

File →

John H. Foster, M. D.
170 Hillside Avenue
Westview House
Waterbury, Conn. 06710

? Mrs and Chas
in 11
The Mission movement in C

MISSION TO CHINA

In the Lorimer Chapel at Colby is a ^{plaque} tablet
commemorating the missionaries who have gone out over the
years to foreign countries; Burma, India, China, the Philippines
and Africa. Why did they go? What was their aim? What have been
the results? As one of the survivors of that list on that plaque
+ will 10 years residence in China
I would like to comment on the missionary effort in China. ^{a new present movement in} Far East

The era of Missions to China covered, roughly, a period
of one hundred and fifty years, from the early 1800s until the
Communists took over in 1949, and played an important role in the
awakening and development of the "Sleeping Giant" in that period.
In the background was the ~~xxxxx~~ pressure of the Opium War, the
Clipper Ship trading strife, the subjugation and threatened subdiv-
of China
ision into "spheres of influence" by the foreign powers; Britain,
Russia, Italy, France and Japan. There were the Unequal Treaties
and Extraterritoriality forced upon them. ^{her} We in the United States
also humiliated them by ^{by} our Exclusion Act and considering them
the "Yellow Peril". Their internal disunity was shown by the
constant battling of their Warlords and provincial chiefs. The
Taiping Rebellion and the Boxer Uprising were also examples of
their unrest and instability. The blind selfconfidence of the
Chinese officials and their contempt for foreigners contributed
to their difficult situation.

The accusation that the missionaries went out to
destroy the culture of another people and substitute their own

is not substantiated by fact. True, missionaries went with a sense of mission, a conviction that they had a message that would be helpful to those in "darkness". True, also, China had an older and more tested, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~, civilization ^{- a fabulous past history,} than we. But, it is also true that they had something to learn from, the West; that in the process we learned from each other. The missionaries spread the Good News of the love of God for all people, demonstrating the message through schools, hospitals and homes for the aged. The poor were the first to respond, but the character of the schools, and the quality of the medical service, and the nature of the of the mission's efforts to meet the needs of the people, took them into the Yemens (magisterial courts) and opened up communication with the scholars. The products of these schools became the leaders of the New China; the Sun Yat Sen, the Soongs, the Wellington Koo, the Chang Fu-liangs, the Jimmy Yens, the Kungs, Chiang Kai Shek and hundreds of others.

We do not need to apologize for the Missionary Movement. It was a large factor leading up to the 1910 revolution and final emergence of China as one of the present day world powers. Historians in the future may consider this period of Church action as another of the "Crusades". Primarily it was religious, evangelistic and educational. It was non-political. It was international. In 1922, when the National Christian Council was formed in Shanghai, there were one hundred and twenty different foreign missionary organizations cooperating. Millions of dollars had been contributed by the churches of the world. This same

^{mission}
altruistic attitude for the needy and the under-privileged showed up a generation later, this time under government sponsorship. First there was the Marshall Plan. Then the Peace Corps attempted to carry out, on a national basis, a program which the missionaries had been working on for over a century.

Missions in China were shocked by the Japanese invasion of Shanghai in 1937, and were gradually brought to a complete closure as the conflict developed into World War II. Mission Stations were occupied and the missionaries evacuated; some to their home countries, but many hundreds to the prison camps in China, Japan, Korea and the Philippines. When peace was declared there was an attempt to re-open some of the missions, but that effort completely collapsed when the Nationalist armies of Chiang Kai-shek were defeated by the Communists in 1949.

It is now twenty five years since The Peoples' Republic of China came into power. We have witnessed an amazing revolution and reorganization ^{in the} and habits ^{Chinese} of the 700 to 800 million people, ^{WE HAVE SEEN} the apparent obliteration of the ^{Christian} missionary movement, ^{THE Peoples Republic of} China accepted as one of the five great World Powers in the United Nations Organization. ^{HAS BEEN}

We may well speculate on our choices of action at that 1949 point in Sino-American relations: 1.- Should the United States have intervened militarily in support of Chiang Kai-shek? Or, 2-, should we have recognized and helped the ^{new} Mao Tse-tung regime? 3-, Should we have removed ourselves ^{completely} from the Asiatic area? Or, 4- Was the line of action we followed the correct one? Hind-sight is almost always the best.

1.- Chiang Kai-shek's government fell because it was incapable of solving the age ^{problems of} old land reform, ignorance and official corruption. Chiang, in the period before the war erupted, had looked to the West for help and advice and advisors in his Cabinet. However the missionaries, from the beginning, had tried to avoid becoming ~~involved~~ involved in politics ^{of} the government. So in his emergency they did not have the expertise he needed ^{curing} for his overwhelming political, social, economic and military ills.

