

From Foreign Mission to International Goodwill: The Change of Friends World Activities by Orthodox Philadelphia Yearly Meeting

Tetsuko TODA

INTRODUCTION

It has been generally pointed out that the Christian mission came to non-Christian lands without understanding the relativity of cultural values and systems. Missionaries did not doubt that they were engaged in a rightful work of transmitting the God's words and thus expanding the kingdom of God on the earth. They came to the non-Christian countries to conquer heathenism. They concerned themselves little to learn something from Asian and African countries. Missionaries were the representatives of Western Civilization as well as the evangelists of Christianity.

We should, however, expect something different in the Friends foreign mission. Quakerism or the Society of Friends has several distinguishing features—the teaching of the Inner Light, the denial of professional ministry, the waiting worship of silence, the emphasis on equality of men, the peace testimony and the simple way of life. There are reasons to believe that Friends had better access to other peoples and cultures because of their doctrines; for example, their belief that all men are children of God. Contrary to our expectations, Friends were rather reluctant to undertake the foreign missionary work. They faced problems especial to them. Nevertheless, Friends have been known for their social service and international understanding in foreign countries. American and British Friends suffered hardships and inconveniences because of their peace testimony during the First World War. It was only through this trying experi-

ence that Friends discovered their own way to make themselves useful abroad.

This paper focuses on Philadelphia Friends who assumed the Friends mission in Japan and aims to offer a historical survey of their attitudes to the foreign mission. We will follow the change in Philadelphia Friends' view on foreign works through the church documents and periodicals of Orthodox Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. By examining their experience, this paper also attempts to introduce the trend of Friends world activities in general.

AMERICAN FRIENDS AND FOREIGN MISSION

How could Quakerism, which valued the spontaneity of the spirit, be compatible with foreign mission, which usually required some professionalism and organization?

Foreign mission was avoided by Friends for a long time.¹ The Friends foreign mission was censured for three points. The older way of Friends mission was traveling ministry, the visitation by "concerned" Friends of their fellow Friends on completely voluntary basis. Modern foreign mission required some methods—long residence and institutional facilities—of missionaries. The critics of the Friends foreign missionary movement blamed, first of all, that persuading people to some faith, especially with artificial and programed activities, was inconsistent with the Quaker emphasis on the spontaneity of the spirit. Secondly, it was against the "lay ideal" of Friends, for the missionary be paid and considered a

professional in religious matters. Thirdly, the Friends foreign mission adopted a pastoral system in the mission fields at the sacrifice of the traditional Quaker way of worship—waiting worship of silence. This last one was the most crucial question. There were various opinions about what type of Quaker worship was to be introduced abroad. Some insisted that the waiting worship of silence was the most precious part of Quaker practice without which Quakerism would become meaningless. On the other hand, since the waiting worship was one of Quaker “peculiarities,” it was doubted whether this worship could be adopted by local Christians, let alone imposed on them. The Friends foreign mission, in reality, did not introduce nor foster the Quaker way of silent worship in foreign lands. This evoked a comment like: “Indeed Quaker missionaries have often been almost indistinguishable from other Christian missionaries...”²

The American Friends foreign missionary movement was related to the acceptance of a pastoral system. We have to learn the divisions in American Quakerdom during the 19th century and recognize what kind of Friends participated in the foreign mission.³

American Friends suffered two major separations in the 19th century. The first one, the Hicksite Separation, broke out in 1827. One group was influenced by the religious liberalism of the Enlightenment. It depended principally on the Inner Light and strengthened the Quaker opposition to the creeds. The other group was more evangelical and esteemed the Bible highly. The liberal and Inner-Light stressing group was called Hicksite; the other evangelical one Orthodox. They divided American Yearly Meetings in half. The second separation, the Wilburite Separation, broke out in the 1840's within the Orthodox wing of Friends. One group, Gurneyites, represented by Joseph John Gurney, continued to be called Orthodox after the separation. This group had more in common with other Protestant denominations. The other group was led by John Wilbur, and called Wilburite or Conservative. The Wilburites protested against Gurney's evangelical modifications and adhered to Quaker traditions. But they remained a minority. There were consequently three kinds of Yearly Meetings in America in the second half of the 19th century. One was a group of “Gurneyite-Orthodox” Yearly Meetings,

most of which accepted a pastoral system as their formal pattern. Another group of “Wilburite-Conservative” Yearly Meetings observed the traditional waiting worship of silence and maintained older Quaker customs in clothing and speech. A group of liberal “Hicksite” Yearly Meetings emphasized the significance of the Inner Light. Like “Wilburite-Conservative” Yearly Meetings, they kept the traditional silent worship.

