

David A. Hollinger, “The Protestant Boomerang: How The Foreign Missionary Experience Liberalized the Home Culture”

November 18, 2013

Washington University in St. Louis
(Danforth Distinguished Lecture Series)

Marie Griffith

Good afternoon. Good afternoon, on behalf of the John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics at Washington University in St. Louis, I am delighted to welcome you all to our inaugural Danforth Distinguished Lectures featuring Professor David A. Hollinger, in conversation with Professors Jon Butler, Darren Dochuk, and Molly Worthen on the subject of Protestant Foreign Missions and Secularization in modern America. I'm Marie Griffith, the Danforth Center Director, and as many of you know, the Center serves as an ideologically diverse venue for fostering rigorous scholarship and informing broad academic and public communities about the intersections of religion and U.S. politics, talk of which is too often uninformed and destructive. The Danforth Center seeks to understand these intersections with empirical clarity and to identify important contributions the academy can make in the public sphere. We are committed to supporting outstanding scholarly research on the historical and contemporary intertwining of religion and politics, making a public impact by disseminating excellent scholarship to students and the broader populace through courses, public lectures, major conferences, and widely accessible publications such as our award winning online journal, Religion and Politics, and fostering public debate and discussion among people who hold widely different views.

The John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics owes its existence to the tremendous generosity of the Danforth Foundation, founded in 1927 by Mr. and Mrs. William H. Danforth. The foundation's commitment to funding St. Louis based initiatives is well known and in 2009, it announced a major gift to Washington University to establish this Center in the name of former U.S. Senator from Missouri, John C. Danforth. Senator Danforth serves as an exemplary model of commitment to both public service and academic excellence and he continues to be a tremendous advocate for the work we are doing here at the Center, for which we are extraordinarily grateful. Two years after the founding gift, an additional Danforth Foundation monetary award established the Danforth Distinguished Lectures, envisioned to be a series that would initiate and sustain an ongoing discussion that would be widely influential, intellectually provocative, and distinctive in its subject matter. The issue at the heart of this series, how the persistent interaction of politics and religion in America influences our everyday lives, is of great import to the social struggles of our time and to the pursuit of a good and just society. The Danforth Lectures provides a venue for exploring these issues by

inviting a distinguished thinker to focus his or her thought and research on one specific aspect of religion and politics. These Danforth Lectures begin here, this week, with three consecutive late afternoon presentations by Professor Hollinger and his distinguished scholarly respondents. These presentations will be shortly disseminated through numerous media outlets, supplemented by a wide range of campus discussions this week, that involve representatives of the Washington University faculty, student body, and invited guests from around the country, whose own engagement with the subject of the lectures can produce a lively and informed discussion with a public impact. Included in this visiting group are several senior scholars as well as younger fellows who have been chosen from graduate and professional schools around the country. So thank you to all of you visiting here in that group, we are so glad you are here. Many of these discussions as well as the lectures themselves will be archived on the Danforth Center's website so that the conversation can continue indefinitely.

The Danforth family is represented here today by Senator Danforth's daughter, Mary Danforth Stillman who also serves as a member of the Center's National Advisory Board and we are very thankful that she is able to be with us today for this inaugural lecture series.

I'm delighted now to introduce one of the Center's renowned senior faculty members who will introduce today's speaker, and that is Leigh Eric Schmidt, the Edward Mallinckrodt Distinguished University Professor at Washington University in St. Louis.

Leigh Schmidt

Some years ago now certain lines from a poem by Edna St. Vincent Millay got stuck in my head. The lines contained a dark lament about the trivialization of language under the incessant pressures of American boosterism: "the finest, the best, the purest, what do they mean now" she asked, and then continued, "we are a nation of word-killers: hero, veteran, tragedy. – Watch the great words go down." The academy of course has its own way of deflating certain words by overuse or misuse. Excellent, for example, brilliant, preeminent, original, and field changing, those also come to mind. Over the years, I have mostly tried to keep such words carefully boxed away in relatively mint condition only to bring them out for use on just such rare occasions as this. Introducing Professor David Hollinger at the inaugural event of the Danforth Distinguished Lectures is one of those times when prodigality rather than frugality with the great words feels very much warranted. Brilliant, preeminent, original, and field changing: they all apply with all their vital force preserved to Professor Hollinger's scholarship. David Hollinger is the Preston Hotchkis Professor of American History Emeritus at the University of California Berkeley. He received his BA in History from La Verne College at Church of the Brethren School in Southern California, and his PhD in History from Berkeley. His

achievements, honors, and academic leadership defy quick summary. He has served as the president of the organization of American Historians and is an elected fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He has on two separate occasions been an elected member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, about as exalted as learned company gets. He has served as a trustee of both the Institute for Advanced Study and the National Humanities Center, he has chaired the Academic Freedom Committee for the American Association of University Professors. That sampling suggests how far Professor Hollinger's work has reached beyond his home discipline of History. Indeed it has stretched across the humanities and social sciences. It has included plenary addresses for example at the American Political Science Association and the American Psychological Association.

