working well, too well. There was great enthusiasm about the things Gützlaff reported. Hundreds being converted, fellowships established, and all from thousands of pieces of Gospel material being distributed by Chinese throughout the interior of China. Gützlaff journeyed to Europe to continue promoting the mission, which he named the Chinese Union. He aimed, thereby, to recruit more funds and personnel between 1849 and 1851. In his absence, Theodor Hamberg handled the mission. Onlookers grew curious about some claims. Officials of the London Missionary Society resident in Hong Kong cross-checked various claims Gützlaff had made. They grew increasingly suspicious about some of the Christian groups he said existed and the dubious character of some of his workers. Eventually members of the Protestant community in Hong Kong held an inquiry to determine the real state of things. Gützlaff was still in Europe, but Hamberg represented him during the proceedings. In the final analysis, the inquirers raised serious questions about the level of Christian knowledge being propagated by many of the hired Chinese workers, but more importantly "Testimony indicated that a significant minority of the Chinese Union members were opium smokers, that some of the

¹⁹Ibid.

preachers had never left the Hong Kong area, and that some of the colporteurs had resold their tracts to book suppliers to be repurchased by Gützlaff."²⁰ As one may imagine, the findings shook Gützlaff and the established network of supporters he had developed. He left Europe in 1850 determined to vindicate his mission and its personnel. Yet, when he arrived in Hong Kong, his energy was depleted. While still in Europe, he complained of various aches and pains. Upon arrival he seemed physically a weakened man. "Gützlaff would die on 9 August 1851, seven months after returning to China."²¹ With the death of its charismatic leader, the mission foundered and collapsed.

Gützlaff's essential vision or methodology, however, lived on in the practices of others whom he had influenced. The driving passion he had to reach the Chinese interior, beyond the geographic constraints of the day, caught the eye of another visionary just starting on his journey into the mission world. The young J. Hudson Taylor (1832-1905) carefully studied Gützlaff's ventures and caught the spirit of the man's vision. In Taylor's biography, a drawing of Gützlaff appears with the caption "Dr. Charles [sic] Gützlaff in the dress of a Fu-Kien

²⁰Jessie G. Lutz and R. Ray Lutz, "Karl Gützlaff's Approach to Indigenization: The Chinese Union," in Christianity in China: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present, ed. Daniel H. Bays (Stanford: Stanford University, 1996):275. Note also that details of the flow of events described in this section are referenced to this same source 273-277.

²¹Ibid., 277.

Sailor. The devoted missionary often referred to by Mr. Hudson Taylor as 'the grandfather of the China Inland Mission.'²²

Underlying Gützlaff's approach was a simple trust or confidence in the Chinese that was atypical for his day. An indigeneous spirit infected all that Gützlaff advocated. Although he had mixed results due to the character of some of his Chinese partners and the short tenure for his efforts, he "had done more than most missionaries to promote this, but to little effect."²³ He not only influenced Taylor, but "He had, moreover, been the means of bringing to China a number of able Germans who were to lay the foundations of continuous and growing missions."²⁴

Gützlaff's circumstances, taken as a whole, prompted the right missiological questions, and prompted many to think creatively and attempt what seemed impossible. He provided some answers. Perhaps he was naive at several points, but his energetic vision stimulated others to take up the challenges and do things that had been left undone. Tarleton Perry Crawford, as will be evident later, was also influenced by the Gützlaff

²²Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor, Hudson Taylor In Early Years: The Growth of A Soul, 4th ed. (London: Morgan and Scott, 1920):89.

²³Daniel H. Bays, "The Growth of Independent Christianity in China, 1900-1937," in Christianity in China: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present, ed. Daniel H. Bays (Stanford: Stanford University, 1996):308.

²⁴Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of Christian Missions in China (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929):255.

incident. He gained some practical ideas that shaped his missiologial convictions when he arrived in Hong Kong right in the midst of the controversy surrounding Gützlaff.²⁵

Missionary Motivation

If one is attempting to understand Crawford, Gützlaff, Taylor or others of that period in China, an underlying question needs to be addressed. What could possibly motivate these folk to leave their familiar surroundings, family, friends, culture and the like, to attempt to live among other folk so different from themselves and in circumstances that were often threatening? Asked another way, what right did they have intruding or imposing upon the cultures of the Orient? Various answers are perhaps reasonable, but no single cause is comprehensive enough to explain all the motives for all the missionaries involved. One Chinese scholar's interpretation offers an interesting point of departure for answering this question of motives. Kwang-Ching Liu concluded that missionary motivations were different from those of the "traders and

²⁵L. S. Foster, Fifty Years in China: An Eventful Memoir of Tarleton Perry Crawford, D.D. (Nashville: Bayless-Pullen, 1909):50-51. L. S. Foster was Martha Foster Crawford's brother and compiled his biographical account of Crawford after the latter's death but before Mrs. Crawford died. He had access to her original sources and collective memories. Regarding the incident described here, he alludes to what was likely the Crawfords' reaction to the Gützlaff matter. "During the few days spent at Hong Kong they [the Crawfords] saw and heard much that gave them food for future reflection." p.51. See also Appendix A which provides a chronological structure for interpreting the Crawfords' lives.

entrepreneurs" in that they seemed concerned about a set of truth claims and compassionate acts that moved them to do what peers might have judged to be extreme measures for an overarching cause.²⁶

He elaborates further elsewhere by noting that,

Many Americans today will ask the question: what justification was there for Americans going to China and telling her people what to believe and learn? The answer lies in the missionaries' belief that they should offer to other peoples the elements in Western civilization that they valued for themselves. The idea that every soul is worth saving, that every individual should be given the chance to develop his capacities--this, in combination with the scientific and technical knowledge of the West, could and did make a contribution to China and the Chinese.²⁷

Taylor provided significant insight about how his study of the Bible led to a firm sense of "calling" and motivation. This lengthy, but helpful excerpt also illustrates how easily he blended religious convictions with strategic initiatives.

I saw, further, that all through the New Testament the coming of the Lord was the great hope of His people, and was always appealed to as the strongest motive for consecration and service, and was the greatest comfort in trial and affliction. . . . I saw that the Apostolic plan was not to raise ways and means, but to go and do the work, . . . On Sunday, June 25th, 1865, unable to bear the sight of a congregation of a thousand or more Christian people rejoicing in their

²⁶Kwang-Ching Liu, Americans and Chinese: A Historical Essay and A Bibliography (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1963):13.

²⁷Kwang-Ching Liu, American Missionaries in China: Papers from Harvard Seminars, edited with an introduction by Kwang-Ching Liu, East Asian Research Center Harvard University (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1966):1.

own security, while millions were perishing for lack of knowledge, I wandered out on the sands alone, in great spiritual agony; and there the Lord conquered my unbelief, and I surrendered myself to God for this service. . . . Need I say that peace at once flowed into my burdened heart? There and then I asked him for twenty-four fellow-workers, two for each of the eleven inland provinces which were without a missionary, and two for Mongolia; and writing the petition on the margin of the Bible I had with me, I returned home. . . .²⁸

Those skeptical of the purity of such expressed motives assign more adulterated intentions to missionary actions, especially in the last century. Some judge it to be tantamount to ethnocide when they assess the ways some missionaries impacted developing cultures with aspects of modernity, particularly when clothed in the garb of haughty Western values. Southern Baptists traditionally ventured forth into the mission fields of the world to accomplish a sense of "calling" similar to those expressed above. Yet, some in their own ranks raise questions about the deeper sincerity of those motives. One Southern Baptist observer surveyed the period between 1845 and 1945 and concluded that "Southerners also developed a regional brand of religion which colored their understanding of America's divine role as the world's redeemer. They fashioned a Southern errand to the world which contained the classic Southern emphasis upon individualism, piety, personal religion

²⁸J. Hudson Taylor, "A Retrospect," (London: China Inland Mission, 1875 [1954]): 18-19, 112, 114, as cited in Classic Texts in Mission and World Christianity, ed. Norman E. Thomas (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995):70-71.

and soul-winning."²⁹ Be that as it may, and it is indeed a possibility that folk can be deluded regarding their own motives, there is potentially another explanation that may be much more profound, at least to the Crawfords. An essential and defining encounter with what is perceived to be the resurrected, saving Christ can impact an individual's thinking so seriously that it alters the course of their life. Both of the Crawfords experienced profound, cathartic moments whereby a "call" into service was unmistakable in their thinking. Tarleton was converted as a boy and grew deeply aware of his own sin in relation to the abundant grace of God. Concluding that he would be ushered into the presence of Christ upon his departure from this life solely due to Christ's sufficient sacrifice, "Instantly joy filled his soul and he began to sing and praise God. He said, 'I will spend my life in telling of His great mercy.' He seems thus to have been called to the ministry from his conversion; . . ."³⁰ Additionally, before they ever met, Martha experienced a session of prayer before retiring for the night on November 1, 1849 in which she was particularly seeking direction from God about her future. She simply requested God to show his will to her and she would obey. "The words were

²⁹Robert Norman Jr. Nash, "The Influence of American Myth on Southern Baptist Foreign Missions, 1845-1945" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989):256.

³⁰Foster, Fifty Years, 25.

barely spoken when a powerful conviction, like a flash of lightning, darted across her mind, that God's will for her was to take the gospel to the heathen. She saw no light, heard no audible voice, but the impression was as deep and vivid as if there had been both."³¹

It is ill advised for historians to go beyond what the physical records say, and it is difficult to try to ascertain something as subjective as one's motives for missionary service. The mature, recorded reflections are all that one can use to determine what the Crawfords thought was happening in their lives. At the very least, they indicate that they affirmed a basic belief in a personal, living God, whom they individually had vital relationships with, and that his will was for them to tell others about him, especially how others could have such a relationship. The larger sociological issues aside, these were the driving beliefs that sustained this Southern Baptist couple through rather turbulent times in nineteenth-century China for approximately fifty years.

Southern Baptists In China

On November 17, 1851³², the Crawfords set sail for China and embarked on more than a sea voyage; they started to fulfill what they perceived to be God's calling on their lives. They were not the first Southern Baptists to work in China. They

³¹Ibid., 31.

³²See Appendix A.

joined an existing work, one that was begun before the Convention was formally established in 1845. J. L. Shuck (1812-1863) was a Southerner who began working in China under the auspices of the Baptist Union's Triennial Convention in 1835. He and his wife were the first American Baptists to work there. After delegates formed the Convention, Shuck transferred his appointment. Their work was in and around the southern port city of Hong Kong. From that base, in 1847, Southern Baptists opened a mission outpost in Central China, using Shanghai as their center. By 1859, they entered Northern China, and established work in Teng Chow, Shangtung province.³³ The Crawfords joined the work in central China, then under the leadership of Matthew T. Yates (1819-1888), on March 30, 1852. Tarleton and Martha lived out their ministries in three cities spanning three periods. From 1852-1863 they worked attached to the Central China Mission. In 1863, they relocated to Teng Chow to help start the North China Mission. There they worked until 1892 when they moved to Taianfu, closer to the interior of China, to establish a base for the Gospel Mission Movement. In 1900, they evacuated China during the Boxer uprising. The following chart illustrates the logistics.³⁴

³³See H. Leon McBeth, The Baptist Heritage (Nashville: Broadman, 1987):413-416 and William R. Estep, Whole Gospel Whole World: The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention 1845-1995 (Nashville: Broadman, 1994):139-142.

³⁴See Appendix A.

Period	Location
1852-1863	Central China Mission: Shanghai
1863-1892	North China Mission: Teng Chow
1892-1909 (Tarleton to 1900 Martha to 1909)	Gospel Mission: Taianfu

Gospel Missionism and The Landmark Movement

The Landmark Challenge

In May 1859, a crisis transpired which helped define the nature of the Southern Baptist Convention. J. R. Graves (1820-1893), was the editor of the Tennessee Baptist, a state newspaper. Through that medium, he had the ear of thousands of Southern Baptists. In the 1850's, he began to echo some ideas that sounded like the Anti-mission sentiments of an earlier generation.³⁵ His theological foundations were different, based as they were on a reassessment of ecclesiology and not necessarily tied to soteriological concerns (as with the Anti-missionary thinkers). Yet, there was a connecting motif. Both Graves and the Anti-missioners were concerned about trends toward federalizing the control of missionary activities. Central boards were suspect to them because they did not see normative examples or illustrations of such in the Bible. Graves took up the same line of argument but with ecclesiology as his point of departure.

³⁵See chapter two of this thesis.

Eventually, the issues were debated intensely enough that the Convention itself had to act because Graves was forcing the issue upon it. The specific concern was whether the Foreign Mission Board, or any Board for that matter, had a legitimate right to exist and, thereby, to usurp the authority that rightly belonged to local churches as the only visible expressions of the body of Christ. Floor discussions grew heated and a committee was formed to hash it out after regular meeting hours. Graves was on the committee. He met with various Convention leaders long into the night in a side room of the First Baptist Church of Richmond, Virginia. The fate of the Foreign Mission Board was mostly the topic of discussion. By extrapolation, however, the entire idea of a convention was at stake.³⁶ In the end, the committee affirmed the need to retain the Board to facilitate the collective efforts of Southern Baptist Churches in carrying out their objective of fulfilling Christ's commission. Board supporters did yield to Graves one key item. They deemed it acceptable for local churches to act independently if they so chose, and that they would be allowed to utilize the Board's avenues for sending funds to field missionaries.

Resolved, That in case any churches, associations, or other bodies entitled to representation in this Convention, should prefer to appoint their own missionaries, and to assume the responsibility of defraying their salaries and entire expenses, that the

³⁶Estep, Whole Gospel, :91-93.



respective Boards are authorized, under our present organization and fundamental rules, to become the disbursing agents of such bodies so appointing missionaries and appropriating funds, whether such contributions be intended for the civilization or the evangelization of the heathen; provided that such expenses of forwarding the money, as have to be specially incurred, be borne by the contributors.³⁷

T. P. Crawford was home from China and attended that particular Convention meeting.³⁸ Is this simply a coincidence? Or was Crawford, who was actually sent as a missionary by the Big Hatchie Association where Graves had garnered much of his support,³⁹ somehow connected to and in sympathy with Graves' ideas? Was Crawford a Landmarker working from within to subvert the Board? This issue is crucial to understanding the Gospel Mission Movement. In this writer's opinion, the evidence supports the assumption that Landmarkism, near the end of the nineteenth century, needed a fresh infusion of controversy to sustain its interests. When Crawford, and the other Gospel Missioners, issued a clarion call from China that was in sympathy with elements of Landmark ideology, Landmarkist leaders seized the Gospel Mission Movement for their own ends and not

³⁷Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session. Held in the First Baptist Church, Richmond, VA., May 6-10, 1859, (Richmond: Southern Baptist Convention, 1859):95-96.

³⁸Ibid., 19. The Convention's record listed Crawford in attendance as an invited participant, not a delegate since he was a returned field missionary.

³⁹Foster, Fifty Years, 39-40.

the reverse. Since this premise is feasible, it allows an interpretation freed from the hindrances of linking the Gospel Missioners exclusively to Landmark ecclesiology and raises curiosity about what other, even China based, motivations were involved.⁴⁰

Crawford and Landmarkism

The field circumstances, issues, and influences help explain the driving forces behind the Gospel Mission's values. Ecclesiological concerns developed, chronologically, as secondary issues. It was only after Crawford, Herring, and others sensed that they were being ignored by the Board's leadership, and hindered from communicating their ideas directly to churches, that they broke away from the Board's control. When the break came, they had no alternative but to appeal directly to the constituent churches that were willing to listen to their ideas. Ecclesiology became important at that point. One observer demonstrates the distinction and uses separate terms to keep the historic developments isolated from each other.

The terms 'Gospel Missions' and 'Crawfordism' are sometimes associated with the early stages of Landmark development. In this study however, 'Gospel Missions' is used for descriptions of the movement associated

⁴⁰In a later section, the evidence for this argument is explored in more depth. Suffice it to say at this point that Lamkin (see footnote 8) successfully demonstrated the idea that Landmarkism seized Gospel Missionism in his dissertation.

with T. P. Crawford and the Landmark Associations, while 'Direct Missions' is used for the alternative offered to the board method by early Landmarkism.⁴¹

The field based roots of the movement are also recorded by the Gospel Missionaries' peers. In 1907, China Protestant missionaries convened to commemorate their first century of work. The committee in charge of organizing the meeting commissioned a historical volume documenting their century's worth of progress. This work listed the Gospel Mission as "The Gospel Baptist Mission, Shantung." The book is essentially a summary of each mission's development. Regarding the origin of the mission as a break away from the Southern Baptist Board, it is noted that "There were two main causes for this separation. The one on the field, which came first in point of time, was a deep desire on the part of the missionaries to cultivate a healthy self-support among the native Christians by keeping out

⁴¹David L. Saunders. "The Relation of Landmarkism to Mission Methods," The Quarterly Review 26 (April-June 1966):44. Saunders is not arguing the full premise, but the fact that he recognizes the confusion over the terms indicates that there is a noteworthy difference between the two movements. The "Landmark Associations" Saunders mentions were the ones that finally broke from the Convention, and under Ben Bogard's leadership formed a completely separate Baptist entity in "the early 1900's." p.55. Interestingly, T. L. Blalock, the only Gospel Missioner to not realign with the Board after 1910, eventually sensed the stigma associated with the term Gospel Mission and opted to rename his mission to reflect the ecclesiological emphases. In his opinion, the reason for the Gospel Mission's collapse was that its members were a mixed lot. Had they all come out to the field directly from local Baptist churches, he thought things would have been different. T. L. Blalock, Experiences of a Baptist Faith Missionary for 56 Years in China (Fort Worth: Manney, 1949):63 and 45 respectively.

of view, as much as possible, foreign money. The other matter aimed at was to bring into a closer relationship the missionary on the field and his constituency at home; . . ."⁴²

Many historians continue to associate Gospel Missionism directly with the Landmark movement and conclude that it was simply an outgrowth of the latter. In a biographical account of B. H. Carroll (1834-1914), one observer repeats this suspect conclusion by stating that "Carroll staunchly opposed Landmarkers like Crawford and Hayden because they threatened Baptist solidarity and the viability of organized missions."⁴³ The latter was a Landmarker by choice; the former does not warrant the label in quite the same way.

W. W. Barnes, a Southern Baptist historian of an earlier generation, published what became a standard text in 1954. In it he surveyed the Gospel Mission Movement in relation to Landmarkism and focused on the later phases while ignoring the field issues. "The Gospel Missioners made the same attack on the Convention and its boards that the Antimissionaries and

⁴²The Centenary Conference Historical Volume, A Century of Protestant Missions in China (1807-1907), ed. D. MacGillivray (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission, 1907):330-331. Latourette, A History, 372 affirmed this in similar terms by observing that Crawford's new organization was designed to "on the one hand more quickly promote the self-support and independence of the Chinese churches and on the other would bring the individual missionary into closer touch with the local congregations in America."

⁴³James Spivey, "Benajah Harvey Carroll," in Baptist Theologians, ed. Timothy George and David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman, 1990):319.

J. R. Graves, as well as Alexander Campbell, had previously made; they proposed the same methods in the homeland and on the foreign field."⁴⁴

Other scholars have delved into primary sources, but have, nevertheless, drawn inaccurate conclusions regarding the degree to which Crawford could have been in contact with or influenced by Graves or Pendleton. Irwin T. Hyatt Jr., for example, elaborates on developments in Crawford's early career, especially his appointment to China.

A note on the Big Hatchie Association is in order here, as Crawford's connection with it is tied to his subsequent Gospel Mission theology. The Landmarkers, dedicated to the primacy of local churches over the Southern Baptist Convention and its denominational boards, organized at the Big Hatchie annual meeting of 1851; the next year Crawford was selected as the

⁴⁴William Wright Barnes, The Southern Baptist Convention: 1845-1953 (Nashville: Broadman, 1954):115 and the entire section 113-117. Barnes' observations were based on evidence relating to the issues during and after the Landmark Movement had seized the Gospel Missioners for their own aims. He does not deal with the primary sources from Crawford, Herring, and others to determine their reasons for breaking from the Board. Hence, the secondary evidence skewed historical understanding and tended to reflect more the reactionary concerns over Landmarkism than the heart of the field issues that produced the movement. Later scholars, except for Estep, failed to notice the primary evidence that Lamkin uncovered and generally followed the lead Barnes offered. See descriptions of Gospel Missionism in Robert A. Baker, The Southern Baptist Convention and Its People 1607-1972 (Nashville: Broadman, 1974):278-280; Norman Wade Cox, and Judson Boyce Allen, ed. Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists (Nashville: Broadman, 1958), s.v. "Gospel Missionism," by John F. Gibson; Estep, Whole Gospel, 139-144; Jesse C. Fletcher, The Southern Baptist Convention: A Sesquicentennial History (Nashville: Broadman, 1994):101-102; Robert Alton James. "A Study of the Life and Contributions of Henry Allen Tupper," Th. D. diss. (New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989):190-194; and McBeth, The Baptist, 416, 453.

association's own missionary. James Madison Pendleton, leader (or 'prophet') of the group, was Union University's leading professor and very likely Crawford's sponsor before the Big Hatchie membership.
 . . .⁴⁵

In reflecting on Crawford's Big Hatchie connection, Hyatt makes two mistaken assumptions. First, he sequences the events incorrectly. The Big Hatchie Association only gradually came to accept Graves' conclusions regarding boards, and that was well after Crawford had departed for China in 1851. Otherwise, it seems illogical for Crawford to write to the recording secretary (with apparent consternation and surprise over Graves' activities in his home association) expressing full support for the Board as well as criticizing Graves' influence there nearly thirteen years (1872) after the crucial "showdown" session that Graves forced upon the Convention in 1859. Crawford wrote, "I have seen for years that [the Big Hatchie Association] could not do anything for my support because of the anti-foreign mission influence existing there. . . . They can not do anything at their big meeting for the ubiquitous 'bookstore' [a reference to Graves' Tennessee Baptist newspaper] is always present at these. Don't give up on the western churches but do all you can to keep them cooperating with the FM Board."⁴⁶ Crawford wrote, in the

⁴⁵Irwin T. Jr. Hyatt, Our Ordered Lives Confess: Three Nineteenth-Century American Missionaries in East Shantung (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1976): note ten on p.244.

⁴⁶T. P. Crawford, "Letter to James B. Taylor, Tengchow, February 15, 1872," Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, as cited in Lamkin, "The Gospel Mission Movement," 46-47.

same letter, that Graves was "the author of all the opposition to the Board of foreign missions, and all other enterprises which he thinks interfere with him, and his 'Publishing House'."⁴⁷ Hyatt implies that forming the association and sending Crawford out in 1851 are so closely linked that it necessarily means Crawford was an antiboard, Graves-like partisan.

Additionally, Hyatt presumes that because Pendleton taught at Union University he was, "very likely Crawford's sponsor before the Big Hatchie membership."⁴⁸ Chronologically, however, this does not fit the facts. Pendleton did not even move to Tennessee until 1857, and only then did he assume the post at Union University. So it is impossible for him to have been one of Crawford's professors or even his sponsor before the association. Pendleton wrote, "On the first day of January, 1857, I left Bowling Green [Kentucky] and removed to Murfreesboro, Tennessee. Nothing had been more unexpected by me. The explanation of the matter is this: The Trustees of Union University decided to establish a Theological Department in the Institution, and, to my amazement, they appointed me professor."⁴⁹ Crawford, however, entered Union University in

⁴⁷Ibid, empahsis is his.

⁴⁸Hyatt, Our Ordered Lives, 244.

⁴⁹J. M. Pendleton, Reminiscences of a Long Life (Louisville: Press Baptist Book Concern, 1891):108. See also "Dr. J. M. Pendleton," The Biblical Recorder, 25 March 1891, 4 for an

1848, graduated and married Martha in 1851, and finally sailed for China in November of 1851. By the time Pendleton moved to Union University, Crawford had been in China over five years.⁵⁰ Whatever his faults, Crawford was not a Landmarker when he sailed for China in 1851. It was forty years after he first arrived in China that Crawford broke away from the Board (1852-1892) and began espousing ideas regarding the authority of boards in relation to local churches with which many Landmarkers could agree; and that opinion materialized only under duress when the Board silenced him.⁵¹

Two additional items need elaboration here. A cardinal principle to Landmarkers was that only local New Testament congregations were legitimately capable of engaging the gospel ministry functions prescribed for the church. Since, as Graves and others espoused, Baptist churches practiced the ordinances according to New Testament principles, they alone could rightly be acclaimed as real, biblical churches. Because local churches bestow the authority for the gospel ministry upon God called individuals, only Baptist ministers were to be sanctioned.⁵² As

obituary notice and summary of Pendleton's life.

⁵⁰T. P. Crawford, Evolution In My Mission Views or Growth of Gospel Mission Principles In My Own Mind, ed. J. A. Scarboro (Fulton, KY: Scarboro, 1903):12.

⁵¹See Appendix A.

⁵²See Chapter 2 starting on page 46 of this thesis for further elaboration.

late as 1878 or 1879, Crawford saw no need to apply this practice. He left a "Rev. Mr. Mateer of the Presbyterian mission" to preach in his stead and have supervision over his church in Tengchow.⁵³ Next, it is not completely accurate to say that Crawford, even in his most bellicose moments, rejected the notion of boards and conventions.⁵⁴ In Crawford's most provocative work he clarified his position as follows:

Again, I am not opposed to the existence of Conventions, Societies, Boards or Committees of the proper kind, in the proper place, and for the proper purpose; but I am deeply opposed to all those which intrude themselves and their enterprises upon the Churches--to all those which take any part of their work, their workers, or their funds away from their control. . . . While opposing all intruding bodies, I could readily sanction General and State Conventions for mutual acquaintance, for interchange of views on matters of common concern, for gathering information regarding the condition and work of the various Churches, for stimulating their religious zeal and Christian fellowship, and for keeping the unity of the faith in the bonds of Gospel love, purity and peace. But these Conventions should collect no funds, employ no men, hold no property and exercise no authority over the government or the work of the Churches. CHURCHES, AS SUCH, TO THE FRONT!⁵⁵

⁵³Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session, Held in the First Baptist Church, Augusta, GA., May 8-12, 1879 (Atlanta: J. P. Harrison, 1879):59.

⁵⁴Barnes, The Southern Baptist, 113.

⁵⁵T. P. Crawford, Churches, To The Front! (China: n. p., 1892):13-14. Emphasis is Crawford's. This treatise was the breaking point and is the beginning of the Gospel Mission Movement. It was written after Crawford and others were unsuccessful in persuading the Board.

Considering the sequence of events which led Crawford to appeal directly to the churches, indeed he did not oppose all boards, rather he tried to express his ideas through the Board. He came to oppose boards that, in his opinion, were structured to bypass the will of the churches they were established to represent.⁵⁶ Crawford concluded that the Southern Baptist Convention's Foreign Mission Board was guilty of such abuse of authority.⁵⁷

The broader evangelical community of Protestant missionaries expressed ideas similar to those advocated by Crawford. Issues relating the self-support, or indigeniety debate were continually present. One example is expressed by a Crawford contemporary. When commenting about the need for "native" churches to assume their biblical role and become more in control of their own affairs, including their financial support, he wrote, "The native church, even when awakened to a sense of their importance, is often disposed to agree against the practical adoption of them [self-support principles] on the ground of poverty or some other pressing and merely local reason. It seems so much easier and safer to depend on the

⁵⁶For an itemization of the progression of Crawford's appeals (from simple letters to Board officials to personal presentation of his ideas) see Michael E. Whelchel, "Gospel Missionism (1892-1910) and Its Effects Upon the Policies of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention," (Th.M. thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982):38-48.