It was the Orthodox wing that responded to the revival movement and mission zeal in the 1860's. Friends, especially in the Midwest, shared revival meetings with people of other denominations. They gave up their traditional Quaker worship of silence. Instead, they adopted a pastoral system—planned service, congregational singing, and moreover paid ministry. All the Orthodox Yearly Meetings but Philadelphia eventually accepted this pastoral system to some degree.

The foreign mission moved in the same direction, towards a pastoral system, because missionaries should be paid.⁴ This was the reason that Orthodox Friends could respond to the passion of foreign mission. Neither Hicksite nor Wilburite Friends who had not adopted a pastoral system were interested in the foreign mission. These Friends distrusted planned and organized religious activities. They were, Hicksite and Wilburite Friends thought, opposed to the Quaker teaching of spontaneity of and dependence on the Inner Light. They regarded such religious activities as “creaturely.” In short, the foreign mission was approved only by a wing of the whole American Quakerdom. It was Orthodox Friends. (Hereafter, all the Friends and Yearly Meetings mentioned in this paper without any explanation are Orthodox. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting is Orthodox Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, but not Hicksite Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.)

Even Orthodox Friends did not entirely welcome the foreign missionary movement. While Yearly Meetings hesitated to participate in the foreign mission officially, the women's missionary associations were established unofficially in 1880's. Various Yearly Meetings gradually took over the works of the women's societies and replaced them.⁵ At the early stage, each Yearly Meeting had its own mission field.⁶ It was not until 1894 that the “American Friends

Board of Foreign Missions" was formed to offer information on foreign missions to the Yearly Meetings so interested. When Orthodox Yearly Meetings federated and established the Five Years Meeting in 1902, the American Friends Board became its official Board. The Yearly Meetings transferred their missionary works to this Board one by one. By 1912, the American Friends Board had assumed the management of all missionary works except those of Canada, Philadelphia and Ohio.⁷

PHILADELPHIA YEARLY MEETING AND THE WOMEN'S FOREIGN MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION OF FRIENDS OF PHILADELPHIA

Examining Philadelphia Friends' foreign mission, we need to keep the following thing in mind. The foreign missionary movement was not altogether upheld by Philadelphia Friends. In fact, it was a minority of Philadelphia Friends who promoted the foreign mission. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting itself had stayed indifferent to it. Why did this happen?

When the Wilburite Separation took place, Orthodox Yearly Meetings divided into a majority of evangelical Gurneyite-Orthodox Yearly Meetings and a minority of Wilburite-Conservative Yearly Meetings. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, however, chose a particular course at the Wilburite Separation. At that time, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting consisted of a majority of conservative Wilburite Friends and a minority of evangelical Gurneyite Friends. The Yearly Meeting had lost about 16,000 members—two thirds of its membership—at the Hicksite Separation of 1827. It avoided splitting into Gurneyite and Wilburite Yearly Meetings, for fear of losing its members again. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting chose isolation from other Orthodox Yearly Meetings by discontinuing official correspondence. By doing so, it escaped deciding which were legitimate, Wilburites or Gurneyites. This solution left the membership of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting mixed. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting turned to be the only exception to the acceptance of a pastoral system among Orthodox Yearly Meetings. It did not join the Five Years Meeting later.⁸

Though a minority, evangelical Gurneyites of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting were strong. Most of them were "affluent city Friends." Joseph John Gur-

ney, who infused evangelism into American Friends, valued "a more active role for each individual in his own salvation" above the absolute dependence on God. The study of the Bible and involvement in human betterment were encouraged. Philadelphia Gurneyites were concerned with social problems. They participated in the works for Indians and freedmen, and also supported peace, temperance, foreign mission, First Day Schools and other philanthropic activities. They engaged in these activities through unofficial associations for social problems, because Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was against organized philanthropy.⁹

Philadelphia Gurneyites were in a unique position. They were an evangelical minority in conservative Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. The Yearly Meeting did not accept a pastoral system, neither did Philadelphia Gurneyites. They were critical about Midwestern Friends' excessive evangelism.¹⁰ Philadelphia Gurneyites took part in social betterment through voluntary organizations. The foreign mission was forwarded by one of these organizations. It was not warmly received by the whole Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.