Our armed forces had won the war, but there was such a strained relationship between our military advisors, -(General Stilwell and his group)- and the Generalissimo, that further cooperation would have been impossible. We were right in withdrawing our troops from China.

2.- There are those who now say we should have stopped our support of Chiang and have recognized ^{and} helped Mao Tse-tung and his new regime. That would have been impossible at that time. There was such deep emotional, almost sentimental, interest and support of the Nationalist Chinese, - perhaps partly because of the more than a century of missionary contact and friendship- that to desert them in their time of need would have been unthinkable. At that same time, in 1948, we were battling to restrain Soviet aggression in their siege of West Berlin, by our famous Air Lift. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Our fear, distrust and hatred of our Communist enemies, made any diplomatic recognition of Mao's revolutionary government completely ^{unrealistic} hopeless.

3.- ^{There are those} ~~We had our isolationists~~ who would have had us withdraw from the Asiatic area, but by that time we were too deeply involved in the ~~whole Pacific field of conflict~~ ¹⁰¹ with our treaty commitments with Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines and the other South East Asian

nations, promising to protect them from "aggression," for us retreat into isolation.

4.- In looking backward to 1949, could we, or should we, have done differently in that period? As a nation we apparently had no fixed long range policy, except to maintain peace and the status quo. We had to meet each crisis as it arose. There was much uncertainty, even controversy at high levels. Think, if you will, of John Foster Dulles, Dean Acheson, Dean Rusk, Generals Stilwell Marshall, Westmoreland and Mac Arthur. Pat. Hurley, along with John Service, John Davies and John Carter Vincent. There was Senator Mc Carthy and our Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Nixon, all strong personalities, with many conflicting ideas. I do believe our leaders tried to make wise decisions, not merely expedient ones. ^{AT THE TIME} On the whole the results have been good. History will have to be the final judge. However some writers are already calling this the era of Pax Americanus.

By our program of protecting and subsidizing Japan and Taiwan we helped both countries make their phenomenal recoveries equal to Europe's under the Marshall Plan. Also, in this period we had the courage and the power to hold back aggression in three major confrontations with our enemies: In 1948 it was in West Berlin when the Soviets tried to absorb them; ^{7th Nov 1948} In 1950, we restrained the North Koreans in their attempt to destroy South Korea; In the 1960s we responded to an appeal by South Vietnam for help when they were invaded by Ho Chi Ming's forces. (This was Dean Rusk's version.) All of these actions were primarily defensive. The last two were bloody and prolonged, and, at times unpopular at home. However they were carried through to an end, an armistice or peace treaty, even not conclusive. Is not our recent involvement in the Mid-East-

Arab-Israeli War a fourth confrontation with Russia?

A new chapter in Sino-American relations was opened with the visit of President Richard Nixon in 1972 to Peking. Hopefully there will be a return to a full diplomatic friendship between our two nations.

In conclusion: 1.- What is there left of the Missionary Movement in China?, and 2- What next for China?

As far as is generally known, organized Christianity has been completely and ruthlessly suppressed. No mission schools or hospitals have been permitted to ~~benzinue~~. We do know ~~instances~~ where the government has taken over some of these institutions, and greatly expanded them. In Peking, the former Peking Union Medical School and Hospital are used actively, and in Changsha, the Hsiang-Ya (Yale-in-China) Medical School, where we formerly had fewer than 200 medical students, we now hear that the whole plant has been enlarged with over 800 students. The Baptists who had extensive activity and church property in west and south-west China, now have none, although they do have some workers and churches in Hong Kong. Is there anything left of the former great reservoir of good will for Americans which we thought was there? * Again, we must wait for future historians to complete the story of the Missionary Era.

What about the future of the present government of China? These have been twenty five momentous years, with Mao Tse-tung the idol currently being worshiped. He has apparently accomplished miracles, against tremendous odds; a brilliant military leader, a philosopher, an author, a poet and a statesman. When he and Chou En-lai leave the scene can their successors carry on their ideas and ideals? Or will there be another scramble for power, a return

old struggle for survival, with more repression for the masses?
Is the Communist party strong enough to hold the country
together? Is Communism the "Wave of the Future"? Or, will this
period be noted as a passing phase, an incident, in the
many thousand year ^{old} history of China?

John Hess Foster

1974

X
This does not mean that the Missionary Movement was a failure,
or that all that effort was wasted. Rather, was it not, that
having help^{ed} spark the Renaissance, and having helped launch the
Revolution, it was a case of "Mission Accomplished"; Its services
being no longer needed or desired, it deserved a "Well Done"
citation, a victory rather than a defeat?