⁵⁷Crawford, Churches, 13. More detail regarding these developments are given later. Here the data necessary to gain a more accurate perception of Crawford's association with the Landmark movement per se is presented.



wealth of foreign churches than on God and themselves."⁵⁸

It is safe to say that some of Crawford's ideas were compatible with Landmarkist ideology, but to conclude that he was an ardent advocate of the J. R. Graves type Landmarkism, goes beyond the evidence. Landmarkers, however, took advantage of the overlap with some of his ideas and used them for their own agendas, but the origin of Crawford's principles is found in his field experiences. Along with those of Herring, one can see a Baptist version of missiological values that were emerging in other Protestant missions, primarily in the so-called "faith missions."⁵⁹

Historical Development of Gospel Missionism's Core Values

Tarleton Perry and Martha Foster Crawford in China

There is unquestionably more of romance, more of what is commonly called heroism, in the new plan than in the old, but we believe that as 'faith without works is dead,' so a bare trust in God without the use of means suggested by sound common sense, is fanaticism.⁶⁰

⁵⁸C. C. Baldwin, "Self-Supporting Churches," The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal 3 (June 1870-May 1871): 346-347.

⁵⁹See J. Herbert Kane, Understanding Christian Missions, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978):160-161 for a discussion of the nature of a "faith mission."

⁶⁰"Our Board and the 'Gospel Mission'," The Foreign Mission Journal 25, no. 2 (September 1893):41.

This unsigned article in the official publishing organ of the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board illustrates the tension that arose over the missiological methodologies advocated by Gospel Missioners. The dialog had become a public debate over differing mission methods to the extent that one model was called "old" and the other "new." A paradigm war ensued. What were the issues? Was the Gospel Mission movement consisting of maverick innovaters or renegade revolutionaries? To assess the situation, the core values of the Gospel Mission Movement need clear exposition and that entails a study of them as they developed in and around the Crawfords' field experiences. The following is a biographical sketch with a view to identifying what became the core values of the movement.

Tarleton was born in 1821 in Warren County, Kentucky. He grew up in the rugged frontier. Martha was born in Jasper County, Georgia. He and Martha both accepted Christ at early ages. Their lives developed separately until their paths crossed in the early spring of 1851. Martha was moving toward a commitment to full time missionary service and sensed a transition in her life when a young gentleman caller came her way.⁶¹ The Foreign Mission Board appointed Tarleton to service

⁶¹Martha Foster Crawford, "Martha Foster Crawford Diaries. 7 vols. Manuscript Journals 1847-1881," (Held by Perkins Library of Duke Univeristy Manuscript Department), 1851. Martha muses to herself in an entry dated "Feb. 18th Providence! A Mr. Crawford called this evening. He was in Richmond on the reception of Mr. Teague's letter to Mr. Taylor--he is agent for the board--intends going to China= and has come to see me! . . . Feb. 19th. I like Crawford better than ever: a self-made--easy, everyday kind of

in China on March 6, 1851. He was eager to go to the field as a married man. Various Board administrators exchanged correspondences with Tarleton, and he was thereby made aware of Miss (Martha) Foster's interest in the same things by administrators at the Board. Their courtship was short and to the point. After some inner turmoil, they decided it was the right thing to do. So they were married on March 12, 1851.⁶²

Soon thereafter, the newly weds were en route to the Big Hatchie associational meeting. There the couple presented themselves as missionaries to China. Tarleton was ordained by the association and "It was thought proper to notice me [Martha] as wife of the Miss. Of the B. H. Assoc.: And bro. Nolen delivered an address to me publicly."⁶³ Next, the couple travelled on to attend the Southern Baptist Convention meeting held in Nashville, Tennessee. On May 11, 1851 "T. P. Crawford, and sister Crawford, were publicly set apart to the work of Foreign Missions, before a large and interested assemblage."⁶⁴ Martha was the first individual from the State of Alabama to be

fellow."

⁶²Ibid. See Foster, Fifty Years, 22-48 and Appendix A.

⁶³"Martha Foster Crawford Diaries," 28 April 1851. The reference to the "B. H. Asso." is the Big Hatchie Association. See also Foster, Fifty Years, 48.

⁶⁴Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session. Held in the First Baptist Church, Nashville, Tennessee, May 9-13, 1851 (Richmond: Southern Baptist Convention, 1851):10.

commissioned and sent out by the Foreign Mission Board, so there was a special ceremony by the Alabama delegation to honor her for this milestone event.⁶⁵ By November of that same year the Crawfords departed for China. They arrived in the spring of 1852 and began work shortly thereafter.⁶⁶

Gospel Missionism's Core Values

Just before he died in 1902, Tarleton finished a biographical account of how he developed his missiological ideology. He wove his life and field experiences around the development of very specific missionary convictions. In that account he summarized his understanding of Gospel Mission values as follows:

The Gospel Mission Movement is sustained and propelled by the co-operation of three leading convictions which may be briefly expressed as follows: First--The gospel of Christ as the power of God unto salvation, in every mission field unaccompanied by any kind of pecuniary inducement to the people; or in other words, through native self-support everywhere. Second--The churches of Christ should, as organized bodies, singly or in co-operating groups, do their own mission work without the intervention of any outside convention, association or Board. Third--Self-denying labors for

⁶⁵"Martha Foster Crawford Diaries," 12 May 1851.

⁶⁶Board of Foreign Missions, "Eighth Annual Report," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, 1853):30. See also Appendix A.

Christ's sake, both by the churches at home and by the missionaries abroad.⁶⁷

Crawford attributes the development of his ideas about self-support to two key incidents. First, as noted earlier, he reacted negatively to the whole Gützlaff affair. He saw Gützlaff's debacle as a clear case of missiological motive gone awry. The underlying culprit was, in his estimation, foreign money. Crawford reflected on those events and concluded that "These things, be assured, made a deep impression upon my unsophisticated Baptist mind. This money method of making disciples and preachers seemed to me the very opposite of the course employed by Christ and His apostles. . . . I have always regarded that decision at Hong Kong [to oppose use of mission funds for subsidy of native helpers] in the spring of 1852 as my first step in the direction of the self-support principle in the Gospel Mission."⁶⁸

The idea that missionaries should be ultimately accountable to the local church constituencies that send them out is rooted in the rebuff Crawford received when he presented his non-subsidy ideas before the Foreign Mission Board in late 1885. The Board members were unwilling to enact a policy that would encourage the non-subsidy system on a global basis. They went

⁶⁷Crawford, Evolution, 24-25. Each concept is only summarized here. They will be revisited as they surface in the chronological accounts that follow.

⁶⁸Ibid., 27. See also Foster, Fifty Years, 213-215.

another step and recommended that "Dr. Crawford, should not continue further discussion before our Southern churches of plans for the conduct of missions; . . ." Crawford reacted to the motion and declared it to be "unbaptistic, and as interfering with my liberty of speech in matters of public concern."⁶⁹

Finally, Crawford's understanding of the way missionaries ought to relate to the Chinese stems from his concern about the economic gap, and corollary lifestyle differences between them. He agreed with many members of the Central China Mission who held to the belief that "their salaries [were] larger than needed for a comfortable support They were also considering the question of adopting the native dress, leaving their foreign built houses and living in modified native dwellings, in order to get nearer to the people. . . . I fell in line with their decision."⁷⁰ Crawford exhibited a positive attitude toward other cultures, specifically Chinese ones, that

⁶⁹Ibid., 65. Crawford's criticism of the Board was not a rejection of the Board concept per se (see p.159 where he attacks only the "Modern Board System" one that would interfere with the missionary's right to consult with the churches), rather he opposed what he called a "gag" order p.66.

⁷⁰Ibid., 97. Crawford goes on to credit a colleague with the native dress concept, "But I will leave Brother Herring, the real author of this self-denying principle in the Gospel Mission Movement, to give the details of its origin and development." p.98.

was not unique, but was unusual in his day.⁷¹ To see the evolution of each concept in Crawford's mind, it is necessary to set each into its own historical flow of events.

Shanghai Period: 1852-1863

The first phase of Crawford's field experience was quiet and almost nondescript. The Crawfords simply arrived and involved themselves in the mission work already well established in the Central China Mission. Yates and others had established the mission in 1847. The early years were primarily devoted to learning the language and attempting to understand cultures around them. They survived the violence of Tai Ping rebels, the struggles of speaking and preaching in Mandarin, and began the arduous task of seeking out how one can successfully ingraft the gospel from one culture to another.⁷² In their own way, the Crawfords began to conform to the culture, "They endeavored to work, under their new and peculiar circumstances, without introducing unnecessary foreign customs. In short, they tried to make the New Testament Christianity, rather than its modern type, their model; yet without yielding any essential article of

⁷¹See, for example, the cultural attitude expressed by Gustav Warneck at the turn of this century. "The inferiority of a great part of the non-Christian humanity of to-day . . . does itself create a necessity for missionary superintendence even as a bulwark." Gustav A. Warneck, Outline of a History of Protestant Missions from the Reformation to the Present Time: A Contribution to Modern Church History, trans. by George Robson (New York: Revell, 1903):349.

⁷²Foster, Fifty Years, 54-97.

faith or practice as held by Baptist Churches, fully believing these to be in accordance with divine teaching."⁷³ In 1857, the Crawfords returned to the United States. They toured the churches of the South, attended the Southern Baptist Convention meeting in May 1859, and returned to China in the Spring of 1860.⁷⁴

Teng Chow Period: 1863-1892

1863-1869

In 1860, the foreign powers moved to have China sign a treaty at Tien-tsin. Many in the missions community viewed this as an answer to consistent prayers for the right to journey into and live in China outside the original treaty ports. As soon as avenues were open, the missionaries "went forth to occupy these stations."⁷⁵ As early as 1859, Southern Baptist missionaries attempted to penetrate that region through the city of Chefoo. After signing the treaty, efforts were hastened. Various events and circumstances made it apparent that the primary base of

⁷³Ibid., 98.

⁷⁴See Appendix A. The reader will note that the 1859 Convention meeting is the one referred to earlier when J. R. Graves created such a crisis over the right of boards to exist, especially the Foreign Mission Board.

⁷⁵H. A. Tupper, The Foreign Missions of the Southern Baptist Convention (Richmond: Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1880):221. The Shantung mission history Tupper provided was a report written by Martha Foster Crawford in 1874.

operations for their Shantung work should be the city of Teng Chow. Finally, the work began, "On the first day of March, 1861, Mr. Hartwell, with his family and assistant, Tseu Chieu T'ao, arrived in Tung Chow."⁷⁶

The Crawfords arrived to aid in the early development of the Shantung work on August 29, 1863.⁷⁷ Originally the Crawfords and the Hartwells worked well together. Various types of work evolved; schools, churches, and open evangelism. Early on J. B. Hartwell, established a church, "The North Street Baptist Church of Tung Chow was organized on the 5th of October, 1862, with eight members, . . ." Hardly four years later, "In December, 1866, Mr. Crawford had organized the Pai Fong Baptist

⁷⁶Ibid., 223.

⁷⁷See Appendix A. There were two Presbyterian families working in Teng Chow at this time as well. One is of special significance in this thesis because of his influence on Crawford's ideas. John L. Nevius lived and worked in Teng Chow from 1861-1871. Lamkin, "The Gospel Mission Movement," 54. Interestingly, Crawford's publications do not indicate Nevius as the source for any of his ideas. Yet, nearly twenty-four years later, Crawford prepared and delivered an address to new missionaries. In that presentation he made a notation in the upper left corner of the first page, "Nevius Plan" and included Nevius' writings in the bibliography. The address itself sounds very much like Nevius' ideas. T. P. Crawford, "New Missionary Orientation Address Given in Chefoo, China, March 3, 1887," (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board): Crawford file, first and last handwritten pages. There is no evidence of Crawford being influenced by the writings of Rufus Anderson, yet this is likely due to such literature being only remotely available on the field rather than an aversion to specific methodological issues. For example, see Rufus Anderson, Foreign Missions, Their Relations and Claims (New York: Scribner, 1869).

Church, composed of eight persons,⁷⁸

The establishment of two separate churches within such a short span of time might imply significant growth. However, it is more the result of an emerging feud between Crawford and Hartwell, which eventually reached a crisis stage. Not only was there a personality clash, but sharp contrasts in their perceptions of how to do missions created escalating tensions. Since Hartwell preceded Crawford in Shantung, he set the pattern and used a native subsidy system. Crawford, however, ". . . throughout adhered to his plan, adopted soon after entering on his work in Shanghai, of having no paid assistants."⁷⁹

The enmity between these two co-laborers grew so intense that they eventually had to separate and work together only in limited ways. Each missionary was then free to pursue his own

⁷⁸Tupper, The Foreign Missions, 225 and 227. In a report to the Board, Crawford corroborates the founding date of the church. See Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Thirteenth Meeting, Held in the Seventh Baptist Church, Baltimore, May 7-12, 1868, (Baltimore: Southern Baptist Convention, 1868):44.

⁷⁹Ibid., 228. The directly contrastive methods appear in the same annual report to the Foreign Mission Board during the 1869-1870 reporting cycle. Crawford noted, "I occasionally go to other towns to preach and distribute books; but for the want of native assistants have not, as yet, been able to open a chapel at any of them." In the same document, Hartwell reported, "I have retained the same assistants, Messrs. Oo, Sun and Liang, that I employed last year, and have again to commend them for faithfulness, as I believe, in Christ. I have also taken up a young man who gives promise of usefulness as an assistant bye-and-bye." Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Fifteenth Meeting, Held in the Walnut Street Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky, May 5-10, 1870, (Baltimore: Southern Baptist Convention, 1870):11 and 16.

ministry using whatever techniques he chose. A brief note in the 1867 annual report of the Teng Chow mission work indicates that "His position [Crawford's understanding of missionary methods] is so far removed from brother Hartwell [sic], that it is deemed wise to operate independently, each being directly responsible to the Board. This arises from no want of harmony between them. In all that relates to the great interests of the cause, they are laborers together with God."⁸⁰

1870-1879

Free to pursue his own course, Crawford began putting his ideas into action. The decade of the 1870's was perhaps Crawford's most fruitful phase in that he was able to mature and field test his ideas without much interference. As Crawford applied his techniques for planting churches without the use of paid assistants, he naturally would encounter the question of how to train the voluntary associates he had working with him. He developed an early version of a decentralized, voluntary type of theological education by extension.⁸¹ Martha described

⁸⁰Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held in the First Baptist Church, Memphis, Tennessee, May 9-13, 1867, (Baltimore: Southern Baptist Convention, 1867):62. The reader will note that indication of the Convention's session number is irregularly given in the primary sources. For a more in-depth survey of the actual division between Crawford and Hartwell, see Lamkin, "The Gospel Mission Movement," 55-64.

⁸¹This term is not meant in the same sense as it has been developed in this century, but it is interesting to note that Crawford was experimenting with methods not common to his time.

Tarleton's practice as follows:

Mr. Crawford gives his class certain lessons which they prepare at home. They come up quarterly spending a week or ten days reciting what they have learned-- read essays and hearing [sic] lectures etc. They receive no compensation but are entertained in plain style as guests while here.⁸²

Tarleton's meager success in carrying out his ideas, when subsidy systems were being used in the same general vicinity (Hartwell's practices for example), likely accounts for his eagerness to differentiate his mode of operation from those of his colleagues. The progress was slower than his peers probably because the nationals drew natural comparisons and sensed the competition between the two systems applied in such close proximity to each other. By comparison, however, it should be noted that Nevius's success was also limited in this context, but very successful later in Korea when his methods were applied

The residential school was much more in vogue among his contemporaries. T'ien-en Chao, "The Chinese Indigenous Church Movement," 50-54.

⁸²Martha Foster Crawford, "Martha Foster Crawford Diaries," July 14, 1874. Tarleton described his training process in an earlier annual report. He indicated that he had "a class of five studying for the ministry. . . . They go home and study the lessons I give them, and thus they are to go on studying and preaching without money till they are ready to be ordained . . . and look to their own people for support." Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventeenth Meeting, Held in the Baptist Church, Raleigh, North Carolina, May 9-13, 1872, (Baltimore: Southern Baptist Convention, 1872):48. The emphasis is Crawford's.

from the inception of a mission plan.⁸³ Crawford was drawing attention to his methods and critiquing others when he gave annual reports like the following:

We have never paid native preachers with mission funds. We believe the system will retard the growth of vital Christianity in China and all other heathen lands. We desire to see the church grow from the healthy root of faith in Christ and love for His cause.⁸⁴

In 1877, nearly two generations after Protestant missionaries first entered China in 1807, there was a growing awareness of the need to confer or exchange ideas among the

⁸³John L. Nevius, The Planting and Development of Missionary Churches, 4th ed (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958). The author of the foreward is not indicated but does note "that even in Dr. Nevius's own field his plans were not wholly satisfactory, . . ." Contrast that observation to the summary of his method's great success in Korea some years later. C. A. Clark, "The Presbyterian Church of Korea," in The Growing Church: "The Madras Series," Presenting Papers Based upon the Meeting of the International Missionary Council, at Tambaram, Madras, India December 12th to 29th, 1938, (Tambaram, Madras: International Missionary Council, 1939):147-150.

⁸⁴Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Twentieth Session, Held in the Citadel Square Baptist Church, Charleston, S. C., May 6-10, 1875, (Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1875):60. The author of the quotation is not specified, but it is written in the first person, and Crawford was the only one in the Teng Chow mission using the methods indicated. Elsewhere, Crawford noted the impact of having both systems side by side in the same area, "Though I employed no preachers or other religious workers, yet the whole field became so demoralized through the operations of other missionaries that the building up of self-supporting, self-acting, spriritual-minded churches became a manifest impossibility. Thus the aim of my life seemed to be checkmated." Crawford, Evolution, 38.

community of Protestant missionary expatriates.⁸⁵ Were they having similar experiences throughout China? What were the issues being faced in applying the gospel to Chinese contexts? How could they enhance mutual interaction and edification? Questions like these were on the minds of the conference attendants when they arrived in Shanghai and began the first "General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China" on May 10, 1877. The meeting ran for two weeks and touted a full agenda of papers, presentations, and worship aimed at accomplishing the Conferees' hope of compiling a set of "materials from which present and future missionaries may draw stores of valuable information; also that the circulation of these Records at home will disseminate the much important information and be instrumental in creating a deeper interest in China as a mission field."⁸⁶

The Crawfords attended the Conference and both prepared papers to address vital issues surfacing from the work in China. Martha's paper was entitled "Woman's Work for Woman," It pertained to strategies about how best to reach Chinese women and supply the need for female education. She was one of four

⁸⁵Robert Morrison (1782-1834) was the first Protestant missionary to China and he entered Canton in 1807. Latourette, *A History*, 210-212.

⁸⁶Records Of The General Conference Of The Protestant Missionaries Of China, Held At Shanghai, May 10-24, 1877, ed. M. T. Yates, R. Nelson, and E. R. Barrett (Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1878):iii.

ladies invited to present papers (not all on this particular topic). In all four cases, a male read or presented the ladies' papers, an action that sounds odd to the modern reader.

However, this was apparently a common practice in the late 1870's because of the perception of biblical injunctions against women speaking in church (I Tim. 2:11-12). An indication of this rationale appears in J. Hudson Taylor's recorded response in the time devoted to discuss both Martha's paper and the one that preceded her on the same topic. Taylor invited the ladies to speak up as these vital issues were discussed. He expressed to the audience his preference, "I wish that some of our sisters here could be induced to speak of their own work, and as our meeting is a Conference and not a church meeting, I think this would be as unobjectionable as it is desirable." Apparently his invitation was heard as shortly thereafter "Miss A. M. Fielde of the A. B. M. U." [American Baptist Missionary Union] rose and spoke.⁸⁷

⁸⁷Ibid., 155-156. It is this writer's opinion that Hyatt, in his Harvard study, has misread the way Martha and Tarleton appeared before this conference. He said that the whole scenario was an example of ways Tarleton "exploited his wife." Hyatt concluded that Martha's paper was "clearly written at her husband's urging, . . . Then in Shanghai he felt it necessary to read her paper himself, doing so in a fashion that created misunderstanding and adverse comment." Hyatt, Our Ordered Lives, 252-243. A perusal of the sources Hyatt offers indicates that Tarleton did rise to clarify a minor point in Martha's paper, but none of the recorded responses indicate her paper was ill received. In Martha's account of the Conference in her diary, also noted by Hyatt, there is a brief statement that Tarleton read her paper (as noted earlier, however, that was done for all of the ladies' presentations), but the controversial notations she made were pertaining to Tarleton's paper on native self-support. "Mr.

Tarleton's paper caused no small controversy; some of the stir was his doing, and some was not. The Conference planners inadvertently invited two papers in "opposition to paid native agency; but that it is not therefore to be inferred that the Conference is opposed to the use of such agency." The editorial committee was asked to make the clarifying note in the official records that this was an unintended mishap.⁸⁸ Crawford's title was a bit misleading, "Advantages and Disadvantages of the Employment of Native Assistants." It is misleading in that the structure of the essay is one sided. Yet, Crawford did explain why he had organized it that way. In his introduction he stated, "Since the advantages of the system have been fully appreciated by the missionaries generally, . . . I beg to direct attention, in this Essay [sic], to the neglected side of the question, and to point out very briefly some of its leading evils."⁸⁹

Crawford read my Essay on 'Woman's work for Woman' [sic]--and his own on 'The employment of Assistants'. His called forth some strong opposition also strong support." "Martha Foster Crawford Diaries," September 6, 1877.

⁸⁸Records Of The General Conference, 21.

⁸⁹Ibid., 323-324. Crawford's presumption that the "pro" position was well understood, accepted, and being applied is substantiated by the consternation it caused when two "con" papers appeared on the agenda without the other side being presented. Additionally, a later observer documents just how pervasive the practice was by providing a statistical summary showing that "throughout the 1876 to 1949 period, on the average 88.75 percent of the total Chinese evangelistic task force were unordained assistants who were under the employment of foreign missions." T'ien-en Chao, "The Chinese Indigenous Church Movement," 47.

In his essay, Crawford carefully argued against the subsidy system by pointing out that it may have gained what appeared to be quantitative success without much concern for the qualitative development of the Chinese Christians. Crawford argued that while working toward the goal of external trappings, the subsidy system simultaneously undermined the essence of Christianity, namely individual worth and responsibility before God in a direct relationship.⁹⁰ Crawford focused his criticism on the way in which the entire system affected the local church in China.

Yet in China the Bishop, Pastor, or a Committee of Missionaries as the case may be, furnishes the money, appoints, directs, and dismisses the assistants or native preachers at pleasure, as mere employers, without consulting the church. In short, I fear the tendency of the system in every respect, and feel in [sic] duty bound to raise a warning voice against its longer continuance. . . . We have tried the employment plan for a long time without success. Let us therefore exchange it for the self-supporting one, and see what will be the effect. Let the revolution, beginning from this Conference, go forward. . . .⁹¹

⁹⁰T'ien-en Chao, "The Chinese Indigenous Church Movement," 90 concludes a section outlining how the employment system kept the Chinese church from developing a sense of self-worth and that only within the independent churches, which formed after the turn of the century, did a sense of "Chinese identity, . . . [emerge] which motivated the Chinese Protestants to assume responsibility for church development."

⁹¹Records Of The General Conference, 328. Crawford later responded to another discussion about native self-support in the Conference and was convinced that there were many listening to the ideas that he and others advocated, "I am rejoiced however to find since coming to this Conference, that the tide is turning among the missionaries in favor of the voluntary principle of labor. Let the reformation go on." p. 295.

Controversial as his paper may have been, it was, nonetheless, stimulating much productive debate. The Foreign Mission Board report to the Convention the year following the Conference recorded a summary of Crawford's essay, and a critique of its reception, that had been published in the Shanghai periodical, "Celestial Empire." The unnamed journalist concluded that, "The paper was received with much greater favor than Mr. Crawford apparently had expected, as he was warmly cheered at its close."⁹² The Conference gave Crawford hope that his ideas were being well received.

Enthusiasm faded when his health began to suffer. As early as 1873-1874, Martha reported that "Mr. Crawford's health is giving us great uneasiness." Again, she wrote that by 1878 it was necessary for Tarleton to return to the United States to regain his health. "Yesterday my dear husband left--perhaps for America. We all saw that a change was absolutely necessary. He goes expecting to remain a while in Japan--then to California--perhaps then to the East [likely she meant the Eastern United States] he knows not where."⁹³ Tarleton did return to America

⁹²Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Session of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held with the First Baptist Church, Nashville, May 9-13, 1878, (Nashville: Southern Baptist Convention, 1878):48-49.

⁹³Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings of the Nineteenth Session of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held at the Baptist Church, Jefferson, Texas, May 7-11, 1874, (Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1874):34 and "Martha Foster Crawford Diaries," June 22, 1878.

and toured extensively while there attempting to secure a hearing for his ideas about native self-support to any and all who would listen. He suggested to "all the Protestant Boards in America, either in person or by letter, . . ." that a meeting like the one in Shanghai in 1877 be held to discuss policies and strategies for the use of funds in promoting missions, especially in field applications. Almost every Board replied with much interest, and the Southern Baptists even delegated their recording secretary, Dr. Tupper, to be a representative at such a meeting. Alas, "It never assembled."⁹⁴

1880-1889

Undaunted by the fact that such a national level meeting in America was never held, Crawford returned to China in July of 1879. He was convinced as much as ever that he had to move ahead with the work along the lines he believed to be not only biblical, but the most practicable for the long term health of the resultant churches. At this juncture, Crawford began to extrapolate his thinking beyond the simple application of mission or foreign money to churches. He saw similar problems with establishing, and then perpetually financing institutions of foreign character, educational or otherwise, with external funds. The Chinese finished the curricula of mission schools and then expected religious employment. Hence, the same problem as with the pastoral subsidy system, but routed through the

⁹⁴Crawford, Evolution, 46-47.

humanitarian institutions of the mission. Martha had assumed most of the load while Tarleton was in America (1878-1879) and expanded her school work. The heavier loads almost ruined her health. She and Tarleton discussed the matter upon his return. They decided that since she had not been on furlough back in her homeland for twenty-two years, and her health warranted such, she should return. She was gone to the United States from October of 1881 to July 1883.⁹⁵ During that time frame, Tarleton assumed responsibility for managing the schools. His suspicions about the outcomes of these enterprises was confirmed as he became more involved in their operations. He observed the cultural extraction effect the schools were having on the boys when they finished their training. "It had become evident to his [Tarleton's] mind that young men educated in mission boarding schools were unfit to make their way among their countrymen. They must look alone to foreign employment as teachers, doctors, or preachers."⁹⁶ Tarleton took steps to salvage the schools by refocusing the expected outcome. He introduced English into the curriculum pointing the graduates toward employment with the emerging business interests in China that would require use of that language, and gradual implementation of a fee schedule leading to self-sufficiency for

⁹⁵Poster, Fifty Years, 183-191.

⁹⁶Ibid., 187.



the schools.⁹⁷

Crawford's reforms were, in one sense, "stop gap" measures trying to forestall the conclusion that perhaps the mission community ought to abandon the concept of free educational institutions and focus specifically on evangelistic efforts. Earlier, Martha commented on the fact that because they both were involved in separate circles of activities, they were not as united in their lives as they were formerly. They even sensed a growing distance between them.

At Shanghai [1852-1863] we always worked together--here the work has been different and we have drifted apart. We both saw it and wished to remedy it. We must try to return if possible to the old plan & work more together--he in mine & I in his. He thought this would require the disbanding of my school. I should deplore this--the very thought of it seemed like amputating all my limbs--I hardly think it necessary--but if it is I am ready for the amputation.⁹⁸

Approximately four years later, however, she saw the philosophical and methodological issues Tarleton had raised clearly enough to write him, while she was in America, and

⁹⁷Ibid., 188-189. Crawford justified the action in his annual report, "The English language is in great and growing demand in China, as in all other parts of Asia; and by adding it to the curriculum we hope to be able to throw the support of our schools upon the natives instead of on the Board--an end long and intensely desired by us." Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings Twenty-seventh Annual Session of the Southern Baptist Convention Held with the Church in Greenville, S. C., May 10-14, 1882, (Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1882):62.