The "Women's Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia" (the WFMA) started, therefore, as an organization completely dissociated from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. It was formed by 22 women on December 12, 1882. Many missionary organizations were established by women Friends in America between 1881 and 1888. The Philadelphia Association was the second among them.¹¹ The circular for invitation to join the WFMA strongly articulated its early members' sympathy for their "sisters" in heathen lands. It emphasized the oppressed and deprived condition of women in non-Christian countries and the necessity of spreading the gospel among them.¹² In its *First Annual Report*, the goal in founding the WFMA was declared "to promote more effectually than isolated individual effort could do the knowledge of the gospel among our down-trodden sisters" and "to assist in their Christian education."¹³ It was anxiety about heathen women that motivated some women Philadelphia Friends to set up an organization for foreign mission. In the circular, the WFMA also referred to "the simplicity of the Gospel truth," "the spirituality of our views" and "the non-requirement of water baptism" as the advantages of

the Friends foreign mission. But its members disregarded what would happen to their denominational distinctiveness in the mission fields. It is said that they did not envision establishing a Society of Friends in foreign countries but rather introducing Christianity as a whole.¹⁴

For a few years, the work by the WFMA was limited to the support of the works in Mexico, Syria and India performed by British and Midwestern-American Friends. During 1884 and 1885, the interest of the WFMA was directed to Japan. As early as 1883, a letter was read at its meeting in August from a Japanese student in Philadelphia, who indicated that the Quaker principles would be attractive to "the higher classes in Japan."¹⁵ The WFMA decided to start the Friends mission in Japan and to advertise for a missionary to Japan in November, 1884.¹⁶ At the annual meeting of January 23, 1885, a young Japanese man, Kanzo Uchimura told of his conversion under the influence of a Christian professor who came with the Bible to Japan from the United States.¹⁷ Uchimura and another famous Japanese Christian, Inazo Nitobe together attended the meeting of June 20, 1885 and appealed for mission work in Japan.¹⁸ The first officially designated missionary to Japan under the sponsorship of the WFMA was Joseph Cosand, a Kansas Friend. He, with his wife, Sarah A. Cosand, sailed for Japan on November 10 and arrived there on December 1, 1885.

So far as the WFMA simply helped the missionary works of other Yearly Meetings, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was silent. When it discovered that the WFMA was planning to open its mission field in Japan, the standing committee of the Yearly Meeting, the "Meeting for Sufferings" admonished against the WFMA. The "Minute of Advice" was adopted by the Meeting for Suffering at the session of September 18, 1885. This Minute said that the foreign mission was "not recognized by the Discipline of our Yearly Meeting." It was "a departure from the Gospel order heretofore recognized among us." A mission work would weaken the "spiritual nature of Divine worship" and the "true source and authority of Gospel ministry." It would also threaten "the preservation of our members in a consistent support of those principles we were raised up to exhibit to the world." The Meeting for Sufferings cautioned the members of

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting not to connect themselves with the WFMA nor to support it.¹⁹

Rebecca N. Taylor, one of the pioneer women of the WFMA remembered this episode in an article written later. The WFMA encountered strong objection from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. A majority of this Yearly Meeting tried not to deviate from recognized Quaker principles and not to inspire criticism of anything un-Quaker. They were "extremely particular in regard to all they did and said and spent..." One day, two women Friends, "dressed in drab Quaker costumes of extreme correctness," visited and observed the meeting of the WFMA. They said nothing during the meeting and left immediately when it closed. This visit resulted in the above-mentioned warning against the WFMA later sent to the Monthly Meetings. But the members of the WFMA continued their activities, evading antagonism with the Yearly Meeting.²⁰

The annual meeting of the WFMA on January 22, 1886 was prefaced with a speech saying that the members of the WFMA had to keep away from any confrontation with the Yearly Meeting during the present difficulties. As long as they worked faithfully according to their convictions, these difficulties would pass away.²¹ Yet the majority of the Yearly Meeting would have felt more in common with a person like Rebecca White who rejected the application for contributions for a missionary to Japan, explaining:

I do not wish to aid in building up a spurious Quakerism in any part of the world: and as several of our well known principles are assailed, or in jeopardy, at the present time, particularly those that are opposed to a paid ministry; the so called ordinances; instead of waiting for and depending altogether upon the pointings and puttings forth of the Divine head of the Church; I am rather distrustful of the present movement. Excuse my candor, but I would not wish to assist in hiring any one to preach the Gospel...²²

Most of Philadelphia Friends stood against foreign mission because they thought that it would impair Friends' peculiarities and furthermore their Quaker faith itself. It was a minority of Philadelphia Friends who started the foreign mission by organizing the WFMA. While this Association was severely opposed by the Yearly Meeting, its members were not quite sure what they intended to spread—Quakerism,

Christianity or Western Civilization.