⁹⁸"Martha Foster Crawford Diaries", March 2, 1878.

concede that perhaps the schools needed to close.⁹⁹

In 1883, a publication detailing how a non-subsidy system had been implemented by the American Baptists in Burma came to light and renewed Tarleton's hope of pressing upon the Foreign Mission Board his ideas about indigeneity and native self-sufficiency. The Board went to the expense of mailing copies of the book to most of its field force.¹⁰⁰ He mobilized himself for another trip to America once again to attempt to put the issues before the Board. He presumed receiving the book from the Board meant they were beginning to think along the same lines, "The fact that our Board had sent me and their other missionaries a copy of Carpenter's book led me to suppose they wished to prepare our minds for the adoption of a native self-support policy." Hence, in March of 1885, Crawford "set out from Tung Chow to the United States determined to do my best to bring it

⁹⁹In 1917, C. W. Pruitt wrote out his thoughts about his early days on the field with Tarleton and noted that while Martha was in America from 1881-1883, he and Halcomb, another new missionary, roomed with Crawford. On a given day "he [Tarleton] received a letter from his wife which made him very happy . . ." C. W. Pruitt, "Recollections of Dr. T. P. Crawford and Wife," (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, 1917) Crawford file, handwritten page 3. This was the letter in which Martha conceded the need to move away from the schools. Pruitt and Halcomb, had "arrived soon after Mrs. Crawford's departure, . . ." Foster, Fifty Years, 188.

¹⁰⁰The publication that so excited and influenced Tarleton was C. H. Carpenter, Self-Support, Illustrated in the History of the Bassein Karen Mission from 1840-1880 (Boston: Rand and Avery, 1883).

to an end."¹⁰¹ In May he had reached the western coast of America and traveled eastward to Texas. He visited various family members and friends working his way on to Richmond. His prior visit back home in 1878-1879, had stirred up discussion about his then rather novel ideas of native self-support.¹⁰²

Arrangements were made for Tarleton to appear before the Board the "first Monday in October." He did rise to speak just after they had finished their business agenda. He "asked permission to lay the object of my visit before them, which was at once granted."¹⁰³ Crawford asked to be able to present the details of his plan to a sub-committee first, and then to the Board as a whole. This schedule was readily agreed to and several days later Crawford met with the smaller committee in the same board room. The follow-up meeting with the Board was then scheduled for October 27, 1885. To insure that his points were understood, Crawford "took the precaution to reduce them to writing and to read them in their hearing."¹⁰⁴ He rounded out his presentation with a proposed resolution.

¹⁰¹Crawford, Evolution, 43. Foster, Fifty Years, 203-204.

¹⁰²Crawford, Evolution, 45-47.

¹⁰³Ibid., 47.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 49. The speech is recorded in on pps. 49-56.

*Resolved, That the Board will adopt provisionally the policy of confining their appropriations to the support of the missionaries and their evangelistic work, detailing the manner of its application thereto in printed regulations, to be submitted to the missionaries and also to the Southern Baptist Convention for consideration and suggestions, with a view to ultimate adoption by all parties.*¹⁰⁵

In essence, Crawford suggested that the Board go through the cathartic process of breaking completely away from a dependency oriented system. This would have meant that fields already established on a subsidy system would have to move away from that model and any new works would start with a native self-support model. Representatives from two of the Board's other fields were in these meetings and voiced opposition to Crawford's ideas, predicting a calamity if applied boldly in their respective countries of service. The Board opted, instead, to set the ideal of self-support forth as a desirable goal for all field personnel to move toward, but they were reluctant to establish it as a cardinal principle to be globally applied to the Board's work.¹⁰⁶

By design then, the Board joined the trends in mission thinking of their day regarding foreign support for mission work.¹⁰⁷ Had the Board committee left well enough alone, things

¹⁰⁵Ibid., 56.

¹⁰⁶Crawford, Evolution, 60-62.

¹⁰⁷See above the discussion about, and reaction to, Tarleton's essay prepared for the May 1877 General Missionary Conference in Shanghai, especially footnote 90 of this dissertation.

may have been different, but they went further and enacted restrictions on Crawford and his relationship to the churches of the Southern Baptist Convention. He was not in attendance at the meeting where the Board acted. The Board dispatched two representatives to show him the record of their actions and to relay to him the Board's desire that he "not advocate my [his] views of self-support and mission methods before the churches, but to return to China as soon as possible, or words to that effect."¹⁰⁸

While en route to Richmond, Crawford spoke at various churches throughout the southwest sections of America. Apparently he had already been speaking to the churches about the self-support system, enough to prompt an editorial response to his ideas. The meetings with the Board took place in October and November of 1885. Yet, Crawford wrote a letter to the editor of a Baptist state paper dated November 7, 1885 to clarify some issues raised by an editorial in the Texas Baptist paper. The conflict was over whether, when presenting his views in Texas, Tarleton had inadvertently said disparaging things about the Canton mission's ways of doing their work, and by consequence, had cast doubt on the missionaries working in that mission. Crawford responded by emphasizing that he had "never attacked the Canton Mission, its missionaries, or its work. . . . I know that attacking missions, Boards and persons is not my mode

¹⁰⁸Crawford, Evolution, 63.

of proceeding. It is the subsidizing system, or too free use of foreign money in our Christian mission work, that I oppose."¹⁰⁹ At this point it is sufficient to note that Crawford had already begun speaking of these ideas in the churches before having the meetings with the Board and being told to not do so.

During his meetings with the Board, Crawford introduced yet another concept that challenged the Board's *modus operandi*. He began speaking about doing away with mission structures per se. This surfaces again as one of the Gospel Mission's core values but under the headings of "self-denying labors" and church autonomy. Crawford saw that two of his ideas intersect at one major junction. The trend toward more field bureaucracy would inhibit even further the missionary's accountability to the churches and cause unhealthy competition on the field.¹¹⁰

The Board responded with an official pronouncement of its right to set up such structures and to define the ways such they should operate.

The Board shall have the right to constitute the missionaries of a station, or district, into a mission, to act as their agent within the limits

¹⁰⁹T. P. Crawford, "Self-Support in China: or Mr. Simmons' Article in the Issue of October 29th," Letter to the Editor (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, November 7, 1885) Crawford File. The state paper to which Crawford was writing is not identified.

¹¹⁰See Crawford, Evolution, 24-25 and 62. In the former reference he outlines his major missiological convictions, in the latter he notes the way the Board responded to his ideas regarding the dissolution of bureaucratic structures on the field.

assigned, or to hold each missionary directly responsible to the Board, or, in a given district, to constitute several independent missions, with a missionary, conveniently located, to act as treasurer for them all.¹¹¹

As his ideas regarding this motif were developing, Crawford wrote a letter to the Board's secretary, Dr. Tupper, just before the series of meetings with the Board in which he presented his self-support views. The letter provides more information about his understanding of the way field interaction between missionaries should have taken place. Crawford argued for operational autonomy for "every ordained minister of the gospel" and for such to be "exempt from the authoritative control of others and unhampered in his ministrations." However, he did affirm that these missionaries should be accountable to the churches that sent them and they should "be subject to the laws of mutual dependence, helpfulness, and submissive one to another as laid down by Christ and his apostles."¹¹² He wrote Tupper in great detail expounding his ideas about how the organized meetings of field missionaries ought to be conducted.

"'Missions' or organized legislative bodies will be discontinued and in their stead associated missionaries shall hold annual

¹¹¹Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings (Thirty-First Session--Forty-First Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held in the Meeting-House of the First Baptist Church, Montgomery, Alabama, May 7-11, 1886, (Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1886):XXV.

¹¹²T. P. Crawford, "Letter to Dr. Tupper," (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, September 8, 1885) Crawford File.

meetings for general acquaintance with each other's work, for consultations and unions of effort in extending the Redeemers [sic] Kingdom among the peoples; . . ."¹¹³ In this correspondence, Crawford sounded like he was advocating an administrative structure based on mutual trust and autonomy not unlike that advocated by Taylor and the China Inland Mission.¹¹⁴ Crawford continued his journey across the eastern seaboard of the United States and departed for China on September 23, 1886, arriving back in Teng Chow in December.¹¹⁵

Mrs. Crawford showed similar convictions at about the same time. In February of 1888, she drafted a history of the Baptist work in Shantung Province. She wrote it for presentation in "Chefoo China" and copied it to a supporting group in "Jackson, Miss. [Mississippi]," primarily intended to stir up new recruits for the cause in China. She compared and contrasted their

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Howard Taylor noted that the absence of certain topics in Hudson's writings is significant. "There is no mention even of a Committee, no reliance upon organisation or great names. . . . He [Hudson] had simply learned from painful experience how much a missionary may have to suffer, and the work be hampered, if not imperiled, by being under the control of those who, however well-intentioned, have no first-hand knowledge of its conditions, and are, moreover, at the other side of the world."Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor, Hudson Taylor and the China Inland Mission: The Growth of a Work of God, 1st ed. (London: Lutterworth, 1918):43. Crawford shared these concerns, but founded his ideas in his understanding of the authority of local churches over that of mission boards or committees.

¹¹⁵See Appendix A.

"simple evangelistic labors" with those heavily laden with dependency models of sister missions, both through hiring of native assistants and establishing institutions. Martha noted "It is our aim to evangelize the masses and encourage the growing up in a natural way of a native form of Christian education and civilization."¹¹⁶ Martha not only echoed Tarleton's basic values, but she enhanced the understanding of a direct influence from the China Inland Missions' convictions and practices, even their simple administrative structures. Peers on the field began to document the results of the Crawfords' methods. "In the better elements in our churches here there can be seen distinctly a spirit of healthy independence and self-reliance, a spirit of spontaneous faith, a personal rejection of the parasitic position as dishonoring to God and to man."¹¹⁷ It

¹¹⁶"Martha Foster Crawford Diaries," February 11, 1888. Martha goes on to note the basic methods used by the China Inland Mission to inspire greater numbers of volunteers to invest their lives in China. She observed that "Their plan is to dwell in native houses, dress in Chinese costume and live in as simple a manner as is consistent with health." Their simple methods empowered them to accumulate a sizeable field force and to engage in evangelistic endeavors "without a single foreign built dwelling, chapel or school, while avoiding a display of such parts of our civilization as offends the native taste. The Chinese have a civilization of their own and need not, cannot take our type of it."

¹¹⁷Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings (Thirty-Second Session--Forty-Second Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held In the Meeting-House of the Broadway Baptist Church, Louisville, KY., May 6-10, 1887, (Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1887):X. The author of this statement was C. W. Pruitt, a recent arrival to Shantung Province that was greatly impressed with the work the Crawfords had established using their peculiar methods. Interestingly, however, Pruitt did not join in

is significant to note that the ideas espoused by the Crawfords were not completely novel to the times, but were calling on the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board to embrace methods that were radically different from prior practices.

By the Spring of 1889, Tarleton had grown increasingly unhealthy. On the thirty-seventh anniversary of their work in China, he wrote a letter to the treasurer of the North China Mission resigning from the active engagement of field work in Teng Chow "to retire from them [his labors] and look after my health" Tarleton was quick to emphasize that he was not wanting to "sever my connection with the Board or with the Mission, but only to retire from the service (of the Board)." His wife's status was to remain intact. He noted "she will continue to draw her half of our salary, or \$515, with the appropriations for her work as usual, but hereafter, in her own name, . . ."¹¹⁸ Later, the Board noted that Tarleton's services were "voluntary," yet he continued to engage in evangelization in the streets and villages accompanied by Board personnel.¹¹⁹

with the Gospel Mission band when it formed in 1892. His views present a candid perspective untainted by any devotion to the Crawfords per se.

¹¹⁸Crawford, Evolution, 93-94. The broader context of the letter lets the treasurer know that the constant struggles with competing views and methods were taking their toll on him. The implication is that he would try to regain his health and continue experimenting with his methods without Board responsibilities.

¹¹⁹Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings (Thirty-Sixth Session--Forty-Sixth Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held In the Opera-House at Birmingham, Alabama, May 8-12, 1891,



Eventually Tarleton's health deteriorated enough that his doctor told him to return to America again to recuperate. Martha wrote a letter to Dr. Tupper stating that, "My husband has written you of his retirement from the burdens and responsibilities of the work here. He will leave for the United States about the 23rd of the present month [April 1889]. . . . He goes with the urgent advice of his physician, . . ."¹²⁰ The decade of the 1880's was very decisive for Tarleton. His principles and methods reached a fuller state of maturity, were presented before the authorities of the Board, not recognized as worthy of global acceptance, his health began to break, and he discontinued formal service with the Board. The next decade proved to be even more cataclysmic.

Taianfu Period: 1894-1909

1890-1899

Tarleton's visit home was short lived. He arrived on the western coast of America and traveled inland across the country. He only went eastward as far as Texas. There he spent most of his time "resticating [sic] with relatives and recuperating his impaired strength." He attended several association meetings

(Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1891):XIX.

¹²⁰Martha Foster Crawford, "Letter to Dr. Tupper," (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 13, 1889) Crawford File.

and the Convention meeting in May of the following year.¹²¹ At the end of the Convention, he "set out for China, reaching . . . Tung Chow some time in July, 1890."¹²² While this journey was not profitable for the development of his ideas among the churches in the United States, it was restful and helped him regain good health.

Disappointments during his stay, were overshadowed by events surrounding his trip. When he arrived in Shanghai in 1889 to depart for America, he visited the missionaries of the Board's Central China Mission and discovered them "earnestly discussing a new departure." Their concerns were similar to Crawford's in that they desired a closer affiliation to the host cultures of the Chinese and saw their excessive salaries and western lifestyles a hindrance.¹²³ Among these Central China missionaries was D. W. Herring. Just as Tarleton departed for America, a new batch of young missionaries arrived in the Teng

¹²¹Foster, Fifty Years, 209. Foster observed that upon arrival in Texas, Tarleton's views on the way local churches in the United States should relate to the movements on the field were only sketchy, but developed enough to attempt to engage the pastors and leaders in discussions about the "church method" of doing missions. The interaction with those churches and associations was less than satisfactory. Tarleton was dejected as he surmised the churches to be "entirely out of harmony, both in spirit and in practice, with our Baptist Christianity." He "felt miserable in view of the tendency of things among us." Crawford, Evolution, 104.

¹²²Crawford, Evolution, 105.

¹²³Foster, Fifty Years, 226-227.

Chow area to begin their careers. Among them were G. P. Bostick and T. J. League. Both men came to the field and engaged the work without direct orientation by Crawford. However, soon after the veteran missionary's return in July of 1890, Crawford's ideas were topics of considerable interest to them. They grew convinced of the value of the native self-support system.

Bostick did not come to agree with Crawford easily though. He came to the field with set negative impressions of Tarleton because of the reputation Crawford had for promoting odd ideas. Later, when Tarleton came under direct attack from the Board, Bostick wrote out his reflections about his initial impressions and how he shifted in opinion.

I desire now to say that I and the other young missionaries coming here recently have come with an idea that Dr. Crawford was about half crazy, and I believe that all of them would unite with me in saying that this aged servant of God is badly misunderstood and grossly misrepresented at home. . . . I was surprised to find that I could get along so easily with him. This erroneous idea about Dr. C. seems to be in the atmosphere at home, . . . I wish to say that coming in contact with him, strongly prejudiced against him as I was, and having lived with him for a year and a half, gives me a right to an opinion about the man.¹²⁴

¹²⁴G. P. Bostick, "Letter to the Editor," The Biblical Recorder, July 20, 1892:1. In an earlier letter, Bostick expounds on the method Crawford used to introduce him to the self-help model. Crawford served as a mentor to Bostick by walking into culture scenes with him, showing him by live case examples the grounds for the model, and Tarleton cast vision about how the principles could be applied if given a proper trial. G. P. Bostick, "Letter from China," The Biblical Recorder, May 20, 1891:3.

Inspired by the apparent enthusiasm of the new missionaries, and many of the elders too (especially that of Miss. Lottie Moon), Crawford led the mission to set forth its principles for conducting mission work together as the Board's North China Mission. The Mission gathered and decided that such a document would not be issued unless "by unanimous vote."¹²⁵ The document appears in virtually the same form in at least two publications; minutes of the Convention, and in the North Carolina Baptist paper. In Crawford's biographical summary of his mission ideas, he only emphasized the self-support principle as the core of the document.¹²⁶

The document's preface, as it appeared in the Convention's minutes of 1891, provided a rationale for its issuance. It was "to harmonize the views and unify the work of the several stations of this mission. . . ."¹²⁷ The Mission personnel entitled the document "Articles of Agreement Adopted by the American Southern Baptists, Shantung Province, China."¹²⁸ The

¹²⁵Crawford, Evolution, 107.

¹²⁶Ibid., for the latter. For the former documents see Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings May 8-12, 1891, XVIII-XIX and G. P. Bostick and T. J. League, Committee for the Mission, "North China Mission in a Nutshell." The Biblical Recorder, February 11, 1891, 6.

¹²⁷Convention, Proceedings May 8-12, 1891, XVIII.

¹²⁸Ibid. See Appendix B for the text as it appeared in the Convention minutes.

values reflected in this document were a precursor set of those expressed by the Gospel Missioners a few years later. Almost all of the signatories of the document eventually joined the ranks of the Gospel Mission Movement. Notable exceptions were Lottie Moon, C. W. Pruitt, and Annie S. Pruitt.

The eight points of the "Articles of Agreement" reflected Crawford's cardinal principle of native self-support, both on an individual and corporate or institutional level. The aim was to encourage a balanced autonomy and accountability between the missionaries by encouraging a sense of interdependence with the churches that sent them. At the same time, the document urged missionaries to engage the process of planting churches in a way that fostered the same autonomy for indigenous Chinese congregations as churches in America enjoyed. The desired outcome was

. . . to see earnest, self-acting Baptist churches gradually rise throughout the land, under the guidance of God-called native ministers of the Word. In order to this end, and to cut off 'pecuniary expectation'--a great hindrance to the progress of the truth--we will hereafter use no mission or public money in the work beyond our personal and itinerating expenses, including necessary religious books and tracts, except that aid may be extended to struggling churches in rare cases. . . .¹²⁹

The sub-points elaborated on the autonomy, or self-support principle by having missionaries to agree to work along corollary lines in opening new stations, not fostering

¹²⁹Ibid.

institutionalization tendencies, to hold annual meetings designed to consider "estimates for the coming year and for the transaction of other business of common concern," and to not inflict any type of "ecclesiastical power nor any jurisdiction in matters not specified."¹³⁰ Hence, two of the core values of the later Gospel Mission Movement are reflected in this document; indigeneity and autonomy (both as part of the indigenous development of the national churches and the missionary's relationship to the sending constituency). These convictions matured as these ideals merged with the innovations of Herring and the Central China Mission regarding missionary lifestyle values. The Board reacted by passing a resolution to "bid our brethren and sisters of Shantung Godspeed in all efforts to promote the efficiency of their work for the Master, . . ."¹³¹

Had things moved along these lines exclusively, the Gospel Mission Movement might have never formed. A key to the emerging model was the missionary's sense of direct, personalized responsibility linked to local congregations in America. While in the United States in 1889-1890, Tarleton spoke with various leaders in Texas about churches supporting missionaries directly. He met with virtually no favorable response to the

¹³⁰Ibid.

¹³¹Ibid.

idea.¹³² The concept might have died out for lack of interest had Bostick, a new missionary, not received a letter from a church in North Carolina that "had decided to support a missionary in North China."¹³³ Tarleton sensed that other churches might follow the same course if they understood the reasons for such a move and saw how the model could function in concert with the Board. He envisioned a system whereby the missionary's authority, support, and accountability would be drawn from the sending churches directly while the Board would facilitate and coordinate the cooperative efforts of the churches. Restructuring administration of joint mission efforts would, simply put, shift the focus onto the churches and away from the Board without intentionally diminishing the Board's significance as the coordinating agency of collective mission efforts by the churches. In early 1892, Tarleton published his pamphlet entitled, Churches, To The Front!, to elaborate these concerns. His principles would, however, mean that the Board must be willing to reformat its role to one of facilitation and not ecclesiastical control. As one might imagine, these ideas provided the bases for strong negative reactions because they were considered threatening to the Board. The Landmark elements saw an opportunity and moved to capitalize on sentiments

¹³²Foster, Fifty Years, 228.

¹³³Ibid., 229.

expressed in Crawford's booklet.¹³⁴

The Board did react. In the Convention's session of May 1892, it is noted that some missionaries had lost spouses on the field, others had retired, and "Dr. T. P. Crawford's name, also, will no longer appear on our list of missionaries."¹³⁵ Within one brief year, Martha resigned in protest over her husband's removal from the official roster of Board missionaries, several other field missionaries resigned to join Tarleton in trying a new approach, and Hartwell (Tarleton's ideological adversary) returned to Shantung, coming by request of the Board out of an assignment among Chinese in America. Hartwell was to restore order by causing "a peaceful separation between our mission and what is called 'The Gospel Mission,' which will be promotive

¹³⁴Ibid. 229. The reader should recall that Crawford did attempt to present these ideas to the Board, along with his self-support ideas, in 1885 and was told to not speak to the churches about these concepts (although he had already done so during his travels to the Board). Also, remember there were parallels between this model and the administrative structures of the China Inland Mission. Crawford thought the organizational mechanism was in place, albeit not due to Landmark affiliations. He thought this could be done by simply utilizing the decision of the Convention in its 1859 session to allow for individual churches to support their own missionaries and flow the funds and facilitation for such through the Board. See Southern Baptist Convention. Proceedings May 6-10, 1859, 95-96.

¹³⁵Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings (Thirty-Seventh Session--Forty-Seventh Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention Held with the Churches of Atlanta, Georgia, May 6-10, 1892. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1892:XXXVII.

[sic] of the most harmony possible, and be for the best interest of the cause of truth and the Prince of Peace."¹³⁶

Herring's Resignation

Tarleton could not shape his ideas into the Gospel Mission Movement in isolation. The new missionaries whom he had influenced, and genuinely seemed to share his essential convictions regarding the way mission work should be engaged, were the likely colleagues in the formation of such an entity. They were the principal leaders that joined together and helped consolidate efforts to try something new within Southern Baptist circles. Herring, and to a lesser extent, Bostick and King were significant movers in the development of the Gospel Mission as well.

Herring was born in 1858, a native of North Carolina. He entered Wake Forest College in 1879 and graduated three years later. Upon graduation, he pursued further studies at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Kentucky, finishing three years afterwards. He was appointed as a Board missionary to China on June 4, 1885. China was where he "preferred" to go largely due to the influence of Yates, the veteran missionary in

¹³⁶Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings (Thirty-Eighth Session--Forty-Eighth Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention Held with the Churches of Nashville, Tennessee, May 12-16, 1893. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1893:II-III. See "Mrs. Crawford's Resignation," The Foreign Mission Journal 24 (November, 1892): 97-101, for Martha's letter to the Board expressing her grief over the action taken to remove her husband's name, tendering her own resignation, and the editor's attempt to explain the Board's actions in the context of her husband's radical ideas.

Central China, who was also a graduate of Wake Forest College.¹³⁷

The Herrings set sail for China on December 10, 1885, headed for service with the Central China Mission.¹³⁸ Like most newly arriving missionaries, China overwhelmed Herring, especially the newness (to him) of the Chinese cultures into which he had stepped. As he acquired the language and absorbed things around him, he began to assess mission methodologies. Two prominent factors were early impressed on his thinking; assuming a Chinese lifestyle (especially dress) and the interior sections of China where there was little or no gospel influence.¹³⁹

Crawford attributed the development of the native dress, or incarnational, ideas within the Gospel Mission band to Herring. Crawford implied that Herring was present during the time he was

¹³⁷H. A. Tupper, A Decade of Foreign Missions: 1880-1890 (Richmond: Foreign Mission Board of The Southern Baptist Convention, 1891):413-414. Tupper recorded Herring's birth year erroneously as 1838. This skewed calculations for his life's development. Additionally, his daughter recorded 1858 as the correct birth year in Celia Herring Middleton, Memories of A Lifetime (Raleigh: privately printed, 1988):preface.

¹³⁸Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings, May 7-11, 1886, XXV. The Herrings established themselves quickly because they already had time to arrive, join a local Baptist Church, and write a letter to his home church in North Carolina requesting transfer his membership, "Voted that Rev. D. W. Herring be granted a letter of recommendation and a letter of dismission [sic] to join the Baptist church at Shanghai, China." Wake Forest (North Carolina) Baptist Church, Minutes, (July 21, 1886): 159.

¹³⁹Crawford, Evolution, 97-98 and Foster, Fifty Years, 226-230.



en route back to the United States in Spring of 1889 and encountered the Central China Mission in serious discussion about donning Chinese attire, living in simpler housing, and reducing their salaries to be more lifestyle relevant in Chinese contexts.¹⁴⁰ In the spring of 1891, Herring made an extensive tour into China's vast interior to scout out possible locations suitable for establishing a new mission work. Crawford noted that, besides Herring's concern for the spread of the gospel into zones where it was not yet heard, he also wanted to find virgin areas to establish mission structures not tainted by the subsidy system. Herring had been favorably impressed with the ways and means of doing mission fostered by Taylor and his China Inland Mission. While touring the interior, he came more directly in contact with some of their folk. One Mr. Grainger, a British missionary with that mission, particularly influenced Herring. While walking together in the city of "Chengtu" (likely Chengdu), Grainger described the values of their mission and Herring affirmed the positive influence they had on his thinking. He even commented on the differences in the depth of the conversions that seem to accrue from using their methods. In speaking to Grainger he said, "I've talked with several who know of your work and that in Changsha. They all say your converts are *dao-di* (lit., 'to the bottom,' or genuine)." Grainger replied that one reason for such success was because

¹⁴⁰Ibid.

"there has been so little monetary inducement, that not many are drawn in by filthy lucre. But it isn't easy to live like the Chinese. . . ."141

After his inland tour, Herring's thinking began merging more fully with the sentiments of Crawford and others in the North China Mission.¹⁴² Herring was inspired by a set of experiences; observing the methods and successes of the China Inland Mission, coming into contact with Crawford's ideas, and seeing China's vast interior for himself. He concisely stated his mission principles in a time of simple family discussion, as noted by his daughter.

First, we can't expect to deliver Christians in exchange for dollars here, any more than in America. Second, we should be allowed to dress as the Chinese do--at least in the interior. Third, to be truly democratic, the laymen at home--not just the members of the Board--should feel the burden of responsibility for the work. Direct support by the churches seems to be the answer to this problem, and I don't feel that it should fracture the denominational machinery to try it, at least. Fourth, it's up to us to communicate not only the assets but also the liabilities of the work.¹⁴³

¹⁴¹Susan Herring Jefferies, Papa Wore No Halo (Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 1963):53-54, 51. The author of this book was Herring's daughter who spent most of her youth in China with her parents.

¹⁴²Although Herring agreed in principle with Crawford's ideas, he was hesitant to "be a separatist," to break from the Board. Yet, he also was aware that if the Board would not listen to "the facts of life out here, the missionary is driven to that very kind of action." Ibid., 59-60.

¹⁴³Ibid., 61. Herring elaborated these seminal ideas much more indepth, yet essentially the same, years later. See D. W. Herring, "The Meaning of the Gospel Mission Movement," in The

Herring was overwhelmed with a sense of need to return to the United States and put his ideas before the Board. He sailed in March 1892.¹⁴⁴ Well into the voyage, Herring posted a letter to the Baptist paper in his home state of North Carolina. He described the basic rationale for his return, explained how his duties were being discharged in his absence, and portrayed to the readers the scene that occurred the day he departed China when the national brethren gathered to see him off. He was concerned that they would not understand his reasons for going but was amazed when they responded to his ideas so positively. He described his plan to them and was encouraged by their reaction. He noted that he had

. . . never heard them pray for this object so earnestly before. . . . They already knew, but not so fully then, that we were proposing to start a work in the interior with a view to living amongst the people in native houses and native dress, doing nothing but preach the gospel, and asking no more of the people at home than a support for ourselves. It does my soul good to see how they appreciate the idea.¹⁴⁵

Herring arrived in America. Soon he set about the business of recruiting new workers for China and explaining to Board

Crisis of the Churches: A Collection of Earnest Articles and Extracts from Earnest Men on Matters of Vital Concern to Baptists, ed. T. P. Crawford (Chefoo: n. p., 1894):114-128.