QUAKERISM AND THE FIRST WORLD WAR

In 1899, the "Women's Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia" became the "Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia" (the FMA), admitting men to membership. Then the WFMA was taken over by the "Mission Board of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting" in 1923. This meant that the foreign mission, which had been unofficially undertaken by the segment of Philadelphia Friends, finally got the recognition of the Yearly Meeting.²³ When the WFMA invited men into membership and became the FMA, it was done without hesitation. This change was expected to increase contributions. But the transfer in 1923 was not so smooth. It was after five years' consideration that Philadelphia Yearly Meeting decided to have charge of the foreign mission.

The reason that this conservative Yearly Meeting had been hesitant to undertake the foreign mission was already explained. We need to examine what stimulated Philadelphia Yearly Meeting to accept the mission. A historian of Quakerism, Elbert Russell admits that Friends underwent a radical change through the experience of the First World War, and suggests that the War indicated the beginning of a new period for Friends. The activities during and after the First World War influenced Friends' cast of concerns at home and abroad.²⁴ As for foreign activities, their emphasis shifted from propagation of the Christian gospel to social service and international understanding. We have to go back to the foundation of the "American Friends Service Committee" (the AFSC) and the "Committee on Christian Labor in Foreign Lands" to understand the background of the taking-over of the missionary works from the FMA to the Mission Board.

Friends faced troubles because of their pacifism during the First World War. They refused any military services and instead created some organizations to provide conscientious objectors—both Friends and other pacifists—with non-combatant works. The foundation of the AFSC in 1917 shortly after the United States had entered the war, was one such work. The AFSC had the support of all the American

Yearly Meetings regardless of whether they were Orthodox, Hicksite or Conservative. It took care of the conscientious objectors in the military service, raised funds and gathered relief supplies for distressed Europe, and trained young people for relief work abroad.

War relief required spiritual as well as material service. English Friends had answered these demands of spiritual healing by establishing Quaker embassy centers in several European cities, so that they remained and served even after the immediate necessity of war relief and reconstruction. Quaker embassies were designed to be "settlements for the promotion of international understanding and goodwill, and for spreading the Quaker message through normal business contacts, meetings, and educational facilities."²⁵ American Friends joined this project. The AFSC, which had been organized to provide conscientious objectors with war-time service, accepted new phases of works and reorganized itself. It divided its works into four sections:

- (1) The European section to continue cooperation with English Friends and keep up the European contacts and goodwill centers;
- (2) The Interracial Service Section;
- (3) The Peace Section and
- (4) The Home Service Section for relief and rehabilitation work in the United States.²⁶

Friends had been working in non-Christian countries as propagators of the Christian gospel and they would continue to do so in the years to come. Their activities in Christian Europe, on the other hand, proved to be war relief and international understanding. These two lines of foreign works were integrated into one organization in England, when English Friends recognized that the world wanted both mission and goodwill, and that both works were complementary. The "Council for International Service," which was established to do the spiritual work of Friends in Continental Europe in 1919, took over the business of the "War Victims Relief Committee" in 1923. The "Friends Foreign Mission Association of London Yearly Meeting" merged with this "Council for International Service" in order to meet Friends' increasing interest in "problems of the social order, international relations, post-war relief, and goodwill centers over the world." Foreign mission and international goodwill were viewed as one whole in the same

world service.²⁷

American Friends, however, did not see the necessity of merging the foreign-mission and international-goodwill aspects of their works into one organization by uniting the work of the AFSC and that of the American Friends Board of Foreign Missions. It was owing to their differences of views as to methods and ideals.²⁸ To realize this, we need only to remember the fact the American Friends Board was an official Board of the Five Years Meeting of Orthodox Friends whereas almost all the American Yearly Meetings—Orthodox, Hicksite and Conservative—participated in the AFSC.

This is roughly the way that the Friends world activities changed their cast of concern.

THE MISSION BOARD OF PHILADELPHIA YEARLY MEETING

The motive to set up the Mission Board of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was the letter the FMA sent to Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1918. This letter recommended that the Yearly Meeting should appoint a committee to survey the foreign works carried out by its members through three independent organizations—the FMA, the AFSC and the Young Friends' Committee. Three items were presented to be examined:

- (1) The responsibility of our Yearly Meeting in regard to Christian work in foreign lands.
- (2) The best method of promoting the living concerns of our members for foreign service.
- (3) The co-ordination of foreign missionary interests among all members of our Yearly Meeting.

This request invited serious consideration by the Yearly Meeting and found the appointment of the proposed committee.²⁹

The report of this committee to the next Yearly Meeting pointed out that the administration of foreign works should be left to the existing voluntary organizations on the basis of self-perpetuation. It also mentioned the lack of information about the foreign works performed by the FMA, the AFSC and the Young Friends' Committee. In spite of the fact that "It is important that Friends be informed of world needs but especially of those people whose spiritual necessities have been laid as a burden on the hearts of concerned members," such information still failed to reach the members of the Yearly Meeting. Finally

the committee announced the formation of a "Committee on Christian Labor in Foreign Lands," which, without administering any foreign work, would keep in touch with the foreign works done by three organizations, encourage these activities and inform of those world services.

The "Committee on Christian Labor in Foreign Lands" surveyed both kinds of foreign activities, the mission work in Japan and the reconstruction work in Europe. Its reports revealed that the foreign mission was not so appealing as the war-time relief and reconstruction work. The Committee emphasized that the mission was as important as the latter.³¹ The mission in Japan drew the Committee's consideration on three points. First of all, the position of Japan in the critical international situation at that time required its attention. Secondly, Japan Yearly Meeting regarded Philadelphia Yearly Meeting as its mother Yearly Meeting and demanded qualified Friends from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Thirdly, the present equipment and support of the Friends mission in Japan were inadequate. Some members of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, who were in the service of mission, faced these immediate needs.³²

The "Committee on Christian Labor in Foreign Lands" noticed the heightened spirit of mission during and after the First World War. It compared, in its final report of 1922 to the Yearly Meeting, the exalted experience of the War to the early Quaker movement.

During the late war this sense of mission was significantly revived, and meetings were again fired by the giving of young life to minister of the needs of those, whom having not seen we loved. We caught once again the power that comes from losing life in surrender of ourselves to the needs of the world.

The Committee was afraid that this enhanced spirit would be extinguished when the temporary need was over. It cautioned against "the possibility that our Yearly Meeting may easily settle back within itself, while the continuous needs of our fellowmen the world over call to deaf ears." The final resolution of this "Committee on Christian Labor in Foreign Lands" reads as follows:

If then vital type of Christianity is essentially world-wide in its concern, we believe that there should be a Board or Committee as an intrinsic part of the Yearly Meeting which should consolidate the foreign work not covered by the American Friends' Service Committee.³³

The judgment that the Yearly Meeting should maintain "this sensitization to the needs of the world"³⁴ led the Committee to recommend to the Yearly Meeting the taking-over of the mission works of the FMA in 1922. In accordance with the recommendation given by the "Committee of Christian Labor in Foreign Lands," the Mission Board was formed. The Board took charge of the financial account of the FMA and the administrative responsibility of its works on October 1, 1923. This transfer meant that Philadelphia Yearly Meeting decided to approve the foreign mission as one of the two aspects of Friends world activities.

In 1918, when the FMA first contemplated being a part of the Yearly Meeting, there were about 4,400 members in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting about 1,000 of whom contributed to the FMA.³⁵ Compared with the relief, reconstruction and international-understanding activities, the foreign mission was a minor and less appealing project. The Yearly Meeting as a whole was not so enthusiastic about the foreign mission. The FMA well recognized the "blank wall of indifference" and the "active opposition" to the foreign mission among the membership of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.³⁶ So the leading members of the FMA were very deliberate in conferring with the representatives from the Yearly Meeting about submitting their work to the Yearly Meeting. The final *Annual Report of the Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia* notes:

The transfer of the work to new hands is made with mingled feelings by those who have so long been identified with it. To lay aside responsibility for an enterprise which has for many years had so strong a claim on their time and interest, must cause real regret. This regret is more than compensated by the joy which it gives to them and to all who have the interests of Christian missions at heart, to feel that the work which has heretofore been carried on by a comparatively small part of the membership of the Yearly Meeting, has now become the responsibility of all.³⁷

The transfer of missionary works from the FMA to the Yearly Meeting was achieved in the exalted atmosphere after the Philadelphia Friends' active commitment to relief, reconstruction and international-understanding works during and after the First World War. Yet a majority of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting were ignorant about the Friends

mission in Japan which had been undertaken by the WFMA and the FMA. The Mission Board had to inform, educate and inspire the Yearly Meeting members to support the foreign mission. The first report of the Mission Board to the Yearly Meeting closes with anxiety:

We would urge that the members of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting be mindful of the fact that this Mission Work is now a Yearly Meeting concern. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting stand behind it, and such a work, so sponsored, should lay its weight of responsibility on the heart of every member of the Yearly Meeting. Our membership must become increasingly alive to this responsibility.³⁸

The necessity of educating the membership was repeated for the initial period of the Mission Board.