¹⁴⁴Foster, Fifty Years, 230.

¹⁴⁵D. W. Herring, "Rev. D. W. Herring Coming Home," The Biblical Recorder, April 6, 1892, 7.

leaders the plan. He requested an audience with them and was granted a meeting on June 7, 1892. During the spring of that year, there had been a flurry of events surrounding the resignations of Bostick and others associated with the Crawfords' views. Herring himself voyaged home in spite of the Board's official recommendation for him to wait. For whatever reason, Herring came anyway, at his own expense, to make sure his opinions were fully heard.

As might be expected, when Herring arrived in Richmond for the meeting, he found the Board members predisposed to be closed about his ideas and only offered him a chance "to apologize for coming home despite the refusal of the Board to comply with his request to return at this time."¹⁴⁶ The ensuing discussion raised critical issues surrounding the breach with the Board. There were questions about means of support, the rightful authority or role of the Board in relation to the field missionaries, wearing of native garb, and hopes of entering the interior of China. All were laid on the table for discussion. Several enlightening comments were made which help one understand why this particular set of missionaries, and their ideas, seemed to rankle the Board members so much.

In one series of exchanges over the wisdom of adopting Chinese dress Tupper, the Board secretary, indicated that the

¹⁴⁶Jefferies, Papa Wore, 82-83. Jefferies provides a flowing description of the meeting with the precision of an oral transcript showing how point and counterpoint were expressed.

Board felt it unwise to adopt such traits because "In time, they [the Chinese] will see that our methods are superior." This prompted Herring to focus on the underlying issue that influenced the whole discussion. After all, the methods were not so much issues for the Board as was the question of whether these upstart missionaries were going to be subordinate to the Board's authority. Herring asked them to realize that they were grown men with good educations. Additionally, they were right there in the midst of the Chinese and could be trusted to reason their way to right methods for that context. This point is exactly the allowance the Board made to Crawford in 1885; namely that he was free to enact his principles locally, but that they would not make them general policy. Now, Herring was instructed not to do so even in his own ministry setting. Herring responded to the Board members by emphasizing that "We aren't your servants, gentlemen. We are the servants of the Lord. There is quite a difference." Shortly after that poignant moment, a Board member revealed what was truly in the minds of the other members. "The Landmarkists are making things very difficult for us. Why have an elected Board at all, if we're to have no authority in the situation? As I said before, even Baptists need authority of some kind."¹⁴⁷ Herring assured them that field personnel indeed see the need for authority but they

¹⁴⁷Here is another indication that the Board members were assessing the motives of these field missionaries and drawing links to the Landmark Movement that were not necessarily the Gospel Missioners' intent, especially Crawford and Herring.

want to root it in "the church that supports me." The Board would then be a conduit through which the churches would assume their rightful role as the ordained means for accomplishing the mission mandate. Herring finally saw the futility of continuing the discussions and sadly rose to depart. He recounted how he had pled with others in the North China Mission to not resign from the Board so quickly; to not give up on the "democratic methods of Baptists. . . ." By the end of that fateful meeting, however, he emphasized that "I still believe in them [democratic principles]. I believe in them so thoroughly that I'm forced to resign from the Board in order to practice them. Good day, gentlemen."¹⁴⁸

Within nine days, Herring issued a letter explaining his actions to his fellow Baptists in North Carolina. He concluded that "I was compelled, on conscientious grounds, to offer my resignation. . . ."¹⁴⁹ The Board also published a response explaining their willingness to accept Herring's resignation. They outlined three grounds for the breach in relations. First, they took issue with Herring's apparent insubordination regarding his journey back to America. Second, the Board deemed Herring's ideas (and those of others in China) as radical and unorthodox. They summarized Herring's principles as follows:

¹⁴⁸Citations in this entire section are found in Ibid., 80-90.

¹⁴⁹D. W. Herring, "A Statement from Rev. D. W. Herring," The Biblical Recorder, June 22, 1892, 3.

The paper presented [by Herring to the Board] embraced these points: A number of missionaries were to be enlisted who should go into the interior of China, live in Chinese style as to homes, clothing, &c., and by constant itineration preach the gospel far and wide, no chapels or schools were to be erected and established, and no native helpers of any kind employed. . . . Bro. Herring added to his plan this-- that these missionaries were to be directly supported by individual churches or groups of churches, entirely independently of the Board, . . .¹⁵⁰

By December 24, 1892, Herring was back in China accompanied by three fresh recruits.¹⁵¹ The Gospel Missioners were forming into a substantive effort.

Bostick's Board Battles¹⁵²

In January of 1889, the Bosticks and one other individual were "appointed missionaries to North China." He arrived in North China and began work "in July, 1889."¹⁵³ As noted

¹⁵⁰T. P. Bell, "Resignation of Rev. D. W. Herring," The Foreign Mission Journal 23 (July 1892): 357-358. The Board's reaction was also published in T. P. Bell, "Resignation of Rev. D. W. Herring," The Biblical Recorder, June 29, 1892, 3. Shortly thereafter, came reactions from the readers who understood Herring's moves as insubordinate to the Board's authority as well. See, for example, J. L. Carroll, "Brother Herring's 'Disturbing Element,'" The Biblical Recorder, July 27, 1892, 1.

¹⁵¹Foster, Fifty Years, 246.

¹⁵²Because Bostick was a partisan in the emerging paradigm war, but not a contributor to the Gospel Mission's ideological development, he is treated in less detail than Crawford and Herring.

¹⁵³Tupper, A Decade, 678 and Foster, Fifty Years, 227 respectively.

earlier,¹⁵⁴ Bostick arrived in China predisposed to be suspicious of Tarleton and his antics. Yet, as sometimes happens, the legend about the man seemed not to correspond with the realities he experienced. Gradually Bostick became a supporter and a willing partner in the new paradigm Crawford was hoping could emerge.

Already imbibing some of Crawford's principles regarding living closer to the people and objecting to the level of missionary salaries because they often became a barrier to that aim, Bostick wrote to his home association of Baptist Churches in the summer of 1890. He was thanking them for having supported him and his wife. He said he realized "the sacrifice that some of you made to raise our money, and so we had already decided to reduce our salary for next year, but had not decided how much."¹⁵⁵ Indeed, he outlined the rationale for a significant reduction. The letter mentioned above that stirred both Bostick and Crawford into action that resulted in the publication of Churches, To the Front!, likely came in response to this letter to the association written about a year

¹⁵⁴See note 124.

¹⁵⁵G. P. Bostick, "Letter from Tung Chowfu, China, August 12th, 1890," in The History of the Kings Mountain Baptist Association from November 7, 1851 to November 7, 1951, ed. The Publication or Historical Committee (40th Annual Session, 1890):104.

earlier.¹⁵⁶ Eventually the whole dispute and series of resignations brought the matter to his home association once more. The relationship between the Board in Richmond, its field personnel, and its right to direct collective mission work of local churches working in unison all were issues as they deliberated in 1896. "Some of the older brethren felt that this new project [Gospel Missionism] might tear down and disrupt the present method of sending the gospel through the Foreign Mission Board, . . . The body settled the matter in an agreeable manner. Churches were allowed to send whatever contributions they wished direct [sic] to the Gospel missionaries. This did not in any way hinder the work of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention."¹⁵⁷ Bostick waged a series of public attacks on the Board and its administrative practices, focusing on the need of the churches to assume again the responsibility for sending the gospel to the nations. The Board retaliated in kind

¹⁵⁶See note 133 above. The letter was received in the summer of 1891, whereas his letter to the Kings Mountain Association was written in the summer of 1890.

¹⁵⁷The History of the Kings Mountain Baptist Association, 110. It is interesting that a published report about Bostick's January 14, 1892 resignation letter made mention of him simultaneously writing to the Kings Mountain Association requesting direct support that completely bypassed the Board. However, the Association's minutes reveal no such letter except the one mentioned above written a year and a half prior to his resignation. That letter did not advocate action that would bypass the Board. C. Durham, "Rev. G. P. Bostick's Resignation," The Biblical Recorder, March 30, 1892, 3.

accentuating the build up of the crises.¹⁵⁸ Herring was in America at the time all these events were occurring between the Board and Bostick. The tensions mounted and aided in the convergence of interests that more firmly established the resolve of those willing to attempt a new paradigm by forming a new mission altogether.

1900-1909

Once Herring returned, the Gospel Missioners began to scout out new territory and to set up a new work further into the interior. They tried to do so far enough away to not compete with the North China Mission work, apply their principles in virgin settings, and demonstrate the feasibility of the new paradigm.¹⁵⁹ The Gospel Missioners procured a base of operations in and around Taianfu in 1894.¹⁶⁰ Things moved on in an incipient form until the Boxer uprising began. This caused missionaries to evacuate from all over China. The Gospel Missioners, along with others, learned of Boxer violence near Taianfu on January 1, 1900. Eventually they all departed the province, and many waited the outcome outside the country. The

¹⁵⁸See T. P. Bell, "The Bostick Tract Reviewed," The Biblical Recorder, July 20, 1892, 4; and G. P. Bostick, "Letter from Rev. G. P. Bostick of July 1, 1892," The Biblical Recorder, August 10, 1892, 3 as illustrations.

¹⁵⁹Foster, Fifty Years, 244-257.

¹⁶⁰See Appendix A.



Crawfords traveled back to America again. Tarleton, now in advanced age, wrote his most comprehensive work during their time in America.¹⁶¹ On April 7, 1902, Tarleton died. Gospel Missioners would never really recover from the disruption of the Boxers and the death of the veteran sage of their cause. A bit of new life was given the cause when Martha returned to Taianfu in October of that same year, but she passed away in August of 1909. Many of the Gospel Missioners began returning to the Board shortly thereafter, and by 1910, the Gospel Mission Movement effectively had collapsed.¹⁶²

Summary Interpretation of The Gospel Mission's Core Values

Use of Paradigm Theory

Major events in history are rarely, if ever, the result of

¹⁶¹Crawford, Evolution.

¹⁶²See the absorption of five of the Gospel Missioners noted in Southern Baptist Convention, Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1911 Containing the Proceedings of the Fifty-Sixth Session Sixty-Sixth Year, Held at Jacksonville, Florida, May 17-22, 1911, (Nashville: Southern Baptist Convention, 1911):85; notation of absorbing the work of the Gospel Mission in and around Taianfu in Southern Baptist Convention, Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1918 Containing the Proceedings of the Sixty-Third Session Seventy-Third Year, Held at Hot Springs, Ark., May 15-20, 1918, (Nashville: Southern Baptist Convention, 1918):189. The only individual to hold out and continue outside the Board was T. L. Blalock. Others eventually joined him. See D. MacGillivray, ed., The China Mission Year Book Being 'The Christian Movement in China' 1914 (Shanghai: The Christian Literature Society for China, 1914):92 for a listing of those that continued. Eventually Blalock changed his operation's name to indicate a break with the prior movement. Blalock, Experiences, 63-64.

single cause and effect motion. Gestalts occur in the ebb and flow of historical events as in the psyches of individuals. Complex pulsations of individual human experiences merge into an indivisible whole and create a momentum toward events that can collectively shift the conditions of human experience. Events like the Second World War forever changed the world of men and things. The way life was lived out before that gestalt-like event was radically different and did change afterward.

Kuhn¹⁶³ and Bosch, each in their respective disciplines, were trying to unravel ideological matrices that are almost too complex to comprehend. An interpretative history of ideas in relation to actions is acknowledged from the outset to be imprecise. The "frames of reference will differ according to the perspective through which one views that history."¹⁶⁴ Nevertheless, it is only as historians attempt such endeavors that perceptions are critically modified and more closely come to approximate reality. Knowledge, in that sense, is a map, always incomplete and growing but still an accurate representation of a certain level of reality.

¹⁶³As noted earlier, Kuhn developed models for understanding the shifts that have occurred in the development of science. Kuhn calls these models paradigms. See Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd ed (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1970).

¹⁶⁴Gerald J. Pillay, "Text, Paradigms and Context: An Examination of David Bosch's Use of Paradigms in the Reading of Christian History," in Mission In Tension: A Dialogue with David Bosch, ed. J. N. J. Kritzinger and W. A. Saayman (Pretoria: S. A. Missiological Society, 1990):121.

As the profiles of reality noticeably change, sometimes only evident after the fact, contrasts with the past become increasingly apparent and help define not only past realities but emerging ones as well. It is exactly between the paradigms that reality's creative tensions are most keenly sensed. Bosch noted, "New paradigms do not establish themselves overnight. They take decades, sometimes even centuries, to develop distinctive contours. . . . A time of paradigm shift is a time of deep uncertainty--. . . ." ¹⁶⁵ As developments occur, one senses that there is rarely a "pure ground," so to speak, in which one is squarely in the midst of a single paradigm without elements of one that precedes and one that is emerging. The only constant is change itself. There is always a reaching forward and backward simultaneously to understand the present. Hence, Bosch observed that those living in the midst of a paradigm shift, and sensing contrasting ideologies, "respond to it as though they live in different worlds. Proponents of the old paradigm often just cannot understand the arguments of the proponents of the new." ¹⁶⁶ Assessment of paradigms in historical analysis is simultaneously a most difficult and most necessary phenomenon.

Bosch ventures forth and risks such an undertaking. He proposed six missiological paradigms that correspond roughly to

¹⁶⁵Bosch, Transforming Mission, 349.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., 184.

those defined by Hans Küng to chart the character development of church history in general.

1. The apocalyptic paradigm of primitive Christianity.
2. The Hellenistic paradigm of the patristic period.
3. The medieval Roman Catholic paradigm.
4. The Protestant (Reformation) paradigm.
5. The modern Enlightenment paradigm.
6. The emerging ecumenical paradigm.¹⁶⁷

It is primarily the latter two that are the concern of this thesis. If paradigm shifts occur gradually, then there should be characteristics evident in a shifting paradigmatic case example that resemble both the parent and the emerging offspring. Was the Gospel Mission Movement just such a missiological phenomenon? Were the Gospel Missioners exhibiting signs of paradigmatic shifts, of habits rooted in the Enlightenment modes of doing mission as well as incipient traits of a postmodern one? A direct comparison of characteristics for both models is necessary to draw conclusions. Yet, even the comparisons should be considered "heuristic" or a set of "search" concepts.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷Ibid., 181-182. On pages 349 and 531, Bosch explains his rationale for using "ecumenical" rather than the more common term "postmodern" to describe the emerging paradigm. See also Hans Küng, "Was meint Paradigmenwechsel?," in Theologie--wohin? Auf dem Weg zu einem neuen Paradigma, ed. Hans Küng and David Tracy (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1974):19-26 for the correlation to Küng's models.

¹⁶⁸Bosch, Transforming Mission, 531. Bosch indicates the contingency of such an undertaking and its necessity.

Enlightenment, Postmodern,
and Gospel Mission Values Compared: Indigeneity¹⁶⁹

The Enlightenment thinkers tended to view humankind in optimistic ways. Humans were considered inherently good and unleashed to use the power of their rational faculties to explore the universe. Unaided reason was the new absolute and old ones fell prey to considerable scrutiny. The founding assumption was that of a closed universe where humans were captains of their own fate, and appeals to the metaphysical were suspect. Bosch identifies and elaborates on trends or characteristics under two topical headings. First, he observed that a dichotomy is apparent, in Enlightenment thinking, between knowing subjects and the objects of their knowledge. The autonomy of human reason expressed itself within the ranks of those engaging the mission process as well. The net effect of this assumption was that they developed a certainty of knowledge about the world of men and things, and "their inveterate belief in their own 'manifest destiny'---often tended to treat peoples of other cultures as objects rather than brothers and sisters."¹⁷⁰ Oddly enough, there was a corresponding loss of perspective or a sense of ultimate purpose and *raison d'être*. Free human inquiry eventually led to skepticism about knowing anything at all. By default, a confidence in scientific

¹⁶⁹See Appendix C to view Gospel Mission core values itemized and compared to postmodern ones as delineated by Bosch.

¹⁷⁰Bosch, Transforming Mission, 342.

progress served as a surrogate sense of direction, which, translated into a mission environment, meant "There was a widespread and practically unchallengable confidence in the ability of Western Christians to offer a cure-all for the ills of the world and guarantee progress to all. . . ." ¹⁷¹

As Enlightenment assumptions have run their course, traits of postmodern thinking rose up to address the intellectual felt needs they leave behind. Enlightenment constructs tended to render humankind empty, with a lack of eternal significance, and feeling like human existence is a temporal trap. People began to realize the oneness of their predicament, potentially left in a contingent world destined to struggle with eternal aspirations. That paradoxical tension eventually lead people to "think holistically, rather than analytically, emphasize togetherness rather than distance, break through the dualism of mind and body, subject and object, and emphasize 'symbiosis'." Missiologically it meant "that nature and especially people may not be viewed as mere objects, manipulable and exploitable by others." Community became more of an undergirding purpose, and community required a willingness to "repent" or "convert," to reconsider old categories of thought that had been "long submerged by the suffocating logic of rigid cause and effect thinking," The typical attitude of western superiority began to erode and gave way to valuing other cultures' ways of

¹⁷¹Ibid., 343.

being and doing.¹⁷²

Crawford's primary publication indicates that his views evolved over nearly fifty years of his work in China. The initial encounter with those struggling in the aftermath of the Gützlaff incident did directly impact his thinking. It would be inaccurate to say that his thinking in the early stages reflected the same values as seen in his later years.¹⁷³ His early thoughts regarding the non-subsidy system were rudimentary, possibly reactionary to things he had witnessed that seemed debilitating to the work's move toward autonomy. Yet, eventually Tarleton came to see that the underlying assumptions about non-indigenous work were dehumanizing and that even the gradual autonomy method fostered the same outcome, or at least delayed the chief aim of sponsoring a healthy work. Crawford's more mature, motives indicate an inherent assumption that the nationals not only ought to do the work of the ministry from the beginning, but were fully capable of doing so. His

¹⁷²Ibid., 355-356 and 358.

¹⁷³An example is the progressive development of his views on donning native dress. His would-be son-in-law, A. G. Jones, of the Baptist Missionary Society, wrote regarding one of the Crawfords' conditions for marrying their adopted daughter, ". . . would wear my [Jones] hair in European style and dress foreignly at the ports." Alfred G. Jones, "Letter to Mr. Baynes from Chefoo 25 July 1881," Missionary Journals and Correspondences 1792-1914 (Baptist Missionary Society Archives, 1881). Yet, "For twenty years [making the start date approximately 1866] Dr. Crawford, in accommodation to Chinese ideas, had adopted a long loose coat, . . ." Foster, Fifty Years, 226-227. By 1886, Tarleton indicated approvingly that Martha had "worn it [native dress] to advantage about three years." Crawford, Evolution, 97-98.

desire was to see "Numerous bands of manly, self-supporting, self-propagating native Christians."¹⁷⁴ This simple difference was radical for many of his peers. His affirmation of their responsibility and capability to be "manly," or mature in doing the work would empower them to generate a sense of Christian identity within their Chinese contexts. T'ien-en Chao reflected on the mistaken assumptions of those that opted for a gradual development of indigenous churches as opposed to a healthy independent one. He notes, especially in relation to the use of funds and prolonged dependence, that ". . . The employment system actually perpetuated the dependence of the Chinese church which they knowingly or unknowingly sought to shape according to their own cultural image."¹⁷⁵ The chart in Appendix D shows how the underlying assumptions, those that either affirmed native ability or not, caused differing results. It is impossible to determine whether Crawford would have fully appreciated what later Chinese Christian scholars were to conclude. Nevertheless, he advocated a shift in values toward full native affirmation from the beginning of mission work.

Herring echoed these same ideas. In his treatment he stated the following:

Let the native churches then, from the beginning of

¹⁷⁴Crawford, Evolution, 50.

¹⁷⁵T'ien-en Chao, "The Chinese Indigenous Church Movement," 54.

their existence as churches, conduct their own worship, meet their own expenses, aid or support their own pastors, . . . We propose individually to honor the churches each in its own independent sovereign capacity, as the body of Christ, to work under its direct authority and to depend upon it, or a group of such churches, for the necessary means of support while engaged in preaching the gospel to the heathen. . . we rest the whole movement upon the bed rock of self-denial for Christ's sake and the salvation of men, alike for the churches at home, for the missionaries abroad, and for the native Christians in every field.¹⁷⁶

Herring's statements further affirm the dignity and ability of the nationals, especially as he indicated that he desired the "churches at home" to join in the same causes using the same methods, which reflects a bit of cultural critique for his own Southern Baptist churches.

Enlightenment, Postmodern,
and Gospel Mission Values Compared: Incarnation¹⁷⁷

Enlightenment methods of doing mission were integrally linked with the presumption that reality was objectively discernible in an absolute sense and consequently able to be manipulated by humankind toward progressively better levels, especially social ones. As Western entrepreneurs engaged what they perceived to be primitive cultures, they presumed that

¹⁷⁶Herring, "The Meaning," 117, 121-122.

¹⁷⁷In this section, the term "incarnation" means simply to place one's self into the host culture. It requires an affirmation of the culture, assuming a learner's role, and attempting to live out Christian values in that context. It also aims at offering as much of an emic but Christ-like perspective as possible.

social improvements would aid them in their business adventures. The rest of the world was somehow "broken" and Western ingenuity could "fix" things. This mode of thinking was particularly extant between 1885 and the outbreak of World War One; ". . . it was the high imperial epoch, characterized by the conviction that it was the West and the Christians of the West who would solve the ills of the entire world, primarily by means of the program of colonialism and the planting of Western-type churches in all parts of the world."¹⁷⁸ Such optimism about everything Western lent itself to a form of cultural arrogance that determined non-western cultures to be inferior.

In the latter half of this century, the fallacy of such thinking has become increasingly evident, there was a corollary sense of the need to recognize some degree of contingency in human knowledge. Absolute objectivity was an elusive ideal that never seemed able to fit under the microscope and lend itself to careful scrutiny. A form of critical realism "that remains aware of the contextuality of convictions, and operates in all disciplines . . . " became the *modus operandi* for the post-modern world. Such a fiduciary affirmation required "humility and self-criticism."¹⁷⁹ In mission circles, it required awareness of the dignity and complexity of non-western cultures. The starting point of mission was for the missionary to be as

¹⁷⁸Bosch, Transforming Mission, 343.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., 360.

much a learner and a listener within the context of a new culture as a proclaimer and promoter. The object was no longer to make Western Christians out of the new believers, but to encourage the development of unique forms of the Christian faith as new indigenous believers fleshed out Christian faith from within their own cultural frameworks.

Within the ranks of the Gospel Missioners, a strong movement toward an incarnational lifestyle for missionaries was in full motion. The overwhelming conviction was that only by adopting the cultural patterns of the nationals could the missionaries fit in and begin to communicate with the Chinese. Herring noted, "We, of the Gospel Mission in China, wish to go down to the people; to wear their dress, live in their houses and in general eat their food. For only in this way can we hope to get in touch with those for whose salvation we labor."¹⁸⁰ Simultaneously this statement reflects a hint of the Enlightenment mentality blended with an incipient element of postmodernism. The intent to "go down to the people" implies the former, while the stated desire to be "in touch" with them links with the latter. Herring, however, explicitly moved away from his Enlightenment thinking contemporaries when he said in the same context, " . . . the Chinese greatly need to see Christian life illustrated under conditions similar to their own. . . . Again, it is not our business to foreignize but to

¹⁸⁰Herring, "The Meaning," 126.

Christianize the people among whom we dwell."¹⁸¹ One of Herring's, and the rest of the Gospel Missioners' contemporary critics, chided them regarding their adoption of Chinese lifestyles and dress. He stated, "Live like the people is their great plea. How will this plan work in Africa?"¹⁸² The pundit went on to note that if carried out in Africa the missionaries would need to adopt a lifestyle of nakedness, all the while, he was missing the point of their essential concern, namely to relate to the people without "foreignizing" them.

Enlightenment, Postmodern,
and Gospel Mission Values Compared: Responsible Independence¹⁸³

The Enlightenment did aim at setting humankind free from all restraining influences, especially ones that were perceived to be superstitions. Religiously, this idea worked itself out to mean that "God and humans were felt to be rivals."¹⁸⁴ Autonomous humanity is at once a creative and a destructive entity. It is creative in that freedom to think is necessary for innovation, and destructive in that neglect of moral

¹⁸¹Ibid., 127.

¹⁸²Unsigned Editorial, "Objections to the Crawford-Herring-Bostick Plans," The Biblical Recorder, July 20, 1892, 2.

¹⁸³Responsible independence does not mean unchecked autonomy, rather it means accountability on more personal, relational levels that tends to shy away from large institutionalized forms of administration.

¹⁸⁴Bosch, Transforming Mission, 343.

boundaries can spawn dehumanizing technologies. Autonomy tended to create impersonal, federalized, institutions that often devolved into sociological "towers of Babel." God's glory was the aim in Enlightenment mission acts, but more often than not human glory was achieved.

Bosch notes that the individual left out in the impersonalized realms long enough forced the "need to retrieve togetherness, interdependence, 'symbiosis.'" The individual is not a monad, but part of an organism. . . . Here lies the pertinence of the rediscovery of the church as Body of Christ and the Christian mission as building a community of those who share a common destiny.¹⁸⁵ Institutionalized superstructures are incapable of bearing the weighty need of true "κοινωνία," or interdependent fellowship.

The one aspect of the Gospel Mission plan that was parallel to the mix of ideas found among the Landmarkers back in the homeland was that of local church responsibility in mission. The Landmarkers seized Gospel Missionism and used it for its own ends.¹⁸⁶ In the early phase of Gospel Missionism's development,

¹⁸⁵Ibid., 362.

¹⁸⁶A clear indication of this fact is that when a substantive group of Landmarkers finally broke from the Convention in 1905 to form their own association, they invited the Gospel Mission to join them as their missionaries. The Gospel Mission considered themselves reformers not revolutionaries and refused to align with the new Landmark organization, even if it was to their own detriment because most of their funding was flowing from such churches. See Lamkin, "The Gospel Mission Movement," 203-205.

the Landmark type churches listened to them and provided a measure of support. Yet, the key voices that spoke for Gospel Missionism each reflect values that differed with Landmarkism. The latter formed a type of ecclesiology that lent itself to provincialism, while Crawford and the others were trying to simply reform the way local church involvement in the task of missions was felt, in essence to repersonalize the role of the church. Over the years, a distance had developed between the local church and the field missionary. The sense of responsibility and blessing of engaging the process of mission was being lost on the local level. Note the distinctions made by all three of the Gospel Mission's primary thinkers.

Crawford:

I am not seeking to bring about a *revolution*, but a *reformation* in mission relations and work. I wish the Board to retain their position in the denomination and to reform abuses of their own accord.

A revolution [in the sense of a revision not a break from the board] towards simplicity or local action and responsibility in mission matters, is imperatively demanded. . . . Then, let Boards, pastors, editors, every one encourage them singly, or in groups smaller or larger according to circumstances, to choose, support and look after the work of their missionary evangelist, . . . The Churches and missionaries, taking up the work in this direct way, will feel a living interest in it [mission work] and in each other

Herring:

We do not believe in the unbaptistic system which works down upon the churches, but in the system that is worked in and by them; . . .

Bostick:

Hence no one church or other body, however large and influential, can ever, except by usurpation, control the actions, means and men of our churches. As equal and independent bodies they can and must, to be true to Christ, seek the fullest love and fellowship in co-operating with each other in the Lord's work.¹⁸⁷

Their sentiments, while not reflecting fully the modern trend, do show the need for local accountability, personal and relational involvement. Simply put, it sounds like the beginning of a post-denominational type of attitude. Bosch noted, "The rediscovery of the local church as the primary agent of mission has led to a fundamentally new interpretation of the purpose and role of missionaries and mission agencies." Missionaries must now perceive themselves "as ambassadors of one local church to another local church"¹⁸⁸

The Gospel Mission Movement was not a fully mature form of the postmodern mission paradigm as defined by Bosch. Yet, its adherents did espouse ideas that were innovative for their time. Their convictions showed atypical attitudes like non-western cultural affirmation in an age of Western cultural superiority; lifestyle inculturation in the midst of the host peoples rather

¹⁸⁷See Crawford, Evolution, 68 and Crawford, Churches, To The Front!, 4-5; Herring, "The Meaning," 125; and G. P. Bostick, "What Is Church Co-operation?," in The Crisis of the Churches: A Collection of Earnest Articles and Extracts from Earnest Men on Matters of Vital Concern to Baptists, ed. T. P. Crawford (Chefoo: n. p., 1894):148 respectively.