Philadelphia Friends were willing to participate in activities for war-time relief, reconstruction and international understanding without hesitation, but the ground for the whole Yearly Meeting to assume the responsibilities of the foreign mission was not firm.

CHANGING OF MISSION POLICIES

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting got interested in foreign activities through the AFSC's programs. It extended its concern to the foreign mission and organized the Mission Board. This Board faced the new criticism of foreign mission from the very beginning. Was there any significant change in the concept of Friends mission by the Mission Board? What was the basic rationale for formulating its mission policies?

The disbelief in the foreign mission itself remained strong among Philadelphia Friends, even after the Yearly Meeting became responsible for the mission. Those Friends who expressed negative feelings to the mission opposed it, however, not necessarily on the ground that the Friends foreign mission would damage their denominational peculiarities. Friends brought up more fundamental problems in foreign mission this time.

Ambivalence in the idea of foreign mission was a factor which kept Philadelphia Friends away from it. But there were other factors working against Friends' full-fledged involvement in missionary activities. Many Friends were anxious that the name of mission might provoke a feeling of insult in native people.

Edith Sharpless, a Friend missionary who was working in Japan, raises these questions:

After all, is the missionary enterprise, an impertinence to the cultured people among whom it has been undertaken? It is too crude a spreading of the American eagle? There is so much that is noble and true in some of the non-Christian thought. Is it therefore better not to interfere?—especially when we have such an imperfect product to show in our own civilization, which is presumably the result of centuries of Christian thought and teaching.³⁹

Put differently, her uneasiness may be stated as follows. Is the foreign missionary activity not arrogant, denying non-Christian way of life? Cannot other religions be as valuable as Christianity? In 1925, the Mission Board referred to “the growing but critical interest in missions among Friends and others here, and the new attitude of analysis and criticism of missionary work on the part of Oriental Christians.” The new criticism of foreign mission was, in fact, based on “the militaristic attitude of the west,” “the new idea of self-determination of nations,” and “the frequent financial dependence of the Boards on the fruits of arrogant capitalism which is allied, to race prejudice, etc.”⁴⁰ In sum, the criticism reflected the doubt about the supremacy of Christianity and the recognition that the West itself was imperfect. This realization seems to have led Philadelphia Friends further to perceive the relativity of cultural values and systems.

Therefore, compared with the heightened spirit of the members of the FMA that Christianity was fated to conquer the world,⁴¹ the vision of the Mission Board of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was much subdued. The Mission Board's attitudes were clearly less Christianity-centered and more guided to promote understanding between peoples of different cultures. Notice the Mission Board's official 1924-1925 annual report to Philadelphia Yearly Meeting:

The work which may be done in our meeting is, first, the enlargement of our own conception of humanity. We may study and learn more of the great countries which have been left out of our history books and out of our thinking and fellowship.⁴²

The Board called the Friends mission in Japan “a throughgoing example of international understanding” in the report of 1925-1926. The Board was announced to be striving for “the discovery of a policy

of mutual help which shall gradually come to rule our relations as Christians with the Christians of other continents.”⁴³ It is noteworthy that one of the Friends missionaries to Japan stated: “the most important thing is not what we mean to the Japanese but what the contact there means to us.”⁴⁴ Philadelphia Friends expected that they could learn from the Orient and that their relation with Japanese was to be mutual. From its early years, the Mission Board's approach was more international-understanding oriented than Christian-mission oriented.

The article on the young Friends' view about foreign mission — “A Job in the Far East” — in the *Bulletin* of the March of 1927 confirms this tendency of foreign mission.⁴⁵ These young Friends were strongly directed towards the works of cultural understanding. The answers—there were nine in all—to the question, “Have American Friends any job in the Orient today? If so, what is it? If, not, why not?” will illustrate this point.

Answer No. 5 seems to present most fully how the contemporary young Friends thought the Friends mission should be:

We believe that American Friends have not job today in the Orient as preachers of evangelical religion, but,

- (a) As friends living the Gospel without any other ideal but that of showing the highest type of representatives of Western civilization and the Gospel, and
- (b) As delegates of this civilization to gather the finest fruits of Eastern spirit and culture and to bring back a proper interpretation of them to American people, and
- (c) Thus to destroy all notions of superior or inferior races, and bring about human peaceful relationships on a basis of mutual understanding and good will.