¹⁸⁸Bosch, Transforming, 380. The Gospel Missioners would not have affirmed the modern understanding of post-denominationalism but their convictions regarding localization did reflect incipient forms of such concerns.

than ethnocentric aloofness; and the need for interdependence and community among churches and missionaries (home and foreign churches alike) rather than the often sterile and controlling influence of denominational hierarchies. To be sure, there were sister agencies that espoused similar ideas. Taylor's China Inland Mission proved to be a strong influence on the Gospel Missioners, especially on Herring. The lessons learned from the collective experiences of others like Gützlaff, Carpenter, and Nevius (whether positive or negative) contributed to their thinking. Yet, there was a novel element about their noble experiment in that it embodied all three of these key values and attempted to do a radically new type of mission work within the structure of a provincially oriented denominational sending agency. They were men and women that simultaneously reflected their own times and showed shades of understanding that reached beyond.

Did their influence cease when the mission collapsed in 1910? After its demise, almost all of the Gospel Missioners returned to the Board's structure and lived out their careers in Shantung. Is there any trace of their continuing influence? Have some of their ideas survived and do they perhaps still linger within the Board's halls even today? These questions provide the focus for the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

GOSPEL MISSIONISM'S LINGERING LEGACY AND POST-MODERN TRENDS IN THE SBC'S FOREIGN MISSION BOARD (1910-1997)

Introduction

This has been a serious disappointment to us, for it evinces a lack of faith in God through the churches, His own missionary organization. Perhaps herein is the secret of our failure. The movement was on a faith basis, (it would come in the category of a faith mission) and faith we have lacked. It assumes an amount of faith, spirituality, conscientiousness [sic], and consecration on the part of the people at home, and us all, especially those entering the ministry that alas does not obtain. There is on the one hand the church's hesitation to shoulder the responsibility, on the other hand the missionary's hesitation to trust the church. This added to the fact that the influence of the denomination is against us, makes it almost a vain hope to accomplish, certainly so when looked at from the human side.¹

A few months prior to making a final decision to apply for renewed membership in the ranks of the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board's structure, D. W. Herring wrote to his longtime friend in the battle with the Board, W. D. King, lamenting the

¹David W. Herring, "Letter to W. D. King," (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, December 6, 1906): Herring File. Herring outlines to King a series of points countering the original bases for departing from the Board as the rationale for rejoining. Their experiment proved difficult to implement more due to the attitudes of field coworkers and those of Southern Baptists at home than the validity of the principles per se.

likelihood of needing to rejoin the organization. Both men, along with several other North China Missionaries of the Board, had ended their formal association with the organization in or about 1892. Following the lead of then veteran missionaries Tarleton Perry and Martha Foster Crawford, they attempted to do new things, virtually unheard of within the Board's halls. They wanted to do missions in such a way as to affirm the host cultures in which they lived and worked, relate to new national believers in such a way as to foster a sense of Chinese Christian identity from the beginning and not create dehumanizing dependencies, and to link their work more directly to local churches in the United States that supported them with their prayers, tears, and hard-earned monies.

Something went wrong and the lifeline did not support their visions and dreams. Misunderstanding and mounting tensions between themselves and the Board spilled over into the larger supporting constituency creating more of an air of suspicion than trust. Try as they did, they could not override the Board's ability to communicate directly with the broadest spectrum of local church members through its publications and links with the state Baptist newspapers. Many concluded they were simply an extension of the Landmark controversy and scores of lay and clergy alike were never willing to give their field based missiological concepts much of a hearing. Gospel Mission ideas were perhaps too esoteric for most folk in the churches, since even seasoned field missionaries often thought Crawford,

Herring, King and the rest were too adventuresome, indicating the difficulty for even their peers to perceive their intent.

At the close of yet another century, numerous Christian agencies are reassessing themselves and their organizations in light of their perceptions of the mission mandate. Luis Bush, director of the AD2000 and Beyond Movement, recently addressed a leadership seminar in Norway and challenged his audience to reposition themselves for an all-out push to finish the task of Christ's Great Commission (Matthew 28:16-20). He noted the cycles through which organizations pass from infancy to maturity and finally to the bitter choice between renewal or death. Bush was most concerned with the renewal phase and encouraged listeners to accept the sometimes painful challenge to evaluate themselves and change to meet the demanding, yet supreme aim of global evangelism. He alluded to drastic corporate restructuring undertaken by the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board during the first half of 1997. "The largest evangelical organization in the world in this last year exemplifies this reality [renewal challenge]. They have totally restructured in these last years as we approach the year 2000."² Did the Foreign

²Luis Bush, "What Happens After AD 2000?: The Future of Evangelical Cooperation in Missions and International Perspective," in Norway Leadership Seminar, (March 23, 1998). Bush represents numerous "networks" of evangelicals mobilizing for establishing viable church planting movements among the world's "unreached" distinct ethno-linguistic groups. "Reachedness" is measured by a variety of scales but essentially all formulas try to determine the degree of exposure and response to the gospel exhibited by a given grouping. The allusion to the Foreign Mission Board is deduced by the fact that the Board is closely

Mission Board renew itself to face the demands of imminent mission realities, or was it to revitalize an aging organization that is far from ready to face the future? Oddly enough, the challenges posed a century ago by the Gospel Missioners are related to this very question. Has history repeated itself, or are Southern Baptists better poised for the future of global evangelism in a post-modern world? These and related themes comprise the essence of this chapter.

Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board Values and Practices
(1910-1945)

Herring Sounds Retreat

The Boxer uprisings of 1900 stunned many if not all foreigners living and working in China. The degree of violence caused many to rethink their ways of doing missions. As early as 1902, Herring showed signs of rethinking his decision to leave the Board as well. His misgivings arose from the tension in actually engaging a "faith" mission type of operation, at least from within the context of supporters unfamiliar with that model. One of Herring's local church supporters and friends wrote to R. J. Willingham, then leading the Board, to explain the shift in attitude he had noticed when Herring was with him in Florence, South Carolina during the Summer of 1901. He

involved with these networks of evangelicals, by its size as a sending agency, and its major restructuring in 1997. Documentation of the Board's changes during that year appears later in this chapter.



noted, "I found his views greatly modified since last I talked with him--as to 1) the practical operation of the Gospel Mission theory, and 2) the regular work under the Board. . . . In other words he honestly confessed the discrepancy between theory and application of it, and (in effect) said that some regular organization was a necessity."³

Hardly two months prior to that letter, Tarleton, the aged warrior of the cause, died leaving only Martha as the chief catalyst around which the band held together. Herring was the next most influential leader among the Gospel Missioners and had rapport with the younger members of the alliance. He saw that without the Crawfords, the links in the chain holding the Mission together would surely weaken. Additionally, the ideas were tested, albeit briefly, and found more or less difficult to implement given their circumstances. Such factors were likely running through his mind when he wrote to the members of the Foreign Mission Board in April of 1907, requesting permission to resume duties as a Board missionary. He also sought posting in Chengchow as a member of the Board's newly functioning Interior Mission. Herring still sensed the allure of less developed, more challenging areas, which were more fertile ground for trying Gospel Mission principles anyway. In a personal letter to Willingham of the same date, he raised the question of how to

³Will E. Oliver, "Letter to Dr. R. J. Willingham," (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, June 21, 1902): Herring File.

handle the network of loyal churches and supporters he had acquired during the Gospel Mission days. So that they would not be dismayed, Herring suggested that Willingham allow them to continue his direct support through the Board's financial apparatuses. He affirmed their right and need to do so, but counted it a "personal favor" if Willingham would cooperate.⁴

Eventually most of the Gospel Missioners followed suit. By 1918, all but one of the surviving set realigned with the Board, and most were absorbed into the Interior Mission.⁵ They became partners with few reservations about the Board's operations. G. P. Bostick, once one of the movement's firebrands, showed a tempered spirit in 1919 when he requested something similar to Herring's 1907 request. The record indicated that the Bosticks asked for "the privilege while at home of trying to collect funds for financing the enterprise under the limitations and

⁴D. W. Herring, "Letter to The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention," (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 25, 1907): Herring File. See also D. W. Herring, "Letter to Dr. R. J. Willingham," (Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 25, 1907): Herring File.

⁵See T. L. Blalock, Experiences of a Baptist Faith Missionary for 56 Years in China (Fort Worth: Manney, 1949) for the account of how the "Direct" mission continued after the Gospel Mission collapsed. See also, Interior China Mission, "Mission Minutes," by Annie Jenkins Sallee (Kaifeng: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, June 15, 1918) to see the roster of missionaries indicating former Gospel Missioners as members in good standing.

conditions imposed by the Board."⁶

Indications are that while most of the Gospel Missioners did resume work within the Board's structure, they did not necessarily abandon their core values. Herring, for example, readily acknowledged the impracticality of implementing some of the Mission's ideas, especially the ones involving support, but he still affirmed their original aims. One of Herring's daughters reflected on life around the vital transitional period when the family moved back into the Board's structure. She commented on her father's missiological values.

Two factors lay heavy on Papa's heart. The comparative comfort in which the Americans lived contrasted with the abject poverty he saw among the Chinese. He felt that the missionaries lived in unnecessary luxury on the sacrificial contributions (nickels and pennies from the sale of eggs and jellies) of the folks back home who were members of the little country churches. Also he thought that the funds should be sent directly to the missionaries to eliminate the cost of offices and personnel on a board here in the States. Not only that, the Board was making all the decisions, leaving the missionaries on the field with no authority. Papa wanted also to dress in Chinese clothes. He wanted to live among the Chinese just as they lived. However, the Board and the workers already in Shanghai felt that they should set an example of civilization for natives and that Papa's idea of wearing Chinese clothes would be degrading. . . . Furthermore, the F.M.B. favored subsidizing Christian Chinese workers and schools, a policy which Papa vigorously opposed. He said they were "rice Christians." He feared that some had not really been converted but stayed only as long as the handouts continued. Papa felt very clearly that they

⁶Interior China Mission, "Executive Committee Minutes," (Ki Kung Shan: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, August 8-9, 1919).

should be taught to support their own work and support themselves.⁷

As new missionaries arrived in China after 1910, these values showed up in yet another generation's thinking as the older missionaries, many from the Gospel Mission, provided field orientation to the novices. Yet, the old patterns did not completely die out and the validity of new approaches was still contested because of competitive models.

The Subsidy System Continued

By the mid-twenties, former Gospel Missioners not only resumed work within the Board, but acquired primary leadership roles, especially in the Board's Interior China Mission.⁸ Paradoxical patterns of control blended with the desire to indigenize work were common among most missionaries in China at the turn of the century. As demonstrated in the last chapter, this paradox caused a deadlocked tension and progress toward autonomy generally stalled out, or the kind of progress was usually more Western than Chinese.

In both the North China Mission (original posting for most

⁷Celia Herring Middleton, Memories of A Lifetime (Raleigh: privately printed, 1988):7-8. This writer acquired a photocopy from Middleton's descendants.

⁸See Interior China Mission, "Annual Mission Minutes," (Kaifeng: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 2-4, 1924):2 and Interior China Mission of the Southern Baptist Convention, "Reference Book and Minutes of the Annual Mission Meeting," (Shanghai: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, 1925):ii for listings of mission rosters and assignments.

of the Gospel Missioners) and the newer Interior China Mission (posting for most of them afterwards), the subsidy system was the normal basis of operating. Missionaries employed helpers but controlled all the processes for their development, even the linkages with their local churches. ". . . all Evangelists, Bible Women, and Medical Helpers receiving pay from Mission funds shall be appointed by the Mission, and in each case only after they shall have received the approval of their churches for Christian work. Such workers may be suspended by the Station, but may be dismissed only by the Mission."⁹

Only at times of threatened social upheaval did missionaries determine that something needed to be done in order to depart the field leaving a "mature" church behind. Without social stress, however, they were baffled by entrenched ideas exposing contradictions between indigeneity and practice. Yet,

⁹See North China Baptist Mission, "Minutes of the Meeting at Pingtu," (Chefoo: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 26-28, 1909):24 and Interior China Mission, "Annual Mission Minutes," (Kaifeng: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 7, 1925):39. Note that the employed worker is required to have church support, but is made accountable directly to the mission and its station missionaries. With only a passing involvement of the church the Chinese would naturally sense more accountability to the mission. Such practices, while subtle, retarded indigenization of Chinese churches and the development of Chinese Christian consciousness. Despite Crawford's appeals in 1885, and subsequent writings in the broader Evangelical community, by 1935 the Board still incorporated this paradoxical set of practices (encouraging indigeneity in theory and undermining its implementation) in its manual issued to instruct Board missionaries throughout the world. See Missionary Manual of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention (Richmond: Foreign Mission Board, 1935):14-15.

they were not initiating the drastic measures needed to unravel the past. Southern Baptists were no different. After the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914, and the mounting anti-foreign sentiments in China during the twenties, field missionaries evinced urgent attitudes toward indigeneity which quickly faded when the threats passed.¹⁰

A New Generation Emerges

A younger missionary to China's interior, Greene Wallace Strother, engaged the work in his early years under the tutelage and influence of former Gospel Missioners, Bostick and Herring primarily. He showed their influence on him when he presented a report from the evangelism committee of the Interior Mission in 1931. He outlined four basic recommendations for radical indigeneity. The stenographer visibly altered the Mission minutes to show that Strother's recommendations were disputed and finally tabled. Likely the most controversial item was listed last. Strother's report read

(4) a; Except in direct evangelism, we recommend that the securing of all houses for meeting places be left entirely to the local people. (b) We further recommend

¹⁰See Southern Baptist Convention, "Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1915 Containing the Proceedings of the Sixtieth Session Seventieth Year, Held at Houston, Texas, May 12-17, 1915," (Nashville: Southern Baptist Convention, 1915):137-138, and Interior China Mission, "Special Conference Minutes," (Chengchow: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, December 8-9, 1925):1. Interior China missionaries convened the special conference to prepare for possible departure and handing over of work during rising anti-foreign tensions.

that meeting houses owned by the Board, and actively used for the preaching of the Gospel, be turned over to the local congregation at the earliest practicable moment.¹¹

Such a radical motion was controversial because many in his audience likely had vested interest in maintaining controlling influence over Chinese Christian institutions and churches they had established. Having nationals take responsibility for their own Christian institutions required a level of trust that typical missionaries of that day were not easily going to surrender.

During the Second World War, Strother pursued doctoral studies, since return to China was not feasible at that time. His doctoral thesis investigated the underlying New Testament principles for missionary practices. Strother's thesis shows direct influence from Roland Allen's writings regarding such themes. He noted that addressing the subsidy system would not be an easy task, especially where it already existed, it, nevertheless, needed to be confronted. Yet, he uncovered the underlying long-range impact of the subsidy system on national churches and their sense of initiative. "I discovered what the Chinese already knew: the churches nearest us, outside our local city, and for which we had done the most, were the weakest in local leadership. Those farthest, or for which we had done little, had developed active leadership. . . . It [empowering

¹¹Interior China Mission, "Annual Mission Minutes," (Kaifeng: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 6-8, 1931):2.

the nationals with non-subsidy acts] would dignify and develop the local leadership; it would make it much easier to initiate independence and responsibility; and the quality of church membership would then be their own responsibility."¹² Near the end of his life, Strother reflected on his missionary career. He strongly affirmed two of the key Gospel Mission principles, namely the non-subsidy (indigeneity) model and the need to engage the host culture positively (incarnation).¹³ Strother showed that the Gospel Missioners who rejoined the Board continued propagating their convictions (with less emphasis

¹²Greene Wallace Strother, "A Study of New Testament Missionary Principles and Practice" (Th.D. diss., Baptist Bible Institute, May, 1942):196-197. The Baptist Bible Institute later became New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. Strother's use of Roland Allen's works indicates that outside evangelical influences were beginning to flow into the strategic thinking of the Board's field missionaries to a greater degree than before. Strother had motivation from former Gospel Missioners as well making his missiological mindset uniquely connected to both internal and external dynamics.

¹³Greene W. Strother, Catastrophe In China (Columbia: privately printed, 1967):16, 31-32, and 120. This work was in essence Strother's memoirs. This writer acquired a photocopy from Strother's descendants. A review of Roland Allen's writings shows clear affinity with the basic core values reflected in Gospel Mission thinking. Allen's opinions were certainly factors in Strother's thinking. Allen was, however, not fully mainstreamed in relation to his peers either. He encountered ridicule for holding such convictions. "Nevertheless, Roland felt frustrated and disappointed because, although the merits of his arguments were acknowledged, even people he greatly admired . . . seemed to be impervious to the need for change." Hubert J. B. Allen, Roland Allen: Pioneer, Priest, and Prophet (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995):88. Yet, Allen's clearest argument for such values was widely distributed in Roland Allen, The Case for Voluntary Clergy (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1930):202-212. His thought grows increasingly influential throughout the evangelical world. Even to this day his "arguments" are self-evident.

perhaps on the value of localization) and passed their ideals on to others that continued the missionizing processes after them as heirs to Gospel Mission values.

Nearly the same time as Strother drafted his doctoral thesis, Frank K. Means worked on his at a sister institution. Means' study aimed at identifying the shifting strategic emphases in the Board's actions during the thirty years between 1912 and 1942. His thesis contained a section detailing the Board's practices in relation to "native personnel." Unfortunately, Means reflected more of a status quo mentality and positively reviewed the subsidizing mechanisms used on a global scale by the Board. While Means did show the need to move beyond dependency, he illustrated the paradoxical tension noted earlier, namely encouraging indigeneity while undermining it by paternalism.¹⁴ Contradictory missiological policies increased during the next several years as the Board confronted the challenges posed by rising nationalism in the post-colonial era. Means' ideas grew increasingly mixed showing influences from outside evangelical thinkers and, perhaps, they began to evince early traces of a fracture within the Board's missiological paradigm as it began to shift on a more global scale.

¹⁴Frank K. Means, "Changing Emphases in Southern Baptist Foreign Missions, 1912-42" (Th.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1945):136-142. Means' thesis is notable here because within a few years, Means became the resident missiologist advising the Board's strategic thinkers at a key administrative level. He influenced the Board's actions for years to come. More is said of this later.

Michael E. Whelchel showed that the Gospel Missioners did have some degree of lingering influence and that their values caused reactive measures in Board practices. His summary outlines their impact on field practices and the way the Board operated. Consciousness of the need to identify with host cultures more overtly and acknowledgment of the Board's tendencies to over subsidize national efforts both prompted discussion and awareness of the field problems. Also, the need to personalize foreign mission activities in local congregations throughout the Convention was affirmed.¹⁵ However, the means through which such desired outcomes could be achieved remained undefined for sometime to come.

Old Paradigm Lost (1945-1986)

M. Theron Rankin Era: 1945-1953

In 1973, the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism of the World Council of Churches, issued a call for moratorium in missions. The idea was more benign than it may seem at first glance. It was really a wake-up call for everyone engaged in missions to take indigeneity and contextualization seriously. The idea of gradual indigeneity seemed all too often to stall. The 1973 moratorium call was for a respite in external control

¹⁵Michael E. Whelchel, "Gospel Missionism (1892-1910) and Its Effects Upon the Policies of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention" (Th.M. thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982):87-88.



to empower host churches throughout the world and then to consider renewed relations as peers. Commenting on mission's past failure to achieve indigeneity, Bosch sadly concluded the following:

The assumption seemed to be that the older church inevitably stood in a position of authority; the younger church would increasingly get a greater say in its own affairs until the stage was reached where it could go its own way. All this was accepted policy, in spite of Roland Allen's pleas that something was wrong somewhere. . . . It appears, therefore, that the end result of the process, in spite of everything said to the contrary, was not greater interdependence but increasing alienation.¹⁶

Southern Baptists fit the generally dismal pattern of failing to achieve the best ideals of indigeneity noted by Bosch, as did most agencies when the call for moratorium rang out. This was the case in spite of clarion appeals raising the issues at least from the time of the Gospel Missioners a generation before. Immediately after World War II, things were different, and the Board's leadership analyzed issues on new levels.

By 1945, the Board experienced a century of sending missionaries, planting international churches, and developing relationships with indigeneous peoples. Up to that point, there had never been a field missionary to serve as head of the

¹⁶David J. Bosch, "Towards True Mutuality: Exchanging the Same Commodities or Supplementing Each Other's Needs," in Supporting Indigenous Ministries: With Selected Readings, ed. Daniel Rickett and Dotsey Welliver (Wheaton: Billy Graham Center, 1997 [1978]):57.

increasingly mammoth organization.¹⁷ Rankin served well, in China, gained recognition as a leader, and acquired near heroic status because he was incarcerated from 1940-1942 during Japanese occupation of Hong Kong.¹⁸ Rankin emerged as the first Board head with missionary experience and emphasized the need for realistic answers to field-based questions that long simmered beneath the surface. He expressed concern about the role missionaries assumed, especially in relation to indigenous Baptist entities around the world. He grasped the problem clearly and called for serious study to determine the best solutions. At that early date a call for moratorium was not formally recognized, but the issues were gaining recognition at top administrative levels and came with the force of a respected practitioner. Rankin opened the door but did not live to see resolution. In 1953, Rankin died suddenly and left the Board in the midst of a challenging advance into new fields. Discussion of indigeneity issues, however, lived on into the next administration.¹⁹

¹⁷William R. Estep, Whole Gospel Whole World: The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention 1845-1995 (Nashville: Broadman, 1994):252.

¹⁸J. B. Weatherspoon, M. Theron Rankin: Apostle of Advance (Nashville: Broadman, 1958):92-96.

¹⁹Ibid., 114-116. See also M. Theron Rankin, "A Critical Examination of The National Christian Council of China" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1928):29-30 for more academic explanation of his views on indigeneity. There is no evidence that Gospel Missioners influenced Rankin's thinking, but there are similarities in discernment of the issues and

Baker James Cauthen Era: 1954-1979

While the Rankin era represented progressive attitudes toward the question of indigeneity, Cauthen was a set back and was unresponsive when another post-modern mission trend surfaced, particularly that of localization. Cauthen had also been a field missionary and administrator in China. He assembled a staff of missions analysts in Richmond and moved to achieve two aims during his first decade as the Board's leader. He intended to finish out the advances Rankin's administration set before the people of the Convention and to lay strategic ground work for going far beyond and into more countries.

Cauthen recruited Means as his chief strategist. As mentioned earlier, Means' doctoral thesis indicated mixed convictions regarding tensions over indigeneity. In one sense, Means' ideas molded and shaped Southern Baptist missiological thinking for nearly half of a generation. The Cauthen and Means team continued the paradoxical emphases of encouraging indigeneity while undermining national initiatives with continued subsidy practices for both churches and institutions. Additionally, Cauthen exercised a controlling style of

possible solutions. Rankin did not address other Gospel Mission values directly. See "Board of Trustee Minutes," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 2110, April 10, 1945), and "Board of Trustee Minutes," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 1944, April 10, 1951) for a sampling of indigeneity discussions and assertions during Rankin's tenure.

administration.²⁰

In the early 1960's, Means drafted a comprehensive foreign missions study as groundwork for future Board strategies. The document was not published and was only distributed to a select group of four hundred Convention leaders for review and input. The study reflects a naive understanding of indigeneity (especially Rolland Allen's ideas), a negative attitude toward Donald McGavran's argument against institutional subsidization or entrenchment, and ridicule toward the Gospel Mission (reflecting inaccurate understanding of their link with Landmarkism).²¹ Means displayed the bi-directional pull back to Enlightenment paradigmatic structures and the desire to move ahead. These contrasting pressures indicated rising anxiety as missiological practice was forced into change mode because of external circumstances that were almost too great to ignore.

T. A. Patterson was the executive secretary of the Texas State Baptist Convention in the 1960's. Patterson was a robust leader who wanted to repersonalize missions on the local church level. He developed a strategy which hastened localization trends for Southern Baptist laity and clergy alike. Utilizing

²⁰Jesse C. Fletcher, Baker James Cauthen: A Man for All Nations (Nashville: Broadman, 1977):228-242.

²¹Frank K. Means, "Foreign Missions--A Southern Baptist Perspective," (Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Archives, T. A. Patterson Files, Box 22, Item 786, Wake Forest: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, Undated).

the advantages of rapid air travel, local churches could engage the global missions process in ways never before envisioned. On short term journeys, local church members collated from throughout the State of Texas could comprise a sizeable team for significant evangelistic impact in a given zone. This single idea did more to open foreign mission activity to local accountability and review by folk from the sending churches than ever before imagined. The New Life Movement, as Patterson termed this local church mobilization strategy, targeted some of the resistant areas of Asia. Utilizing mass personal evangelism techniques, the New Life Movement leaders led teams into Japan, the Philippines, South Korea, Guam, Okinawa, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore with a sense of urgency because "Doors are now open, but may close at any time. . . . Entire religious world watching [sic] the outcome of new approach."²²

Patterson was one of the leaders that reviewed Mean's report. The structure, tone, and tenor of the study upset Patterson. He marked the margins throughout with "red flag" items that smacked of too much federalization of control in Richmond and too little sympathy for local church involvement. He poignantly defended the need to call up and mobilize local believers for the mission process.

Pastors, teachers, laymen, and denominational leaders resent the implication that they are incapable of

²²"ABC's of the New Life Movement," Baptist Standard: February 20, 1963:1.

probing the mission enterprise, and of suggesting, under divine leadership, plans and policies. Indeed, they feel it not only their privilege but their duty to review the mission endeavor exactly as they do all else they support. . . . Baptist people will continue to pray and to give, but they will no longer be limited to 'praying and paying,' as some express it. They know that real prayer leads to sharing more than funds. They are well aware that there are areas of administration which must lie with the Board, but today they want and will demand involvement. This is God's plan--not theirs--and he has assured all of his children of his guidance throughout all time so long as they obey his injunction to go make disciples, baptizing them and teaching his precepts.²³

A struggle ensued between Patterson and the Board, especially Means and Cauthen over exactly what role local Baptists from the United States should play in the foreign mission enterprise. Eventually the Board absorbed Patterson's lay mission ideas within its Richmond structure. This allowed Richmond administrators to tame it and make it more docile both on the field and at home. Exposure to the field, however, had already been infused into the life of local churches throughout the Southern United States. Local laity and clergy continued praying, giving, and going directly to the field. The momentum had surpassed Richmond's ability to do more than monitor the lay movement, much less control it. "Partnership missions," as the

²³T. A. Patterson, "Letter to Baker James Cauthen," (Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Archives, T. A. Patterson Files, Box 78, Item 3003, Wake Forest):2 and 4. Emphasis is Patterson's.

idea became known, grew to be part of the overall Board strategy in an enlarged form during the 1970's.²⁴

Geo-political changes in the post-colonial era, globalization trends in the World Council of Churches, the influence of missiological strategists like Allen and McGavran, as well as internal pressure toward localization forced the Board to move more intentionally away from an Enlightenment model for their missionary enterprise toward one that was much more characteristic of post-modern values. Andrew Walls commented on the zeitgeist at this juncture in missions history.