Answer No. 4 agrees that the Orient required not professional missionaries but good lay Christians:

But they [American Friends] are no longer needed as Friends missionaries in the narrowest sense of the word but as Christian missionaries in the largest sense of the word: doctors, teachers, and even honest business men are needed to represent to those people the good in the great Christian civilization across the Pacific, and to throw their influence against the great forces of evil which have also come from so-called Christian countries.

The necessity of mutual respect and understanding is further emphasized in answer No. 9.

The work of Friends in the Far East should be directed, in my opinion, as much toward converting the West as toward converting the East. Mutual respect and toleration, friendship and trust are needed. Mission stations should be centres for collecting the material to interpret the best of the East to the West, as well as the best of the West to the East.

These young Friends were neither particular about Quaker characteristics nor evangelical for that matter. While their response to professional missionaries was denying, they valued the important role that lay Christians could play through normal contacts with people of other cultures.⁴⁶ The young Friends, as well as the Mission Board of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, were more interested in international goodwill—mutual help and mutual understanding, which would benefit each other.

Howard H. Brinton received this direction of foreign mission gladly. He points out :

After the World War when our service work in war-stricken areas developed finally into the establishment of Quaker embassies in a number of European cities, a procedure more congenial to our essential doctrines was inaugurated. Something peculiarly our own, suited to the genius of our Society, was developed.

He adds that "A Quaker missionary must be more than a preacher ; he must also be an ambassador of goodwill with some ability to demonstrate the healing power of our faith in various kinds of conflict ; political, social or economic."⁴⁷ Thus, this famous Philadelphia Friend who was devoted to Japan mission, affirmed that the First World War brought a new period to the Friends foreign mission and that the new tendencies were more agreeable to Quaker faith.

CONCLUSION

Philadelphia Friends opposed the foreign missionary movement in the 19th century, for they believed that the foreign mission would damage their denominational faith and practice. Only a minority of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting supported the mission. It was the Quaker experience during and after the First World War that woke Philadelphia Friends to the need for worldwide activities. Their main interests were, however, social service and international understanding but not Christian mission. With the

idea of international goodwill, Philadelphia Friends reviewed their foreign missionary works and tried to find a suitable Quaker way of foreign activities.

It is easily expected that the Friends mission in Japan undertaken by the Mission Board of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting became more like the AFSC's works in Europe than those of the American Friends Board. The Friends mission in Japan actually inclined to be social-service and cultural-understanding oriented, especially after the Mission Board took it over. Although this was guided by the Mission Board's general policy of foreign mission, it is to be reminded that the position of Japan in the critical international situation required these activities. The relationship between Japan and the United States was worsening during the 1920's and 1930's. The Mission Board faced the "Japanese Exclusion Bill" from its very beginning. The necessity of international goodwill was felt urgent. Japan's conditions after the Second World War, moreover, resembled those of Europe after the First World War. The post-war Japan, in a sense, offered Philadelphia Friends opportunities to demonstrate their ability of relief and reconstruction works.*

(1988年10月18日受理)

NOTES

- 1 About the Friends foreign mission as a whole : Christina Jones, *American Friends in World Missions* (Elgin, Illinois : Brethren Publication House, 1946) ; Elbert Russell, *The History of Quakerism* (New York : Macmillan, 1941), pp.435-448 ; D. Elton Trueblood, *The People Called Quakers* (Richmond, Indiana : Friends United Press, 1971), pp. 247-264.
- 2 D. Elton Trueblood, *Theory and Practice of Quaker Missions* (Philadelphia : Friends' Mission Board, 1935), pp. 40-45.
- 3 About the diversity of Quakerism in the 19th century America : Russell, *op. cit.*, pp. 280-356, 482-509 ; Edwin B. Bronner, ed., *American Quakers Today* (Philadelphia : Friends World Committee, American Section and Fellowship Council, 1972), pp. 5-31 ; Edwin B. Bronner, "The Other Branch" (London : Friends Historical Society, 1975) ; Rufus M. Jones, *The Later Periods of Quakerism* (Westport, Connecticut : Greenwood Press), pp. 435-540. The division of the Yearly Meetings in America after