It can be misleading to refer to this as the end of an era, for this implies some sort of historic finality. . . . The task of world evangelization that formed the declared programme of the missionary movement is not over; it never is. . . . What is changing is not the task, but the means and the mode. . . . It now seems

²⁴Estep, Whole Gospel, 352-353. Partnership missions also became a vital part of Cauthen's Bold Mission Thrust campaign. Paige Patterson, one of the architects of a conservative resurgence that has swept through the Southern Baptist Convention since 1979, echoed his father's (T. A. Patterson) sentiments in an article describing his understanding of the key components for Southern Baptist missions in the future. "Partnership approaches linking churches and states with cities and countries abroad not only must continue but also must proliferate. . . . Traditional career missionaries hopefully will have enough sense of security and confidence to welcome innovations, such as the non-resident missionary program of the Foreign Mission Board." Paige Patterson, "My Vision of the Twenty-First Century SBC," Review and Expositor 88, no. 1 (Winter 1991):37-55:42. Note the gentle but clear tension over the established missionary and innovations required for future advance. This indicates the younger Patterson's awareness of the struggles his father experienced in introducing the partnership missions method.

increasingly likely that the bearers of the gospel will bring no gifts with them, except the gospel itself. And that again was the situation of the early church.²⁵

Walls' sage observations help explain what the Board was experiencing, albeit a bit late. It was having growth pains as the old paradigm moved onto the next stage of human history and passed a major milestone in the journey toward an Evangelical version of post-modern missiological principles.

New Paradigm Gained (1986-1997)

R. Keith Parks Era (1980-1992)

Charismatic leadership is needed to break through the barriers of old models and surge ahead into new ones. Inspired by the Bold Mission Thrust of the Cauthen era²⁶, Parks assumed the helm to push ahead in more esoteric missiological ways. They were, nevertheless, just as significant of a set of changes as

²⁵Andrew F. Walls, The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1996):261.

²⁶Bold Mission Thrust 1976-2000 was the final strategic plan designed and implemented by the Cauthen administration. It was an all out call for full mobilization to push to the end of the century and complete the task of global evangelization as far as humanly possible. It was very parochial in tone because it emphasized what the Richmond based organization would attempt around the world without much indication of how it would partner with other evangelicals or even national Baptist groupings. It did, however, stir up Southern Baptists for bold initiatives. In Park's first address to the Board, he drew upon Cauthen's enthusiasm but showed he intended to update mission modes as well. Estep, Whole Gospel, 304 and 340.

under Cauthen. Parks encouraged the kind of thinking required to move into a post-modern paradigm more completely--". . . individual creativity coupled with individual and corporate action."²⁷

The old would not die out easily though. Entrenched works using old paradigmatic styles of engaging missions proved persistent. Even Board strategists like Winston Crawley still advocated subsidy approaches during the early Parks era in spite of prevailing contrary missiological trends that advocated empowering national bodies from the beginning and certainly aimed at eliminating vestiges of paternalistic patterns throughout.²⁸

Parks had spent his lifetime to that point studying missiological principles and practices. Early on in his administration he developed and promoted seven principles governing all the Foreign Mission Board would enact. Several times throughout his administration he presented these principles to the Board and wove them into his administration's daily practice. Three of these principles directly reflect values that Gospel Missioners would have applauded. Yet, the set of principles was broader and moved further into the realm of post-modern thinking. Those that reflected values quite similar

²⁷Charles James Fensham, "Missiology for the Future: A Missiology in the Light of the Emerging Systematic Paradigm" (D.Th. thesis, The University of South Africa, November 1990):250.

²⁸Winston Crawley, Global Mission A Story To Tell: An Interpretation of Southern Baptist Foreign Missions (Nashville: Broadman, 1985):333-339.

to Gospel Mission convictions are as follows:

3. The incarnational approach which emphasizes the career missionary.
4. The priesthood of the believers, meaning every Baptist is a witness and through volunteer opportunities can be involved personally in missions.
5. The indigenous principle which means that churches which are established are 'home grown' or 'natural' in their environment.²⁹

While such ideas were not unique in the broader evangelical world, Parks placed them uniquely at the core of his agenda for Board administration. During 1985, Parks took the opportunity to try new things and to accomplish his set of missiological ideals. Researchers at the Board scrutinized statistics about world trends and grew more and more perplexed about the resistant blocs of peoples throughout the world. They hit upon a concept which challenged traditional understanding of missionary activity. The Nonresidential Missionary model was virtually unimaginable before. Essentially, such a missionary would change identity by assuming, and legitimately fulfilling the role of a humanitarian aid representative for a non-government organization. By entering resistant bloc zones without the traditional missionary label, whole new avenues of sociological interaction ensued. Relationships based on genuine concern for the well being of such peoples would create

²⁹Estep, Whole Gospel, 341. Parks did not attribute his ideas to Crawford or other Gospel Missioners. At that time, the prevailing historical assumption clouded their reputations too much for them to be understood as pioneers in this kind of thinking.

opportunities for relational evangelism to transpire. Initially, most assumed that the role of a Nonresidential Missionary would require residence outside the targeted zone. The missionary would make frequent sorties into assigned areas to implement the strategy. Yet, as the scheme developed, nations generally granted long-term visas to such organizations.³⁰

Making this and similar initiatives central to the Board's agenda required new administrative structures. Between April of 1985 and July of 1988, Parks navigated around obstacles and set such structures in place. Bold ideas required bold measures. Parks moved that, "In order for the Foreign Mission Board to respond effectively on behalf of Southern Baptists to current and future needs and opportunities in China (since traditional missionary presence is not appropriate) and potentially in other comparable situations, . . . [it is recommended] That an administrative entity be set up in the Foreign Mission Board structure to administer and coordinate ministries in China."³¹

³⁰Ibid., 351-352. David Barrett, author of the World Christian Encyclopedia, was one of the researchers behind the scenes at the Board helping draft the details of such scenarios. For further explanation of this strategy see V. David Garrison, The Nonresidential Missionary: A New Strategy and the People It Serves, ed. Bryant L. Myers, Innovations In Missions Series (Monrovia: MARC, 1990).

³¹"Board of Trustee Minutes," (Nashville: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 589, April 15, 1985). The full set of recommendations showed that work would start in China, but could expand beyond that restricted access country into others. The Board termed this new

Having the Board's backing and the leadership team in place, Parks sketched out more of the details. Barrett and Parks were part of the first Global Consultation on World Evangelism held at Ridgecrest, North Carolina, in June of 1985. The Consultation encouraged dialog and found complementary ideas between Parks and those developing among other Christian agencies, especially those from Latin America and Asia.³² Barrett and other researchers concluded that the task of global evangelism is simply too enormous for one agency or even one network of agencies. Hence, they decided that an internationalization of missions was needed which would generate numerous networks of cooperation and mutual support, including formal partnerships to do what was needed to complete the missions mandate and global evangelization. Parks noted,

I have an increasing awareness that we have reached this stage in order that we can become a more significant factor [in reaching the whole world even unevangelized zones] beyond the locale where missionaries can live and perhaps even beyond the circle of Baptist kinds of people. . . . I have a growing sense of obligation for us [sic] who are responsible for the global extension of our Christian

administrative entity Cooperative Services International. Parks' administration intended the new entity to be a non-competitive element in the Board's overall structure. Yet, that intention historically has proved naive as is evident in later sections that detail the demise of Cooperative Services International in 1997. Barely a month later, Parks appointed Lewis Myers "as director of Cooperative Services International, effective June 1, 1985." "Board of Trustee Minutes," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 596, May 20, 1985).

³²Estep, Whole Gospel, 353.

witness to develop a genuinely global strategy. One that covers all of the world whether or not traditional approaches can be used. . . . God so loved the world that He sent us to all of the world. It is my prayer that we will thoughtfully, wisely plan our efforts in a way that will demonstrate that all of us are honestly and sincerely keeping the whole world in view.³³

Parks wanted to use Cooperative Services International (CSI) to do missions in new zones. Additionally, he wanted to reap the benefit of over a century of trial and error and try new missiological techniques that were all hinged together around the compelling motivational theme of entering neglected areas of the world where millions lived and died without hearing about Jesus Christ. Partnership missions took on new meaning. Parks renewed the original emphasis of involving local Southern Baptist Churches in field activities, but challenged them to focus on praying in concert for opportunities to enter restricted countries. He expanded the concept to include partnership with other Evangelicals with like passion for touching the lives of "unreached" peoples.³⁴

Ironically, the same field where the Gospel Missioners labored a century earlier is where the Board began using CSI to apply a new philosophy of missions--China. Myers reported to

³³"Board of Trustee Minutes," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 592, December 9, 1985).

³⁴"Board of Trustee Minutes," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 447, February 9, 1987) and Estep, Whole Gospel, 352-354.

the Board one year after its creation about CSI's activities and direction since its founding. He sketched out for the Board members what the guiding principles were for CSI's activity in China. He stated,

The stronger the church in China becomes the more capacity she will have for ministry to her people; the more distinctly Chinese she becomes the more contribution she has to make to the world. The three-self stance of the church in China has contributed greatly to her growth and her distinctive 'Chineseness,' and the greatest care must be taken by her friends outside China not to violate this principle. . . . In keeping with these concepts, Cooperative Services International seeks to be an enabler to Chinese Christians in their efforts to strengthen the churches, win converts, contribute to nation-building, train church leaders and interact with brothers and sisters in Christ on an international level.³⁵

Gospel Missioners expressed similar convictions and likewise desired to help the church in China as a peer partner rather than a paternalistic one.

CSI's enlarging role in Park's agenda led to major administrative restructuring along the way. Those on the cutting edge of its development spoke openly about how it challenged the status quo of the Board's operations. Bill

³⁵"Board of Trustee Minutes," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 588, September 8, 1986). Interestingly, approximately a century after their life and work in China, historians now recognize the merit of the Crawfords' efforts to place missionary activity on a non-subsidy model which would foster exactly the kind of initiatives Myers stated in his Board report in 1986. See Wayne Flynt and Gerald W. Berkley, Taking Christianity to China: Alabama Missionaries in the Middle Kingdom 1850-1950 (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1997): 270 and 334.

Wakefield (Board Vice President for Asia and the Pacific) and Myers spoke in a panel discussion for Board members in 1988. They were introducing "Non-traditional/Innovative Approaches" to Board members. They drew lines for a full paradigm shift to take place. Wakefield noted that, "You [audience of Board members] are probably aware, but if not, should be, that we are moving away from the traditional mission structure We've simply set up a direct administrative system where the missionaries in these countries answer directly to a person appointed by the area director, . . . bypassing some of the administrative systems that go in the larger missions."³⁶ Later the Board affirmed that there should be significant changes in the countries where Southern Baptist missionaries had functioned in a traditional way for decades. Board members interpreted Parks as advocating that we should be ". . . equal partners with national conventions who are involved in sending their own missionaries [many of the traditional countries where the Board had work]. Redeployment will give more to these countries where work is not as strong. We would not pull out abruptly, but phase out of mission work in a country. Parks sees our being a catalyst and a stimulant to the national conventions for sending

³⁶"Board of Trustee Minutes," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 1362, February 8, 1988).

missionaries rather than their being dependent on us."³⁷

As the CSI agenda took on further definition, more tension appeared between the traditional way of doing mission in open countries and the challenging ways of doing it in the newly opening frontiers where prior mistaken methods could be corrected and new approaches could be tested. Talk of radical change in mission administration, new partnering and empowering arrangements with existing national conventions, and redeployment of missionary units pointed to the fact that Park's administration was ". . . raising to an intentional program level some new ways of working that we have not focused in on in the past."³⁸ Elsewhere, and in relation to the topic of missionary roles that needed revised to engage evangelism and church planting more proactively as part of Park's emerging paradigm, Wakefield indicated that, "There are some objections to this. People are highly threatened when you think about changing what people are doing to this extent."³⁹

The CSI program initiated during Parks' administration

³⁷"Board of Trustee Minutes," (Glorieta, New Mexico: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 530, July 16, 1988).

³⁸"Board of Trustee Minutes," February 8, 1988.

³⁹"Board of Trustee Minutes," July 16, 1988. Evangelism becomes more central as missionaries aim at doing what it takes to disengage from institutional, subsidized mission activities which foster dependency and hamper indigenous Christian initiatives. Wakefield's quote was in this topical context.

affirmed and enlarged the three core values of the Gospel Missioners, inaugurated partnerships with national conventions and other evangelical agencies of like mind in an unprecedented way, and began the necessary administrative realignment to poise the Board for entering the next century on a whole new footing. The threat of change usually unsettles traditional missionaries with vested interests in the status quo. Parks may have been able to stem the tide of rising criticism had he remained in office. Reformers in the Southern Baptist Convention raised questions about Baptist heritage and doctrinal purity and sponsored corrective measures. These spilled over into the Board's operations and Parks eventually resigned in 1992 only to assume a similar role as head of the splinter group's mission agency within the Convention known as the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship.⁴⁰ The CSI momentum did not derail, however. At nearly the same time as Parks was making his departure, the Board followed through and made CSI a full program level administrative entity. They named Michael W. Stroope as the Area Director for CSI's global operations.⁴¹ During his tenure as CSI's head, he took the post-modern missiological elements embedded in its founding principles and refined them with a

⁴⁰Estep, Whole Gospel, 365-371.

⁴¹"Stroope Elected Area Director of Cooperative Services International," Baptist Press Release, (Richmond), August 20, 1992; Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 4675.

flair that accentuated growing tensions. At the time of Stroope's appointment, nine other geographically defined Area Director posts existed along side his. The Board defined CSI's mandate topically. Wherever "unreached" peoples existed, CSI had jurisdiction and made strategic plans to establish operations there. Such a move cut across administrative lines and heightened the perceived threat to traditionalists that Wakefield had spoken of four years earlier. A new president for the Board faced the challenge of determining the future of both the Board and CSI.

Jerry A. Rankin Era (1993-1997)⁴²

The Board's presidential search committee nominated Jerry A. Rankin to the post after an exhaustive process. On May 25, 1993, trustees announced their decision and indicated that the full Board vote would come one day prior to the annual meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention on June 14, 1993. Generally Rankin's nomination and eventual election were met with praise among missionaries and within the Convention's leadership. Formerly Parks had worked with Rankin in Indonesia and remarked that "He has a lot of gifts and a lot to commend himself for this position. . . . Jerry is very bright and has a clear grasp of mission principles and a background in missions

⁴²Rankin's tenure as President of the Foreign Mission Board continues today. The year 1997 appears here because it marks the chronological delimitation of this research.

experience."⁴³ There was concern over Rankin's supervisory style when the press interviewed past colleagues. Harold Malone, then retired, remarked, "His style of management is more to make decisions and tell you, rather than working with people, getting input and making them feel they are part of the decision-making process. . . . This is one thing missionaries in general will have a difficult time with."⁴⁴

Rankin did not waste time. He assumed his post and spoke to Board members for the first time as President in August of 1993. His initial agenda called for reversing the trend toward centralized strategic planning fostered under the Parks administration, and increasing the links to other "Great Commission Christian"⁴⁵ agencies. Rankin's address included a critique of past practices and concluded they were less focused and more splintered than he desired. He alluded to his view of the CSI phenomenon when he said, "We cannot afford to have a fragmented structure with various departments each devising, advocating and promoting their distinct programs."⁴⁶

⁴³Greg Warner, "'Dark Horse' Jerry Rankin Chosen as FMB Nominee," (Bedford: Associated Baptist Press Release, May 25, 1993).

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵This is a term frequently used by the Board to simply mean evangelical agencies of like mind.

⁴⁶"Board of Trustee Minutes," (Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 1331, August 16, 1993). Tensions between traditionalists

CSI proved to be a successful strategic initiative. Stroope added to its development by taking the principles he inherited and accentuating them with his own charismatic leadership style. During his reports to the Board he frequently chose to deliver vision statements as well as annual summaries of activities. The organization's aims appeared in its mission statement.

The mission of Cooperative Services International and its personnel is to preach the gospel among the peoples of the earth who cannot hear of Jesus Christ and thus cannot understand his great salvation for them. We feel that in doing this we participate with him in establishing 'his glory among the nations, his marvelous deeds among all peoples.' Thus, we intend 'to use all appropriate means to bring salvation through Jesus Christ to the unreached peoples and cities of the world; and to establish indigenous churches among every tribe, tongue, and nation as we anticipate the imminent return of Christ.'⁴⁷

Stroope's vision for CSI was more than an administrative or strategic tool for engaging mission work. He linked all such endeavors to the "imminent return of Christ." This indicates that premillennial thinking was at the core of Stroope's visionary leadership style. CSI's field operations exhibited a sense of urgency, expectation, and cooperation not seen in most

and what some deemed CSI's cavalier actions eventually led to the latter's demise as seen later. This writer concludes that Rankin's reference here is portentous and a subtle indication of his intention to dissolve CSI as is apparent later.

⁴⁷Mike W. Stroope, "Report to the Board: Cooperative Services International," (Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 1961, October 9, 1995).

of the Board's traditional settings because ultimate and eternal aims were more paramount than maintaining entrenchment practices. With a streamlined administrative field structure, CSI partisans spread out to the identified "unreached" peoples of the world (often crossing into zones already occupied by traditionalists) and saw substantive results. By 1996, press releases began to document CSI's progress. "They started 367 churches and baptized 6,548 new believers in some of the toughest places on earth. . . . The Last Frontier ranked third-highest in new churches among the 10 world regions identified by the Foreign Mission Board."⁴⁸ Risking all to find ways of living, working, evangelizing, and starting churches in restricted zones led to a few regrettable casualties along the way. Both Rankin and Stroope represented the Board at the funerals of "Chu Hon and Kei Wol Yi" on April 15, 1995 in Virginia. The couple were Korean-Americans under appointment by the Board who had served with CSI in the Siberian city of Khabarovsk. Their aim was to establish a legitimate presence there, use their medical training to serve the needs of the people, build relationships, and present the gospel to North Koreans living and working in that area. They were both murdered on March 28, 1995. Their local church in Virginia was stunned by the events, but spokespersons consoled them with the

⁴⁸Erich Bridges, "367 New Churches Prove 'Last Frontier' Reachable," Baptist Press Release, (Richmond), March 14, 1996: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 12904.

language of martyrdom. Daniel Moon, a Korean-American commented that "'They went as human sacrifices' for the cause of Christ, Moon told approximately 500 people gathered before the pair of wooden coffins."⁴⁹

A streamlined relational administrative style, growing success, and energetic enthusiasm led to increased CSI appointment trends.⁵⁰ This matrix drew attention to CSI in an unprecedented way and, by implication, indicted traditionalist agendas. These events finally led to a break.⁵¹ In a surprise maneuver, Rankin announced a massive restructuring of the Board's entire field and home administration in the Spring of 1997. Praising CSI's successes, Rankin called for CSI's dissolution as a separate administrative entity and for administrators to graft CSI's dynamism into normal operations worldwide, including the Richmond headquarters. Rankin utilized apocalyptic language similar to Stroope's in calling for such urgent and radical change to meet the demanding challenges of

⁴⁹David Williard, "Korean Christian Martyrs Buried in Virginia Beach," Baptist Press Release, (Virginia Beach), April 17, 1995: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 12107.

⁵⁰See Appendix E for CSI's vision statement and its defining principles.

⁵¹CSI indirectly indicted traditionalist ways by achieving stunning successes and creating fresh momentum within the Board's operations. This writer is not implying that they intentionally set out to undermine directly traditionalist operations; it was rather a byproduct.

doing missions in the world's frontier, "unreached" zones now and on into the next century.⁵²

The common theme between Rankin and Stroope was the concept of the "unreached." Exerting all energy, expending all resources, doing whatever it would take to achieve the goal of global evangelism seemed synonymous in both men's vocabularies, and appeared to be the rationale to urgently push forward to reorganize completely the Board. However, as communiques reached affected field personnel, a subtle but clear difference in definitions surfaced. Avery Willis, Senior Vice President for Overseas Operations, interpreted the radical changes for concerned CSI "family" members just as these Board trustees acted on final resolutions effecting sweeping new Board operations. He reaffirmed the "vision" for change to posture the Board for the future. At first glance, Willis picked up on CSI motivational language and reaffirmed the vital driving ideals of the CSI family.

. . . it is a COMMITMENT TO THE EDGE where the focus is on the world's millions of lost men and women. The nature of the edge is different in different contexts, but in all cases it means fulfilling the missionary task of taking the gospel to new frontiers where it

⁵²Louis Moore, "FMB Trustees Approve Restructure Principles," Baptist Press Release, (Richmond), April 10, 1997: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 13719. The startling thing is that within a six month period, the world's largest Protestant sending agency completely reinvented itself with little consultation between or among field operatives or national Baptist partners where such existed.

has not yet penetrated a people, a nation, or a specific group.⁵³

Note the functional shift in definition implied when Willis stated that the "Edge" is nothing more than finishing the task of simple evangelism whatever the context, regardless of whether the church already exists there or not. Willis elaborated on this difference in a popular missions magazine interview. Willis stated, "Any missionary can do what CSI is doing. The CSI methodology focuses on getting a witness out, working with Great Commission Christians, starting churches. All the ways CSI workers get to unreached peoples can actually be used with any group of people."⁵⁴

Slight differences can make large impacts on strategic planning, allocations of personnel, and financial resources. When distinctions between the two terms "unreached" and

⁵³Mike Stroope and Avery Willis, "Last Update," Electronic Mail Letter, CSI "Family" Communique, June 3, 1997). Emphases are Willis'.

⁵⁴"The Southern Baptists Restructure to Reach the Unreached Peoples: An Interview with Jerry Rankin, IMB President and Avery Willis, Senior Vice President for Overseas Operations," Mission Frontiers July-October 1997:17. To assure this interpretation, this writer asked Rankin to clarify the apparent difference in definition. His reply was that, "We [the restructured Board] are, in fact, making less distinction between World A [only 'unreached' people groups] and other unreached or unevangelized people groups as they all represent massive population entities and ethnic-linguistic groups which are lost whether they have had access to the gospel or not." Jerry Rankin, "A Question," Electronic Mail Letter to Keith Eitel, April 3, 1998). Note the mixed thinking whereby the term "unevangelized," wherever they may be, including traditional entrenched zones, is strategically equivalent to "unreached," that is, wherever the church does not exist or only marginally exists.

"unevangelized" were blurred the CSI vision was as well. The Parks era emphasis on reassessing the way the Board should operate in established areas where Baptist conventions already existed (other evangelicals too) would dissipate without a distinctive meaning for the "frontier," "World A," or "Edge" separate from the "unevangelized" everywhere. This entire discussion ties to the larger issue of contrasting missiological paradigms when the existence of indigenous national conventions (with whom the Board may have had relationships for well over a hundred years) appears in the equation.⁵⁵ The Board initiated little or no consultation with national Baptist bodies as they undertook staggering changes which completely redefined the way missionaries would live and work in or with their national counterparts.⁵⁶ The challenge of the "unreached" or more accurately "unevangelized" within these historically traditional fields appears to have somehow become the nearly exclusive right

⁵⁵Between 1846 and 1849, the Board started works in China and Liberia. The relationship with Chinese Baptists formally ceased in 1951. The relationship with Liberian Baptists ceased in 1871 and resumed in 1960. Between 1850 and 1881, the Board launched works in Nigeria, Italy, Mexico, and Brazil. Nigeria is the oldest continuous work having formed in 1850. Estep, Whole Gospel, 419.

⁵⁶Avery Willis, Vice President for Overseas Operations at the FMB, stated "we did not systematically talk to our Baptist Partners about the reorganization before or following the recommendation to the trustees." He further indicated that the FMB viewed the restructuring as an internal issue and would negotiate with national counterparts after the fact. Avery Willis, "Response Regarding Role of Baptist Partners in Reorganization," Electronic Mail Letter to Keith Eitel, April 20, 1998).

or responsibility of the foreign missionaries. Based on these two realities, one may conclude that the Rankin-Willis restructuring may reinforce non-indigenous attitudes in many traditional fields. In contrast is CSI's "Edge" mentality, especially as defined by Stroope.

Beyond the mission frontiers and outposts which have become familiar names and places to us, there exists an Edge which is still unknown and untouched. This Edge consists of peoples with little or no knowledge of Jesus Christ. The Edge is not beyond God's reach or love. In fact, the Edge has always been the center of God's activity. His desire is for all peoples to know him and sing praises to his name . . . nothing less!

The impact of our lives will be measured by our passion and our passion by the depth of our sacrifice. A passion for the Edge puts to death every other passion and produces a zeal to do whatever it takes to reach the Edge--NOW!⁵⁷

CSI's "Edge" mentality required strategists to redesign how the Board relates to indigenous conventions. In lieu of such aims, the Board apparently has reverted to non-indigenous attitudes toward partners abroad.

The potential for reversal of new missiological directions in the newly designed Rankin administration, prompted Stroope to take a one year furlough offered to Area Directors of the prior

⁵⁷See respectively Mike W. Stroope, "Report to the Board: Cooperative Services International," (Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org:8080>, Accession Number 2464, October 6, 1996) and Mike Stroope, "Where Passion Leads Us," The CSI Edge, Spring 1997:1. The latter was an occasional CSI publication.

structure effective July 1, 1997.⁵⁸ By November, Stroope resigned and formed a parallel, independent group to assist local churches in gearing up for reaching the "Edge" where "World A" peoples exist.⁵⁹ As with Crawford approximately a century earlier, when the Board minimized something Stroope deemed globally significant (CSI "Edge" type thinking remains operative primarily in two of the Board's fourteen new regions), that would require developing and enacting post-modern values, he appealed directly to the local churches.⁶⁰

In many ways, the Rankin administration maintains convictions that have developed in the century between the Gospel Mission and CSI. He solidly affirms the need to avoid subsidy systems throughout the world by not developing them in

⁵⁸Stroope and Willis, "Last Update." Since CSI ceased to exist on that date, Stroope had no Area administration to return to and opted for the furlough.

⁵⁹Art Toalston, "Michael Stroope Launches New Missions Enterprise," Baptist Press Release, (Arlington, TX), November 25, 1997. Stroope issued a communique to the network of former CSI workers explaining his move. The new organization, "All Peoples" was needed because realities at the "Edge" demanded that there be "massive and bold mobilization of the whole Community [networks of local churches]. . . . The local community in Antioch (Acts 13:1-4) is the model of how this kind of mobilization can happen. All Peoples will assist and serve local communities in doing the task." Mike Stroope, "An Open Letter to Friends and Colleagues," Electronic Mail Letter, Former CSI "Family" Communique, December 16, 1997).

⁶⁰This does not necessarily mean that Stroope is a modern day Crawford. It does mean that the Board has internally struggled over post-modern core values once again and similar reactions are apparent.

new zones and trying to work through the maze of issues required to disentangle the Board from subsidizing systems in traditional ones. Rankin concludes that "Subsidy propagates a Western model of a church that sees a building and a paid pastor as essential rather than encouraging a reproducible biblical model of the church as gathered believers responsible to and for their own leadership and facilities."⁶¹ Serious study of the "mission" administrative phenomenon began under the Parks era and has finally transpired.⁶² By coopting CSI's relational or team oriented administrative structure and diffusing it into the Board's global operation, Rankin has presided over the dissolution of a host of field missions as organizational entities, a step forward even if done without much input from indigenous conventions. Yet, Rankin seems unaware of the impact that may accrue from neglecting indigenous consultation about the issues of the "unreached" or of engaging the "unevangelized" within their borders. A partnering mentality would necessarily involve national believers, especially in traditional zones, as

⁶¹Jerry Rankin, "The Rankin File," The Commission, August 1997, 53.

⁶²Alan Neely, "Administration of Foreign Missionaries Through an Organization Known as a 'Mission,'" (Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, May 1986). Myers, original head of CSI, contacted Neely, then missions professor at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, to conduct the potentially controversial study. Neely concluded that retention of mission organizations could "only be understood in the light of generations of colonialism and the deep-seated conviction that Europeans and North Americans were inherently superior." p.30.

peers in the process of evangelization both in their own countries and ultimately to the "Edge", to the "unreached." Rankin's ideas regarding tensions created by CSI's "Edge" mentality were evident early on. When nominated as President, he sketched out his vision for the Board to a local reporter. "He [Rankin] said a Rankin administration would continue the current emphasis on pushing into the unreached areas, but at the same time would press evangelism programs in the harvest fields."⁶³

Stroope has reflected on CSI's background and development in light of recent Board changes. His opinion is that Rankin restructured to salvage the aging organization and to end rising tensions between old and new ways of doing missions. This was strategically done by eliminating the motivational aim of the new approach which gave CSI growing attention and coopting its innovations to breathe new life into old structures. Stroope said

. . . the reorganization was about the controlled risk for a large organization. That here this one segment, because CSI was out of control and was producing risks that they were not able to really control. And then secondly, just the need to minimize conflict. The conflict that was going on between the areas and between missionaries, the more traditional fields and the CSI fields. And then also an attempt to centralize planning and funding that rather than allowing people to draw these straight lines from the

⁶³Ed Briggs, "Mission Panel Taps Veteran of Asian Service," Richmond Times-Dispatch, (Richmond), May 26, 1993.

field to the pew, they wanted that to come through certain channels and in Richmond in order that people could have oversight.⁶⁴

At its founding, and under Stroope's leadership, CSI validated the same core missiological values as the Gospel Missioners attempted to implement (indigeneity, incarnation, and responsible autonomy) in the virgin soil of "unreached" areas in the world and tried to move beyond by developing more in depth ways to involve local churches in the process of doing missions. It also advanced by using a relational management style, and by developing post-denominational partnerships with other evangelicals called Great Commission Christians.⁶⁵ Rankin affirms these principles in theory, but clings to some old Enlightenment attitudes. Especially is this evident when he preserves a paternalistic, status quo presence and attitude in

⁶⁴Michael W. Stroope, Interview by Keith E. Eitel, February 25, 1998, transcript, Southeastern SBC Historical Missiology Oral History Collection, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC:22. This wording sounds awkward because it is from an oral history transcript.

⁶⁵Post-denominational thinkers assume, to a degree, that denominations are Western creations that have outlived their usefulness and merging common interests will aid Christianity's development as it continues expanding making it much more global and inclusive. CSI does not reflect an ecumenical spirit but did show a willingness to partner on a broader scale than the Foreign Mission Board had before. It still maintained its evangelical, conversionist root. For contemporary opinions on post-denominationalism see the following sources: David J. Bosch, Believing In the Future: Toward a Missiology of Western Culture (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995):57-58 and Lacy Creighton, "Toward a Post-Denominational World Church," in Beyond Establishment: Protestant Identity in a Post-Protestant Age, eds. Jackson W. Carroll, Wade Clark Roof (Louisville: Westminster-John Knox, 1993):327-361.



several areas of the world.

Rankin's tenure as the Board's President is barely five years in the making. At this juncture, it is premature to predict how historians of a different era will judge his administration. Only time will tell if the new edifice, designed to posture the Board for the future, will be able to cohere by leaning on CSI's skeletal frame without retaining its passion and its soul--reaching the "unreached."⁶⁶

⁶⁶This is a reference to CSI's "Edge" mentality.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Summary

Sectional strife over the status of slavery created the circumstances which eventually caused the Baptist Union in America to divide into two entities in 1845. The trigger issue was over the right to engage in missionary activity. Northern abolitionists within Baptist ranks pushed for stringent policies banning slave holders from appointment by either the domestic or foreign boards. Since this directly affected numerous Baptists in the South, separatists met in Augusta, Georgia in May of 1845 to settle the issues. The solution was to form a separate organization, the Southern Baptist Convention, for the express purpose of collective missionary activities. They were zealous for the cause of world evangelization and reflected common attitudes and trends for their day.¹

¹Bosch noted that early to mid-nineteenth century missionaries were distinctly different from their commercially driven, colonizing, colleagues venturing into unknown lands for fame and fortune. David J. Bosch, "Reflections on Biblical Models of Mission," in Toward the Twenty-First Century in Christian Mission, ed. James M. Phillips and Robert T. Coote (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993):176-177. Yet, William R. Hutchison concludes that there was also a tendency toward parochial ways and means of "doing" missions even though those involved were likely not aware of the dual impacts that their own culture and the host culture made in

Since its founding, the Convention held firmly to its missionary roots in spite of challenging controversies like lingering effects of the Anti-missionary or Landmark movements. Each in its own unique way threatened the Convention's missiological cohesiveness. Anti-missionism reacted against polished "yankees" promoting causes that drained funds from frontier farmers to coffers somewhere else. Armed with a strident form of Calvinistic thinking, they reacted to Luther Rice and others who called for collective missionary enterprises. Landmarkers did not challenge the need for missionary activity, just the means of doing it through federalized boards which tended to bypass or minimize the role of local churches. J. R. Graves almost toppled the Foreign Mission Board in the Convention meeting of 1859, but succumbed to a compromise move that allowed churches to designate funds for specific missionaries through the Board's financial channels.

T. P. and Martha Foster Crawford, home from China, attended that defining meeting. Yet, they lived and worked inside the Board's structure for over thirty years. In 1892, Crawford published a pamphlet entitled Churches to the Front!. The Board

shaping their ideas and actions. William R. Hutchison, "A Moral Equivalent for Imperialism: Americans and the Promotion of 'Christian Civilization', 1880-1910," in Missionary Ideologies in the Imperialist Era: 1880-1920, ed. Torben Christensen and William R. Hutchison (Copenhagen: Aros, 1982): 168-169 and William R. Hutchison, Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987): 8-9.

removed his name from its roster of missionaries, his wife resigned, and several other of the Board's North China Mission members followed suit.² The band merged their missiological convictions, moved further into China's interior, and called themselves the Gospel Mission.³ The little band held together around three core values: indigeneity, incarnation, and responsible autonomy. Each value, as applied by the Gospel Missioners, was atypical for their day. Their missiological convictions were incipient forms of post-modern values more extant a century later. Even though they were not alone in advocating these values, they blended them together in a unique fashion and were, therefore, strategically ahead of most of their peers both inside and outside the Board.⁴

The Boxer uprising, the deaths of both Crawfords, and

²Repeated attempts to articulate and challenge the Board about the subsidy system had previously failed.

³Both Crawford and Gospel Missionism have been linked to Landmarkism. Yet, chapter three demonstrates that the Landmark movement seized Gospel Missionism for its purposes and that the two movements were only marginally linked.

⁴For interpretation of the Crawfords' methods see Wayne Flynt and Gerald W. Berkley, Taking Christianity to China: Alabama Missionaries in the Middle Kingdom 1850-1950 (Tuscalousa: University of Alabama, 1997). The authors state that "...the Crawfords left an important legacy. Their emphasis on evangelism, on adjusting Western culture to Chinese realities, their refusal to pay Chinese converts, their demand for Chinese self-support and reliance on local churches combined many of the most farsighted with many of the most impractical aspects of China missions. . . . [the Crawfords] were well ahead of their times. . . [their practices] anticipated the Three-Self Movement by a century. . . ." pps. 270 and 334.

trouble maintaining links with local churches in America caused the collapse of the Gospel Mission by 1910. With only one exception, all surviving members returned to the Board by 1915. They lived out their careers as Board missionaries in good standing, mostly as part of the Board's then newly established Interior China Mission. In subtle, but noticeable ways they passed on their convictions regarding indigeneity and incarnation to new missionaries as they oriented them for field service. The place of responsible autonomy, missionaries individually linked to local churches, was a diminishing value as it had proven to be the untenable or impractical element in their thought. Another generation of field missionaries carried on in their tradition up to about the end of World War II. From 1945 on, their direct influence is not traceable, except as mistakenly linked to Landmarkism.

From 1945 to the present, however, missiological voices from the broader Evangelical community began to echo similar themes, especially those of Roland Allen and Donald McGavran. These writers raised the same issues, but without the stigma of Gospel Missionism's label, so Board strategists began to listen. Since World War II, the Board has had four administrative heads. M. Theron Rankin was the first in the Board's history to have been a field missionary prior to serving in that capacity. He brought fresh insight regarding the field's crucial needs and fostered critical thinking about how the Board could move toward indigeneity. His tenure with the Board ceased when he suddenly

died in 1953. Baker James Cauthen assumed the helm the following year and again brought the freshness of field insight to the task. Yet, he and his chief strategist, Frank K. Means, showed mixed convictions and stalled the Board's move toward more modern missiological values. R. Keith Parks, also a field missionary, became Board President in 1980. He inherited a Board moving toward bold goals to be achieved by the century's end. He affirmed the Board's direction but set a different course for achieving its goals. He raised the Board's consciousness about what McGavran had termed "hidden" or "unreached" peoples of the world and drafted action steps for the Board's future that would engage missions in new zones and use new methods. Centered around formation of Cooperative Services International (CSI), Parks affirmed the original set of values cherished by the Gospel Missioners a century before, and enlarged them with another distinctly post-modern value, post-denominational cooperation. Michael W. Stroope became CSI's director just as Parks resigned from the Board in 1992, because of tensions within the Convention. Stroope took on the challenge of directing CSI and added a uniquely visionary and relational leadership style, and did so with a flair that irritated other administrative associates. One such peer, Jerry A. Rankin, became President in 1993. Rising administrative tensions over CSI's topically defined mandate, successes throughout the "unreached" zones of the world, and the cavalier way of traversing into other regional leaders' zones (allowable

by its Board mandate) germinated a final break. In the first half of 1997, Rankin announced the largest restructuring in the Board's history, all done to posture the Board for the demanding challenges of doing mission in the modern era. He dissolved CSI, created fourteen new geographically defined zones, and made CSI's *modus operandi* normative throughout the world. Rankin affirmed CSI's successes, but apparently it was too successful to remain a functioning administrative entity. Coopting CSI's visionary premillennial aims, its managerial practices, and affirming the core values Parks had built into CSI's original purposes, Rankin hoped to infuse the Board with new life to face the future. Yet, he retained an old paradigm attitude in relation to perennial fields. He has taken the inspiring language of CSI's "Edge" mentality and redefined it so that there's minimal difference between the "unevangelized" anywhere in the world (including long standing fields) and the "unreached" in virgin areas where the Church has not traditionally existed. By doing so, he exhibited a non-indigenous spirit toward the national Baptist entities throughout the sections of the world where Board missionaries have worked for generations. If the Board is still dependent on American missionaries to evangelize the "Edge" where the "unevangelized" live within long established fields, then the Board has failed and may continue to do so if Rankin does not reaffirm CSI's driving, mobilizing "Edge" mentality. There is no doubt that there are many that need evangelizing in

traditional fields, but who should engage the processes and determination of missionary roles should be seriously reviewed. On this point, Rankin has accepted the inherited status quo and seems to have created a syncretized method that has the outer form of an Evangelical post-modern missiology yet has sacrificed CSI's internal spirit that gave meaning to the whole process.

Conclusion

At the stroke of midnight on July 1, 1997, the world changed. Hong Kong, long since situated within the United Kingdom, was ceded back under the control of the People's Republic of China at the end of a ninety-nine year treaty. Pundits predict both doom and spectacular success, depending on one's premise. Will Hong Kong change China or will China dismantle the uniquely profitable port city with its paradoxical blend of free market economics and harsh totalitarian politics? Only time will tell.⁵

The world changed in another way at that same stroke of the clock. Facing the challenges of a new century called for radical reconstruction within the Southern Baptist Conventions's foreign mission enterprise. CSI ceased to exist after barely ten years of existence. Its dissolution was heralded as an acknowledgment of its successes. The Board's administration

⁵Hay-Him Chan, "God's Trojan Horse: Hong Kong's Reversion to China and the Evangelization of 1.2 Billion People," World Evangelization 79 (June 1997):4-7.

blended CSI's vitalities into the entire corpus of the aging parent organization. Yet, as with Hong Kong, time alone will tell if CSI's influences will indeed change the Board or whether dismantling CSI will actually suppress the momentum for change so desperately needed to face the demands of doing mission in a brave, new post-modern world.

Was Rankin's move actually an attempt to capture CSI's momentum in order to posture the entire Board for a new century, or even a new millennium? Has the paradigm really shifted fully toward an Evangelical version of a post-modern model? Or could it rather have been an attempt to "freeze out"⁶ forward thinking idealists once again? Only time will tell.

One thing is certain; the aim of stimulating healthy indigenous church planting movements among the world's "unreached" peoples will not be left waiting. The advance to the "Edge" where they dwell will proceed with or without the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board because the seed of CSI's vision has been planted in the heart and soul of thousands of Southern Baptists and hundreds of their churches. Unknowingly, but nonetheless accurately, over ten decades ago, Crawford and the other Gospel Missioners issued a clarion call which might well describe the current situation when he titled his most provocative publication. Indeed, the call still reverberates today, and is more relevant than ever: Churches to the Front!

⁶The term used by Crawford to describe similar Board acts toward his innovations a century earlier.

As local Southern Baptist churches awaken to the needs of the "unreached," they are increasingly taking on their perceived responsibility of completing the Great Commission.

Tarleton Perry & Martha Foster Crawford:
Chronology of Pertinent Events¹

1821	8 May	Tarleton Perry Crawford (TPC) Born in Warren County Kentucky
1830	28 January	Martha Foster [Crawford] (MFC) Born in Jasper County Georgia
1851	6 March	TPC appointed by Southern Baptist Convention Foreign Mission Board (SBC/FMB) as a missionary to Shanghai, China
	12 March	TPC & MFC unite in marriage
	17 November	TPC & MFC depart for China
1852	30 March	TPC & MFC arrive in Shanghai
1857	17 November	TPC & MFC return to U.S.
1858	March	TPC & MFC arrive New York
1859	May	TPC & MFC attend SBC meeting in Richmond
1860	April-May	TPC & MFC depart for & arrive in China
1863	29 August	TPC & MFC locate in Teng Chow
1877	10-24 May	TPC delivers lecture on self-support model to the first General Conference of Protestant Missionaries in Shanghai
1878	June	TPC returns to U.S. due to health
1879	May	TPC attends SEC in Atlanta and addresses the Convention on self-support model
	June	TPC receives honorary D.D. degree from Richmond College in Virginia
	July	TPC returns to China
1881	October	MFC departs for U.S.
1883	July	MFC returns to China; by the end of the year, TPC & MFC educational ministries closed to engage more fully in direct evangelistic efforts
1885	January-February	TPC & MFC receive a mailed copy of an influential book on self-support model from the administration of the SBC/FMB
	March	TPC returns to U.S. to address SBC/FMB regarding self-support model

¹This chronology is compiled from T.P. Crawford, Evolution In My Mission Views or Growth of Gospel Mission Principles in My Own Mind, Fulton, KY: J. A. Scarboro, 1903 and L.S. Foster, Fifty Years in China: An Eventful Memoir of Tarleton Perry Crawford, D.D., Nashville: Bayless-Pullen, 1909. The latter was Martha Foster Crawford's brother as identified in Susan Herring Jefferies, Papa Wore No Halo (Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 1963):130.

1885	27 October	TPC delivers address to the SBC/FMB regarding the need for a general policy enacting a self-support model
	6 November	SBC/FMB votes to encourage self-support ideals as expected outcomes but declines to set global policy
1886	23 September	TPC returns to China
	16 December	TPC arrives Teng Chow
1889	30 March	TPC elects to stop receiving SBC/FMB salary for himself but not for MFC
	22 April	TPC returns to U.S. due to continuing symptoms of paralysis
	July	G.P. Bosticks start work as new missionaries in Teng Chow; Fannie Knight & Lottie Moon start work in Ping Tu
	November	T.J. Leagues start work in Teng Chow
1890	7-20 May	Second General Conference of Protestant Missionaries in Shanghai; G.P. Bostick attends representing SBC/FMB's North China Mission
	July	TPC arrives in Teng Chow from U.S.
	October	SBC/FMB North China Mission forms Eight Principles as a unified basis for their mission work, strong influence of TPC and the self-support model
1892	April	TPC dropped from SBC/FMB official roll of missionaries due to his publication & distribution of his tract <u>Churches to the Front!</u> ; <u>Start of the Gospel Mission Movement (GMM)</u>
	July	MFC writes instructing the SBC/FMB to remove her from the official roll of missionaries in support of TPC
1894		TPC publishes <u>The Crisis of the Churches</u> , a selection of articles expanding the GMM principles, & Gospel Missioners move inland (TPC/MFC to Taianfu)
1900	1 October	TPC & MFC depart for U.S. in the midst of escalating Boxer uprisings
1902	7 April	TPC dies
	October	MFC returns to Taianfu, departs for China with adopted daughter and son-in-law, Rev. Alfred G. Jones of the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS)
1907	25 April-8 May	MFC attends the China Missionary Conference in Shanghai representing the GMM
1909	August	MFC dies
1910		After MFC's death, personal charisma holding the GMM together diminishes; all GMM missionaries return to SBC/FMB except T.L. Blalocks & Attie Bostick, marks the <u>organizational end of the GMM</u>

APPENDIX B¹

SHANTUNG MISSION

Plan of Work

In order to harmonize the views and unify the work of the several stations of this mission the missionaries had a meeting for special prayer and deliberation. The meeting is described as one in which was manifest the presence and power of the Lord. The outcome of the conference was the following document, which was forwarded to the Board, and published by the Mission in some of the papers of this country:

Articles of Agreement Adopted by the American Southern Baptists, Shantung Province, China

We, the Baptist missionaries laboring in the Province of Shantung, North China, approved members of regular Baptist churches, feeling the need of union among ourselves, unanimously agree to form one body for mutual consultation and concert of action in the following particulars:

1. That our missionary work shall be evangelistic, striving by word and life to spread the knowledge of Christ among the people, hoping by the blessing of God upon our work, accompanied by the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit, to see earnest, self-acting Baptist churches gradually rise throughout the land, under the guidance of God-called native ministers of the Word. In order to this end, and to cut off "pecuniary expectation"--a great hindrance to the progress of the truth--we will hereafter use no mission or public money in the work beyond our personal and itinerating expenses, including necessary religious books and tracts, except that aid may be extended to struggling churches in rare cases. We also deem it unwise for us to become pastors, school teachers, charity vendors, or meddlers in Chinese lawsuits.

2. That we will act together in the opening of new stations, the abandonment of old ones, and the choice and change of permanent location; but no new station shall be opened without a missionary of at least two or three years' experience in the field.

¹Southern Baptist Convention, Proceedings (Thirty-Sixth Session--Forty-Sixth Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held In the Opera-House at Birmingham, Alabama, May 8-12, 1891, (Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1891):XVIII-XIX.

3. That it will be best, ordinarily, not to purchase land or build houses in the interior for mission purposes, but to rent from the natives, and to hold ourselves ready to move from place to place as the work may require.

4. That all funds, of whatever kind, received by members of this body for use in their work shall be turned into the public treasury.

5. That any serious dereliction in our missionary character or work shall be, as far as our public support and membership in this body are concerned, subject to the considerate action of the general body.

6. That we will hold an annual meeting in July for the purpose of considering estimates for the coming year and for the transaction of other business of common concern. Other meetings may be held for special purposes at the call of the members of any station, but in such cases the votes of absent members shall be taken in writing on the questions submitted.

7. Desiring to reach unanimity in all cases possible, we will respect the opinion of every one by passing all questions through a second and even a third consideration and vote, at the request of any member of the body, requiring at least two-thirds' majority for the final decision of all questions.

8. That this body is to have no ecclesiastical power nor any jurisdiction in matters not specified.

T. P. Crawford, D. D.

Mrs. M. F. Crawford

Miss Lottie Moon

Eld. C. W. Pruitt

Mrs. Annie S. Pruitt

Eld. T. J. League

Mrs. F. N. League

Miss Fannie S. Knight

Miss Laura G. Barton

Miss Mary J. Thornton

Eld. G. P. Bostick

The Board, after careful consideration, returned the following reply:

"Whereas the Board, far removed from the circumstances under which the Shantung Mission adopted articles of agreement sent to the Board, are unable to judge intelligently of the wisdom or expediency of some of the articles agreed upon; therefore,

"Resolved, that the Board bid our brethren and sisters of Shantung Godspeed in all efforts to promote the efficiency of their work for the Master, which may be wise and scriptural, and which are not contrary to any of the 'Amended rules' or any recorded action of the Board."

APPENDIX C

Gospel Missionism's Core Values Comparison Chart¹

GMM Core Value	GMM Working Definition	Internal Origin	Contributing Influences	Stated Motives	Underlying Assumptions	Post-Modern Parallels
INDIGENEITY	"The gospel of Christ as the power of God unto salvation, in every mission field unaccompanied by any kind of pecuniary inducement to the people; or in other words, through native self-support everywhere." (Crawford 1903, 24-25)	Crawford	Gützlaff, Carpenter, Nevius (Crawford 1903, 26-30)	Churches established from the beginning with national sense of ownership. Rejection of the gradual development toward autonomy model. (Crawford 1903, 50)	GMM, assumed the Chinese to be inherently responsible for work of the church. This was in contrast to values of some missionaries that presupposed the Chinese were not capable and aimed at gradually phasing out subsidy systems, thereby prolonging indigenous development.	Cultural Affirmation A move away from Enlightenment assumption of a "subject-object dichotomy." (Bosch 1991, 342), which was more evident in the gradually phased models of indigeneity.

¹Items noted in this chart are drawn from the following sources listed in sequential order: T. P. Crawford, Evolution In My Mission Views or Growth of Gospel Mission Principles In My Own Mind, ed. J. A. Scarboro (Fulton, KY: Scarboro, 1903); David J. Bosch, Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission, American Society of Missiology Series, No. 16 (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1991); D. W. Herring, "The Meaning of the Gospel Mission Movement," in The Crisis of the Churches: A Collection of Earnest Articles and Extracts from Earnest Men on Matters of Vital Concern to Baptists, ed. T. P. Crawford, 114-128, (Chefoo: n. p., 1894); Susan Herring Jefferies, Papa Wore No Halo (Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 1963); Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor, Hudson Taylor and the China Inland Mission: The Growth of a Work of God, 1st ed. (London: Lutterworth, 1918); G. P. Bostick, "What Is Church Co-operation?," in The Crisis of the Churches: A Collection of Earnest Articles and Extracts from Earnest Men on Matters of Vital Concern to Baptists, ed. T. P. Crawford, 147-149, (Chefoo: n. p., 1894); T. P. Crawford, Churches, To The Front! (China: n. p., 1892).

GMM Core Value	GMM Working Definition	Internal Origin	Contributing Influences	Stated Motives	Underlying Assumptions	Post-Modern Parallels
INCARNATION	"Self-denying labors for Christ's sake, both by the churches at home, and by the missionaries abroad." (Crawford 1903, 24-25)	Herring (Herring 1994, 126-128)	J. Hudson Taylor [CTM] (Jefferies 1963, 51-55)	Goal was to create circumstances whereby relevant cross-cultural identification and communication could take place. (Herring 1894, 126)	Transplantation of Christian beliefs and practices while consciously wanting to avoid conveying western ones. Required an atypical view of non-western cultures. (Herring 1894, 127)	Lifestyle Inculturation Movement away from Enlightenment patterns of culturally ethnocentric paternalism toward cross-cultural identification.

GMM Core Value	GMM Definition	Internal Origin	Contributing Influences	Stated Motives	Underlying Assumptions	Post-Modern Parallels
RESPONSIBLE INDEPENDENCE	"The churches of Christ should, as organized bodies, singly or in cooperating groups, do their own mission work without the intervention of any outside convention, association or Board." (Crawford 1903, 24-25)	Crawford, Herring, Bostick	J. Hudson Taylor [CIM] (Howard Taylor 1918, 43)	<p><u>Crawford:</u> Reformation of the way the Board would relate to the field missionary not a revolt against it. (Crawford 1903, 68)</p> <p><u>Herring:</u> Interdependence partnerships which ought to be inherent to Baptist congregations at home and abroad. (Herring 1894, 125)</p> <p><u>Bostick:</u> Local church responsibility with mutual cooperation (Bostick 1894, 148)</p>	To create a "living interest in it [missions] and in each other." (Crawford 1892, 4-5) To also extend the same privilege to new national churches. (Herring 1894, 125).	Localization Movement away from Enlightenment patterns of denominational dependence or unchecked independence, toward independence with local accountability, or interdependence (missionary & church).

APPENDIX D

Stages of Church Planting: Typical Missionary and Chinese Independent Methods Compared¹

Mission Churches	Chinese Churches
1. Began with <u>buildings</u> and employed Chinese preachers under missionary leadership.	1. Began with <u>self-propagation</u> by the Chinese church leaders themselves.
2. Started <u>institutional work</u> at an early stage as aids to evangelism.	2. Started a <u>self-governing</u> body early in the congregation's development.
3. Gathered a congregation and worked toward <u>self-support</u> capability.	3. Attained <u>self-support</u> and called a pastor.
4. Attained full <u>self-governing</u> status after calling a pastor.	4. Developed financial growth for erecting a <u>church building</u> .
5. Pastor carried on <u>self propagation</u> work.	5. <u>Institutional work</u> : educational, vocational, and philanthropic services expanded <u>as a result</u> of church growth.

¹Jonathan T'ien-en Chao, The Chinese Indigenous Church Movement, 1919-1927: A Protestant Response to the Anti-Christian Movements in Modern China. PhD Dissertation, The University of Pennsylvania, 1986. The emphases are Chao's. In this chart, Chao demonstrates the difference in methodologies employed by foreign missionaries in China (during the 19th and 20th centuries) and Chinese nationals (in the independent church movements that began in 1901 shortly after the Boxer uprisings). Both models intended the same result, namely, church autonomy with Christianity gaining cultural identity, but with very differing effects. The one presupposed national inability to take responsibility from the outset of the work, while the other supposed national ability and responsibility. Adherents of the Gospel Mission Movement held values very similar to those reflective of the Chinese independent church model which affirmed national control from the outset.

APPENDIX E

CSI Vision and Principles July 1995

Vision

To lead Southern Baptists, World Baptists, and Great Commission Christians to use all appropriate means to bring salvation through Jesus Christ to the World A/unreached peoples and cities of the world; and to establish indigenous church planting movements among every tribe, tongue and nation as we anticipate the imminent return of our Lord.

Principles

1. DESTINATION IS THE POINT AND YOU ARE THE KEY! Plans, programs and technology are not our foremost consideration but only means to the end. An indigenous church planting movement among every people must be the point of all we do. You (your competence and character) are the key in reaching the destination. Thus, we must do all we can to adequately support, train and guide you.
2. WE MUST CONTINUALLY CHANGE. Our willingness to challenge and change the way we do things has been one of our strengths. Unwillingness to challenge what has become status quo or conventional wisdom in CSI will mean stagnation. Thus, we must continually check our course, making minor adjustments and major changes.
3. ORGANIZATIONAL CONFORMITY FOR THE SAKE OF CONFORMITY IS DEATH. Our Lord has created something unique and distinctive in CSI for the sake of the nations. To sacrifice this on the altar of organizational expediency or uniformity is wrong. We are part of the organizational family, and yet we do not have to look or act exactly like our brothers and sisters. Our motivation must not be conformity to organizational standards, procedures and policies for the sake of conformity. Rather, our motives must be driven by what it will take to reach the nations.
4. THE WAY FORWARD FOR CSI MUST BE THROUGH HUMILITY AND SERVICE. This which we believe about the nations and to be the very heart of our God will not be grasped by others through arrogance or power of persuasion, but only through humility and service to those around us and the rest of the organization. The politics of power and turf are not the way of our Lord, so they should not be our way either. We must continually remember that we are participants in World A only at our Lord's gracious invitation.
5. WE ALL LIVE UNDER AUTHORITY AND ARE ACCOUNTABLE. We live together under the covenant to bless the nations. In this relationship, we mentor, correct, teach and support each other.

Thus, all of us are accountable to someone in a corporate-like structure where individuals are empowered for appropriate decision-making and leadership. The context in which we work and the stewardship of resources demand that we operate in the most efficient, effective manner possible.

6. THE GREATER OUR DIVERSITY, THE GREATER OUR STRENGTH. A leveling of everyone to the lowest common denominator is not our aim. Everyone must not look and act the same. Equity is not our way of operating. Each of you will be treated differently. The aim is the maximizing of everyone's unique gifts and personality so that the destination is reached.

7. COMMUNICATION MUST BE WIDE AND SECURE. We must redouble our efforts and use the latest means in order to communicate effectively and securely with each other and our constituency.

8. THE EDGE IS WHERE WE BELONG. As individuals and as a group, we dare not draw back from the edge of the World A. We are people who are gifted for and called to the edge; thus, with passion and intent we must continue to enter new people groups and cities rather than seeking only to consolidate the gains we have made.