- the separations is available : Edwin B. Bronner, ed., *An English View of American Quakers* (Philadelphia : American Philosophical Society, 1970). footnote to p. 10.
- 4 C. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
 - 5 Russell, *op. cit.*, p. 440.
 - 6 In 1902, New England worked in Syria ; New York, Mexico ; Philadelphia, Japan ; Ohio, China ; Indiana and Western, Mexico ; Iowa, Jamaica ; Kansas, Alaska : *ibid.*, p. 443.
 - 7 *Ibid.*, pp. 441-443 ; C. Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6.
 - 8 Russell, *ibid.*, pp. 322, 354-356, 484, 497-498. Especially about Philadelphia Quakerdom after the Civil War : Philip S. Benjamin, *The Philadelphia Quakers in the Industrial Age 1865-1920* (Philadelphia : Temple University Press, 1976), pp. 3-25.
 - 9 Russell, *ibid.*, pp. 354, 497 ; Benjamin, *ibid.*, pp. 14-15.
 - 10 Benjamin, *ibid.*, p. 16.
 - 11 C. Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-73.
 - 12 The Women's Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia, printed letter of invitation to join the Association, Philadelphia, 1/16/1883.
 - 13 *First Annual Report of the Women's Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia*, 1884, p. 3.
 - 14 Minutes of the Women's Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia, 12/2/1887 ; Gurney Binford, *As I Remember It : Forty-three Years in Japan* (Richmond, Indiana : Friends Book Store, 1950), p. 75 ; Edith F. Sharpless, "Quakerism in Japan," *The Friend*, vol. 106, no. 24 (12/15/1932), p. 279.
 - 15 Minutes of the Women's Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia, 8/14/1883 ; *First Annual Report*, pp. 10-11.
 - 16 Minutes of the Women's Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia, 11/28/1884.
 - 17 *Ibid.*, 1/23/1885.
 - 18 *Ibid.*, 6/20/1885.
 - 19 Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 9/18/1885, in "History of Japan Committee I," Japan Committee Archives, Box 9, Folder 2-A.
 - 20 Rebecca N. Taylor, "Beginnings," *The Friend*, vol. 106, no. 24 (12/15/1932), pp. 278-279.
 - 21 Minutes of the Women's Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia, 1/22/1886.
 - 22 Rebecca White, letter to N. C. Whitall, 7/23/1885.
 - 23 At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Foreign Missionary Association in January, 1918, the plan that the Association should be a part of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was uttered for the first time : Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia, 1/11/1918.
 - 24 Russell, *op. cit.*, pp. 447, 510.
 - 25 "Report of the Committee on Christian Labor in Foreign Lands," *Extracts of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting*, 1920, p. 62.
 - 26 Russell, *op. cit.*, pp. 510-528.
 - 27 *Ibid.*, pp. 447-448, 524.
 - 28 *Ibid.*, p. 448.
 - 29 "Report of the Committee on Christian Labor in Foreign Lands," *Extracts of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting*, 1918, pp. 8-9.
 - 30 *Ibid.*, 1919, pp. 59-61.
 - 31 *Ibid.*, p. 62.
 - 32 *Ibid.*, 1921, pp. 55-56.
 - 33 *Ibid.*, 1922, p. 44.
 - 34 *Ibid.*, 1920, pp. 61-62.
 - 35 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia, 2/8/1918.
 - 36 *Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia*, 1921, p. 15.
 - 37 *Forty-first Annual Report of the Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia*, 1923, p. 37.
 - 38 "Report of the Mission Board," *Extracts of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting*, 1924, p. 88.
 - 39 *Bulletin of the Mission Board of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting*, vol. 2, no. 9 (4mo., 1926).
 - 40 Minutes of the Executive Mission Board, 10/17/1925.
 - 41 *Quarterly of the Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1mo., 1907), pp. 1-2.
 - 42 "Report of the Mission Board," *Extracts of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting*, 1925, pp. 89-90.

- 43 *Ibid.*, 1926, pp. 34-36.
- 44 Minutes of the Executive Mission Board, 4/8/1927.
- 45 *Bulletin* of the Mission Board of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, vol. 3, no. 9 (3mo., 1927).
- 46 *Ibid.*
- 47 Howard H. Brinton, "Japan and Quakerism," *The Friend*, vol. 110, no. 6 (9/10/1936), p. 88.

*This paper which limited its interest strictly to Philadelphia Friends' experience should be re-examined in broader perspective. Philadelphia Friends' earlier opposition to the foreign mission was very distinctive, but they shared the doubt about the supremacy of Christianity and the disillusionment of Western Civilization about the time of the First World War with other Americans. It is needless to say that any study of mission policies requires the discussion in the context of history of the foreign missionary movement as a whole.