9. WE WILL DO WHATEVER IT TAKES TO GET TO THE DESTINATION. This does not mean that the end justifies every means. Rather, it means that we do what our Lord has asked of us, believing that He intends for His church to exist among all peoples before He returns. To get to this destination, we must move beyond restrictive thinking, work with GCC brothers and sisters, and believe He is working in every situation.

10. THE ORGANIZATION IS NOT YOUR GOD. Your call is from the One who called Abraham to be a blessing to the nations. Your dependency must rest in Him alone. Your power does not lie in the organization's resources or name but in the One who created all things. If our worship and allegiance is not focused singularly on the One who made all peoples and on His Son, then we disqualify ourselves from this race.



Selected Bibliography

"ABC's of the New Life Movement." Baptist Standard. February 20, 1963.

Allen, Hubert J. B. Roland Allen: Pioneer, Priest, and Prophet. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Allen, Roland. The Case for Voluntary Clergy. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1930.

Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. Baptist Battles: Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention. New Brunswick: Rutgers University, 1990.

Anderson, Rufus. Foreign Missions, Their Relations and Claims. New York: Scribner, 1869.

Atwood, E. B. "Outlines of a History of Missions in China." Th.D. diss, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1911.

Baker, Robert A. A Baptist Source Book: With Particular Reference to Southern Baptists. Nashville: Broadman, 1966.

_____. "Reflection on 'The Southern Baptist Convention and Its People, 1607-1972.'" Baptist History and Heritage Vol.9, no. 4 (October, 1974): 223-229.

_____. "The Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1970." Review and Expositor Vol.67, no. 2 (Spring, 1970): 125-139.

_____. The Southern Baptist Convention and Its People 1607-1972. Nashville: Broadman, 1974.

Baldwin, C. C. "Self-Supporting Churches." The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal 3 (June 1870-May 1871): 346-347.

Barnes, William Wright. The Southern Baptist Convention: 1845-1953. Nashville: Broadman, 1954.

Barrett, David B., ed. World Christian Encyclopedia: A Comparative Study of Churches and Religions in the Modern World AD 1900-2000. Nairobi: Oxford University, 1982.

Bays, Daniel H. "The Growth of Independent Christianity in China, 1900-1937." In Christianity in China: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present, ed. Daniel H. Bays, 307-316. Stanford: Stanford University, 1996.

Bell, T. P. "The Bostick Tract Reviewed." The Biblical Recorder, July 20, 1892, 4.

_____. "Resignation of Rev. D. W. Herring." The Foreign Mission Journal 23 (July 1892): 357-358.

_____. "Resignation of Rev. D. W. Herring." The Biblical Recorder, June 29, 1892, 3.

The Biblical Recorder, 25 March 1891 "Dr. J. M. Pendleton," 4.

Bishop, Robert H., ed. An Outline of the History of the Church in the State of Kentucky, During a Period of Forty Years: Containing the Memoirs of Rev. David Rice. Reprint, 1824. Cincinnati: Art Guild Reprints, 1968.

Blalock, T. L. Experiences of a Baptist Faith Missionary for 56 Years in China. Fort Worth: Manney, 1949.

Board of Foreign Missions. "Eighth Annual Report." Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, 1853.

"Board of Trustee Minutes." Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 2110, April 10, 1945.

_____. Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 1944, April 10, 1951.

_____. Nashville: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 589, April 15, 1985.

_____. Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 596, May 20, 1985.

_____. Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 592, December 9, 1985.

_____. Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 588, September 8, 1986.

_____. Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 447, February 9, 1987.

_____. Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 1362, February 8, 1988.

_____. Glorieta, New Mexico: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 530, July 16, 1988.

_____. Richmond: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 1331, August 16, 1993.

Bosch, David J. Believing In the Future: Toward a Missiology of Western Culture. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995.

_____. "Reflections on Biblical Models of Mission." In Toward the Twenty-First Century in Christian Mission, ed. James M. Phillips and Robert T. Coote, 175-192. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

_____. "Towards True Mutuality: Exchanging the Same Commodities or Supplementing Each Other's Needs." In Supporting Indigenous Ministries: With Selected Readings, ed. Daniel Rickett and Dotsey Welliver, 53-64. Wheaton: Billy Graham Center, 1997 [1978].

_____. Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission. American Society of Missiology Series, No. 16. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1991.

Bostick, G. P. "Letter from China." The Biblical Recorder, May 20, 1891, 3.

_____. "Letter from Rev. G. P. Bostick of July 1, 1892." The Biblical Recorder, August 10, 1892, 3.

_____. "Letter from Tung Chowfu, China, August 12th, 1890." In The History of the Kings Mountain Baptist Association from November 7, 1851 to November 7, 1951, edited by The Publication or Historical Committee, 102-104. 40th Annual Session, 1890.

_____. "Letter to the Editor." The Biblical Recorder, July 20, 1892, 1.

_____. "What Is Church Co-operation?" In The Crisis of the Churches: A Collection of Earnest Articles and Extracts from Earnest Men on Matters of Vital Concern to Baptists, ed. T. P. Crawford, 147-149. Chefoo: n. p., 1894.

Bostick, G. P. and T. J. League, Committee for the Mission. "North China Mission in a Nutshell." The Biblical Recorder, February 11, 1891, 6.

Brackney, William H. "The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination, 1814-1845: An American Metaphor." Baptist History and Heritage Vol.24, no. 3 (July,1989): 13-23.

Bridges, Erich. "367 New Churches Prove 'Last Frontier' Reachable." Baptist Press Release, (Richmond). March 14, 1996, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 12904.

Briggs, Ed. "Mission Panel Taps Veteran of Asian Service." Richmond Times-Dispatch, (Richmond). May 26, 1993.

Bush, Luis. "What Happens After AD 2000?: The Future of Evangelical Cooperation in Missions and International Perspective." A paper delivered at the Norway Leadership Seminar, March 23, 1998.

Carpenter, C. H. Self-Support, Illustrated in the History of the Bassein Karen Mission from 1840-1880. Boston: Rand and Avery, 1883.

Carroll, B. H. The Genesis of American Anti-Missionsim. Louisville: The Baptist Book Concern, 1902.

Carroll, J. L. "Brother Herring's 'Disturbing Element'." The Biblical Recorder, July 27, 1892, 1.

The Centenary Conference Historical Volume. A Century of Protestant Missions in China (1807-1907), ed. D. MacGillivray. Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission, 1907.

Chan, Hay-Him. "God's Trojan Horse: Hong Kong's Reversion to China and the Evangelization of 1.2 Billion People." World Evangelization 79 (June 1997): 4-7.

Chao, Jonathan, ed. The China Mission Handbook: A Portrait of China and Its Church. Hong Kong: Chinese Church Research Center, 1989.

Chao, Jonathan T'ien-en. "The Chinese Indigenous Church Movement, 1919-1927: A Protestant Response to the Anti-Christian Movements in Modern China." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1986.

Clark, C. A. "The Presbyterian Church of Korea." In The Growing Church: "The Madras Series", Presenting Papers Based upon the Meeting of the International Missionary Council, at Tambaram, Madras, India December 12th to 29th, 1938, 145-154. Tambaram, Madras: International Missionary Council, 1939.

Cogar, W. G. "Letter Attesting to the Character of J. R. Graves." In A Sourcebook for Baptist Heritage, ed. H. Leon McBeth, 317. Nashville: Broadman, June 18, 1858 [1990].

Cox, Norman Wade, and Judson Boyce Allen, ed. Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists. Nashville: Broadman, 1958. S.v. "Gospel Missionism," by John F. Gibson.

_____. Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists. Nashville: Broadman, 1958. S.v. "Antimission Movement," by A. W. Robbins.

Crawford, Martha Foster. "Letter to Dr. Tupper." Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 13, 1889. Crawford File.

_____. "Martha Foster Crawford Diaries. 7 vols. Manuscript Journals 1847-1881." Held by Perkins Library of Duke University Manuscript Department.

Crawford, N. M. "Shall Polygamists be Admitted into the Missionary Churches?" Tennessee Baptist. With an Afterword by Editors J. R. Graves, J. M. Pendleton, and A. C. Dayton. Vol. 15 No. 1. September 4, 1858.1.

Crawford, T. P. Churches. To The Front! China: n. p., 1892.

_____. Evolution In My Mission Views or Growth of Gospel Mission Principles In My Own Mind. ed. J. A. Scarboro. Fulton, KY: Scarboro, 1903.

_____. "Letter to Dr. Tupper." Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, September 8, 1885. Crawford File.

_____. "Letter to James E. Taylor," Tengchow, February 15, 1872, Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board. As cited by Adrian Lamkin Jr. The Gospel Mission Movement Within The Southern Baptist Convention. Ph.D. diss. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980.

- _____. "New Missionary Orientation Address Given in Chefoo, China, March 3, 1887." Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board Crawford File.
- _____. "Self-Support in China: or Mr. Simmons' Article in the Issue of October 29th." Letter to the Editor. Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, November 7, 1885. Crawford File.
- Creighton, Lacy. "Toward a Post-Denominational World Church." In Beyond Establishment: Protestant Identity in a Post-Protestant Age, ed. Jackson W. Carroll, Wade Clark Roof, 327-361. Louisville: Westminster-John Knox, 1993.
- Crismon, Leo Taylor, ed. Baptists In Kentucky, 1776-1976: A Bicentennial Volume. Middletown, KY: Kentucky Baptist Convention, 1975.
- Durham, C. "Rev. G. P. Bostick's Resignation." The Biblical Recorder, March 30, 1892, 3.
- Eitel, Keith E. "James Madison Pendleton." In Baptist Theologians, ed. George Timothy, and David S. Dockery, 188-204. Nashville: Broadman, 1990.
- Estep, William R. "Course-Changing Events in the History of the Foreign Mission Board, SBC, 1845-1994." Baptist History and Heritage 29 (October 1994): 5-13.
- _____. Whole Gospel Whole World: The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention 1845-1995. Nashville: Broadman, 1994.
- Fairbank, John K. "Introduction: The Place of Protestant Writings in China's Cultural History." Christianity in China: Early Protestant Missionary Writings. ed. Suzanne Wilson Barnett and John King Fairbank. Harvard Studies in American-East Asian Relations no.9 Cambridge: Harvard University, 1985.1-18.
- Fensham, Charles James. "Missiology for the Future: A Missiology in the Light of the Emerging Systematic Paradigm." D.Th. thesis, The University of South Africa, November 1990.
- Fletcher, Jesse C. The Southern Baptist Convention: A Sesquicentennial History. Nashville: Broadman, 1994.
- _____. Baker James Caughen: A Man for All Nations. Nashville: Broadman, 1977.
- _____. "Shapers of the Southern Baptist Spirit." Baptist History and Heritage Vol.30, no. 3 (July,1995): 6-15.

Flynt, J. Wayne. "The Impact of Social Factors on Southern Baptist Expansion, 1800-1914." Baptist History and Heritage Vol.17, no. 3 (July, 1982): 20-31.

Flynt, Wayne, and Gerald W. Berkley. Taking Christianity to China: Alabama Missionaries in the Middle Kingdom 1850-1950. Tuscalousa: University of Alabama, 1997.

The Foreign Mission Journal 24 (November, 1892) "Mrs. Crawford's Resignation," 97-101.

The Foreign Mission Journal 25, no. 2 (September 1893) "Our Board and the 'Gospel Mission'," 37-41.

Foster, L. S. Fifty Years in China: An Eventful Memoir of Tarleton Perry Crawford, D.D. Nashville: Bayless-Pullen, 1909.

Graves, J. R. Old Landmarkism: What Is It? 2nd ed. Texarkana: Baptist Sunday School Committee, 1880, 1928.

Hailey, O. L. J. R. Graves: Life, Times and Teaching. Nashville: n.p., n.d.

Harper, Louis Keith. "Old Landmarkism: A Historiographical Appraisal." Baptist History and Heritage Vol.25, no. 2 (April,1990): 31-40.

_____. "The Historical Context for the Rise of Old Landmarkism." M. A. thesis, Murray State University, 1986.

Herring, D. W. "Letter to The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention." Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 25, 1907. Herring File.

_____. "Letter to Dr. R. J. Willingham." Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, April 25, 1907. Herring File.

_____. "Letter to W. D. King." Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, December 6, 1906. Herring File.

_____. "The Meaning of the Gospel Mission Movement." In The Crisis of the Churches: A Collection of Earnest Articles and Extracts from Earnest Men on Matters of Vital Concern to Baptists, ed. T. P. Crawford, 114-128. Chefoo: n. p., 1894.

- _____. "Rev. D. W. Herring Coming Home." The Biblical Recorder, April 6, 1892, 7.
- _____. "A Statement from Rev. D. W. Herring." The Biblical Recorder, June 22, 1892, 3.
- Hill, Samuel S. Southern Churches in Crisis. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966.
- Hinson, Glenn E. "The Baptist Experience in the United States." Review and Expositor Vol.79, no. 2 (Spring, 1982): 217-230.
- Huntington, Samuel P. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. New York: Viking Penguin, 1996.
- Hutchison, William R. Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987.
- _____. "A Moral Equivalent for Imperialism: Americans and the Promotion of 'Christian Civilization,' 1880-1910." In Missionary Ideologies in the Imperialist Era: 1880-1920, ed. Torben Christensen and William R. Hutchison, 167-178. Copenhagen: Aros, 1982.
- Hyatt, Irwin T. Jr. Our Ordered Lives Confess: Three Nineteenth-Century American Missionaries in East Shantung. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1976.
- Interior China Mission. "Mission Minutes." Kaifeng, June 15, 1918.
- _____. "Executive Committee Minutes." Ki Kung Shan, August 8-9, 1919.
- _____. "Annual Mission Minutes." Kaifeng, April 2-4, 1924.
- _____. "Annual Mission Minutes." Kaifeng, April 7, 1925.
- _____. "Special Conference Minutes." Chengchow, December 8-9, 1925.
- _____. "Annual Mission Minutes." Kaifeng, April 6-8, 1931.
- Interior China Mission of the Southern Baptist. "Reference Book and Minutes of the Annual Mission Meeting." Shanghai, 1925.
- James, Robert Alton. "A Study of the Life and Contributions of Henry Allen Tupper." Th. D. diss. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.

- Jefferies, Susan Herring. Papa Wore No Halo. Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 1963.
- Jones, Alfred G. "Letter to Mr. Baynes from Chefoo 25 July 1881." Missionary Journals and Correspondences 1792-1914. Baptist Missionary Society Archives, 1881.
- Kane, J. Herbert. Understanding Christian Missions. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.
- Kendall, W. Fred. A History of the Tennessee Baptist Convention. Brentwood, TN: Executive Board of the Tennessee Baptist Convention, 1974.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1970.
- Küng, Hans. "Was meint Paradigmenwechsel?" In Theologie--wohin? Auf dem Weg zu einem neuen Paradigma, ed. Hans Küng and David Tracy, 19-26. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1974.
- Lamkin Jr., Adrian. "The Gospel Mission Movement Within The Southern Baptist Convention." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. A History of Christian Missions in China. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929.
- Leonard, Bill J. "Southern Baptists and Southern Culture." American Baptist Quarterly Vol.4, no. 2 (June 1985): 200-212.
- Liu, Kwang-Ching. American Missionaries in China: Papers from Harvard Seminars. Edited with an Introduction by Kwang-Ching Liu. East Asian Research Center Harvard University Cambridge: Harvard University, 1966.
- Livingston, John Kevin. "A Missiology of The Road: The Theology of Mission and Evangelism in the Writings of David J. Bosch." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1989.
- Lumpkin, William L. Baptist Foundations in the South: Tracing through the Separates the Influence of the Great Awakening, 1754-1787. Nashville: Broadman, 1961.
- _____. Baptist Confessions of Faith. Valley Forge: Judson, 1969.
- Lutz, Jessie G. "Karl F. A. Gützlaff: Missionary Entrepreneur." In Christianity in China: Early Protestant Missionary Writings, ed. Suzanne Wilson Barnett and John King Fairbank, 61-75. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1985.

Lutz, Jessie G. and R. Ray Lutz. "Karl Gützlaff's Approach to Indigenization: The Chinese Union." In Christianity in China: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present, ed. Daniel H. Bays, 269-291. Stanford: Stanford University, 1996.

MacGillivray, D., ed. "Gospel Mission," In The China Mission Year Book Being 'The Christian Movement in China' 1914. Shanghai: The Christian Literature Society for China, 1914.

Masters, Frank M. A History of Baptists in Kentucky. Louisville: Kentucky Baptist Historical Society, 1953.

McBeth, H. Leon. The Baptist Heritage. Nashville: Broadman, 1987.

_____. "The Broken Unity of 1845: A Reassessment." Baptist History and Heritage Vol.24, no. 3 (July,1989): 24-31.

_____. A Sourcebook for Baptist Heritage. Nashville: Broadman, 1990.

_____. "The Texas Tradition: A Study in Baptist Regionalism (Part I)." Baptist History and Heritage Vol.26, no. 1 (January,1991): 37-47.

_____. "The Texas Tradition: A Study in Baptist Regionalism (Part II)." Baptist History and Heritage Vol.26, no. 1 (January,1991): 48-57.

Means, Frank K. "Changing Emphases in Southern Baptist Foreign Missions, 1912-42." Th.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1945.

_____. "Foreign Missions--A Southern Baptist Perspective." TMs (photocopy), Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Archives, T. A. Patterson Files, Box 22, Item 786, Wake Forest: Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, Undated.

Middleton, Celia Herring. Memories of A Lifetime. Raleigh: privately printed, 1988.

Miller, Terry E. "Otter Creek Church, Indiana; Lonely Bastion of Daniel Parker's 'Two-Seedism.'" Foundations Vol.18, no. 4 (October-December,1975): 358-376.

Missionary Manual of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. Richmond: Foreign Mission Board, 1935.

- Moore, Louis. "FMB Trustees Approve Restructure Principles." Baptist Press Release. (Richmond). April 10, 1997, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 13719.
- Nash, Robert Norman Jr. "The Influence of American Myth on Southern Baptist Foreign Missions, 1845-1945." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.
- Neely, Alan. Administration of Foreign Missionaries Through an Organization Known as a 'Mission.' Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, May 1986.
- Nevius, John L. The Planting and Development of Missionary Churches. 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958.
- Noll, Mark A. A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- North China Baptist Mission. "Minutes of the Meeting at Pingtu." Chefoo, April 26-28, 1909.
- Nowlin, William Dudley. Kentucky Baptist History: 1770-1922. Chicago: Baptist Book Concern, 1922.
- Oliver, Will B. "Letter to Dr. R. J. Willingham." Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, June 21, 1902. Herring File.
- Patterson, Paige. "My Vision of the Twenty-First Century SBC." Review and Expositor 88 (Winter 1991): 37-55.
- Pendleton, J. M. Reminiscences of a Long Life. Louisville: Press Baptist Book Concern, 1891.
- Pillay, Gerald J. "Text, Paradigms and Context: An Examination of David Bosch's Use of Paradigms in the Reading of Christian History." In Mission In Tension: A Dialogue with David Bosch, ed. J. N. J. Kritzinger and W. A. Saayman, 109-123. Pretoria: S. A. Missiological Society, 1990.
- Pruitt, C. W. "Recollections of Dr. T. P. Crawford and Wife." Richmond: Jenkins Memorial Library and Archive, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, 1917. Crawford File.
- Rankin, Jerry. "A Question." Electronic Mail Letter to Keith Eitel, April 3, 1998.
- _____. "The Rankin File." The Commission. August 1997, 53.

Rankin, M. Theron. "A Critical Examination of The National Christian Council of China." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1928.

Records Of The General Conference Of The Protestant Missionaries Of China, Held At Shanghai, May 10-24, 1877, edited by M. T. Yates, R. Nelson, and E. R. Barrett. Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1878.

Rice, Luther. "Letter from the Agent of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States, to the Corresponding Secretary of said Board." In Second Annual Report of The Board of Foreign Missions for the United States, 68-89. Philadelphia: The Board of Foreign Missions, 1816.

Saunders, David L. "The Relation of Landmarkism to Mission Methods." The Quarterly Review 26 (April-June 1966): 43-57.

Shurden, Walter B. "The Southern Baptist Synthesis: Is It Cracking?" Baptist History and Heritage Vol.16, no. 2 (April,1981): 2-11.

Siewert, John A. and John A Kenyon, ed. Mission Handbook: USA/Canada Christian Ministries Overseas. 15th ed. Monrovia: MARC, 1993.

Southern Baptist Convention. Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1911 Containing the Proceedings of the Fifty-Sixth Session Sixty-Sixth Year, Held at Jacksonville, Florida. May 17-22, 1911. Nashville: Southern Baptist Convention, 1911.

_____. Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1915 Containing the Proceedings of the Sixtieth Session Seventieth Year, Held at Houston, Texas, May 12-17, 1915. Nashville, 1915.

_____. Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1918 Containing the Proceedings of the Sixty-Third Session Seventy-Third Year, Held at Hot Springs, Ark., May 15-20, 1918. Nashville: Southern Baptist Convention, 1918.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held in the First Baptist Church, Augusta, GA., May 8-12, 1845. Richmond: Southern Baptist Convention, 1845.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session, Held in the First Baptist Church, Nashville, Tennessee, May 9-13, 1851. Richmond: Southern Baptist Convention, 1851.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session, Held in the First Baptist Church, Richmond, VA., May 6-10, 1859. Richmond: Southern Baptist Convention, 1859.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention Held in the First Baptist Church, Memphis, Tennessee, May 9-13, 1867. Baltimore: Southern Baptist Convention, 1867.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Thirteenth Meeting, Held in the Seventh Baptist Church, Baltimore, May 7-12, 1868. Baltimore: Southern Baptist Convention, 1868.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Fifteenth Meeting, Held in the Walnut Street Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky, May 5-10, 1870. Baltimore: Southern Baptist Convention, 1870.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventeenth Meeting, Held in the Baptist Church, Raleigh, North Carolina, May 9-13, 1872. Baltimore: Southern Baptist Convention, 1872.

_____. Proceedings of the Nineteenth Session of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held at the Baptist Church, Jefferson, Texas, May 7-11, 1874. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1874.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Twentieth Session, Held in the Citadel Square Baptist Church, Charleston, S. C., May 6-10, 1875. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1875.

_____. Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Session of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held with the First Baptist Church, Nashville, May 9-13, 1878. Nashville: Southern Baptist Convention, 1878.

_____. Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Seventh Biennial Session, Held in the First Baptist Church, Augusta, GA., May 8-12, 1879. Atlanta: J. P. Harrison, 1879.

_____. Proceedings Twenty-seventh Annual Session of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held with the Church in Greenville, S. C., May 10-14, 1882. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1882.

_____. Proceedings (Thirty-First Session--Forty-First Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held in the Meeting-House of the First Baptist Church, Montgomery, Alabama, May 7-11, 1886. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1886.

_____. Proceedings (Thirty-Second Session--Forty-Second Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held In the Meeting-House of the Broadway Baptist Church, Louisville, KY., May 6-10, 1887. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1887.

_____. Proceedings (Thirty-Sixth Session--Forty-Sixth Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention, Held In the Opera-House at Birmingham, Alabama, May 8-12, 1891. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1891.

_____. Proceedings (Thirty-Seventh Session--Forty-Seventh Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention Held with the Churches of Atlanta, Georgia, May 6-10, 1892. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1892.

_____. Proceedings (Thirty-Eighth Session--Forty-Eighth Year) of the Southern Baptist Convention Held with the Churches of Nashville, Tennessee, May 12-16, 1893. Atlanta: Southern Baptist Convention, 1893.

"Southern Baptists Restructure to Reach the Unreached Peoples: An Interview with Jerry Rankin, IMB President and Avery Willis, Senior Vice President for Overseas Operations." Mission Frontiers, July-October 1997, 15-18.

Spivey, James. "Benajah Harvey Carroll." In Baptist Theologians, ed. Timothy George and David S. Dockery, 307-329. Nashville: Broadman, 1990.

Steely, John E. "The Landmark Movement in the Southern Baptist Convention." In What is the Church?: A Symposium of Baptist Thought, ed. Duke K. McCall, 134-147. Nashville: Broadman, 1958.

"Stroope Elected Area Director of Cooperative Services International." Baptist Press Release, (Richmond). August 20, 1992, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 4675.

Stroope, Michael W. Interview by Keith E. Eitel, February 25, 1998, transcript, Southeastern SBC Historical Missiology Oral History Collection, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC.

_____. Report to the Board: Cooperative Services International. Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 1961, October 9, 1995.

_____. Report to the Board: Cooperative Services International. Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 2464, October 6, 1996.

_____. "Where Passion Leads Us." The CSI Edge, Spring 1997, 1.

Stroope, Mike, and Avery Willis. "Last Update." Electronic Mail Letter, CSI "Family" Communique, June 3, 1997.

Strother, Greene W. Catastrophe In China. Columbia: privately printed, 1967.

_____. "A Study of New Testament Missionary Principles and Practice." Th.D. diss., Baptist Bible Institute, May, 1942.

Sweet, William Warren. Religion on the American Frontier: The Baptists 1783-1830. A Collection of Source Material. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1931.

Taylor, Dr. and Mrs. Howard. Hudson Taylor and the China Inland Mission: The Growth of a Work of God. 1st ed. London: Lutterworth, 1918.

Taylor, Dr. and Mrs. Howard. Hudson Taylor In Early Years: The Growth of A Soul. 4th ed. London: Morgan and Scott, 1920.

Taylor, J. Hudson. "A Retrospect." In Classic Texts in Mission and World Christianity, ed. Norman E. Thomas, 18-19, 112, 114. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995.

Toalston, Art. "Michael Stroope Launches New Missions Enterprise." Baptist Press Release. (Arlington, TX). November 25, 1997.

Torbet, Robert G. A History of the Baptists. 3rd ed. Valley Forge: Judson, 1963.

Tull, James E. "A Study of Southern Baptist Landmarkism in the Light of Historical Baptist Ecclesiology." Ph.D. diss., New York: Columbia University, 1960.

_____. "Theological Issues in The History of Southern Baptist Evangelism." Baptist History and Heritage Vol.22, no. 1 (January, 1987): 4-15.

- _____. Shapers of Baptist Thought. Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1984.
- Tupper, H. A. A Decade of Foreign Missions: 1880-1890. Richmond: Foreign Mission Board of The Southern Baptist Convention, 1891.
- _____. The Foreign Missions of the Southern Baptist Convention. Richmond: Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1880.
- Unsigned Editorial. "Objections to the Crawford-Herring-Bostick Plans." The Biblical Recorder, July 20, 1892, 2.
- Wake Forest (North Carolina) Baptist Church. Minutes. July 21, 1886, 159.
- Wamble, Hugh. "Landmarkism: Doctrinaire Ecclesiology Among Baptists." Church History Vol.33, no. 4 (December, 1964): 429-447.
- Warneck, Gustav A. Outline of a History of Protestant Missions from the Reformation to the Present Time: A Contribution to Modern Church History. Translated by George Robson. New York: Revell, 1903.
- Warner, Greg. "'Dark Horse' Jerry Rankin Chosen as FMB Nominee." Bedford: Associated Baptist Press Release, May 25, 1993.
- Weatherspoon, J. B. M. Theron Rankin: Apostle of Advance. Nashville: Broadman, 1958.
- Whelchel, Michael E. "Gospel Missionism (1892-1910) and Its Effects Upon the Policies of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention." Th.M. thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982.
- Williard, David. "Korean Christian Martyrs Buried in Virginia Beach." Baptist Press Release. (Virginia Beach). April 17, 1995, Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, <http://basisweb.imb.org>: 8080, Accession Number 12107.
- Willis, Avery. "Response Regarding Role of Baptist Partners in Reorganization." Electronic Mail Letter to Keith Eitel, April 20, 1998.
- Woodward, C. Vann. Origins of the New South 1877-1913. ed. Wendell Holmes and E. Merton Coulter. A History of the South Series, Vol. 9. Shreveport: Louisiana State University, 1971.