A full register of Professor Hollinger's publications would be beyond the scope of any introduction, no matter how lavish. Several of his books are listed on the program announcement for these lectures, a fourteen page record of his publications, I should say, is only a click or two away on the History Department's website at Berkeley. That list goes back to a 1968 essay in the *Journal History and Theory* on Perry Miller and philosophical history. A telling entry I think, since between them, and Henry May, Miller and Hollinger stand as particular benchmarks in the writing of American intellectual and religious history over the last century. For the sake of brevity, I will not try to be compendious here, but instead I will spend a few moments introducing some of Professor Hollinger's most salient contributions for our thinking about American religion and politics. For an evocative autobiographical reflection on how and why he became a historian, I strongly recommend an essay of his entitled "Church People and Others" which he first published in 2009 and which appears as a chapter in his most recent book. Professor Hollinger's *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism* is one of those rare gems in which exacting scholarship and profound public mindedness seamlessly converge. In that volume he offers an intellectual history of American understandings of cultural pluralism and cosmopolitanism that serves simultaneously as an essay on contemporary political debates about cultural, religious, and racial diversity. In formulating a post-ethnic view of identity in which voluntary affiliations are favored over socially ascribed ones, Professor Hollinger makes a crucial intervention in the tangled public debates about multiculturalism. Though religion was not yet at the center of his account of cosmopolitanism, there were certainly strong hints of its importance. He pointed out for example the relative absence of religion from the debate over multiculturalism. The discussion had been conspicuously aloof from religious cultures, he argued, at the expense of considering how the ways in which Americans thought about religious identity in voluntary terms provided another way of thinking about the fixed boundaries of ethno-racial identities. *Postethnic America* also made it clear that if one wanted to understand American views of universalism and cultural pluralism, one

needed to consider seriously in his phrase “the God of liberal Protestantism.” In his effort to retrieve a rooted American version of diversity seeking cosmopolitanism, Professor Hollinger was leading us back to religious liberals, most of whom, in the American setting, have been Ecumenical Protestants and Post-Protestants. Professor Hollinger has made Ecumenical Protestants: Methodists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, American Baptists, Congregationalists, Lutherans, and Disciples, matter anew for scholars in the humanities and social sciences. Old-line Protestants got used to being counted out, swept aside by evangelicals and the religious right and caught up in a narrative of irreversible decline. Professor Hollinger’s most recent book, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Protestant Liberalism in American History*, an essay collection that Princeton University Press published earlier this year, makes a strong and convincing case that 20th century Ecumenical Protestantism was at the center of American social and political life. He suggests that the primary cultural victories of the 20th century belong to the Ecumenical Protestants and Post-Protestants on race and civil rights, on women’s equality, on marriage and sexuality, and on the respect for diversity. After all the nay-saying about mainline Protestant decline since the 1970s, no one seemed more surprised than Ecumenical Protestants themselves to find out that their apparent defeat at the hands of the religious right was subject to serious debate. It is not every day that the President of the Organization of American Historians is interviewed by the Christian Century as Hollinger was in 2012. The title of the article was “Culture Changers” which of course applied to how Hollinger viewed Ecumenical Protestants. The title could have applied to the historian himself, who as a field changer was also serving as a persuasive public intellectual. We are honored to have Professor Hollinger here to inaugurate this new Distinguished Lecture Series for the Danforth Center on Religion and Politics. Professor Hollinger’s first lecture is entitled, actually I probably don’t need to say this since it’s behind me, “The Protestant Boomerang: How the Foreign Missionary Experience Liberalized the Home Culture.” I should note that he has agreed to take questions after the lecture. The Q&A will run until six o’clock. Please join me now in welcoming Professor Hollinger.

David Hollinger

Well I am deeply grateful for such an exceptionally gracious and generous introduction. I’m also grateful for the honor of being the first Danforth Lecturer, and this honor means a lot to me in the context of the remarkable dispatch and success with which this Danforth Center is establishing itself as a known presence throughout the United States, at least in the parts of academia that I circulate in., I’ve heard it mentioned repeatedly at recent conferences and recent conference visits. It’s very unusual that an enterprise of relatively small scale as this has become widely known as a basic referent point, so I think that Washington University and the Danforth Foundation and everyone who is involved in this has excellent reasons to be proud of the ways this enterprise has

been launched. So in that context I am very glad to deliver the inaugural Danforth Lectures.

Now I put on the screen, here, two very different people: Colonel William Eddy of the United States Marine Corps was one of the most important on the ground operatives of the OSS, the Office of Strategic Services, during World War II and then one of the designers of the CIA; Molly Yard, one of the early presidents of the National Organization of Women, was a radical feminist known for her “take no prisoners” approach to anyone who opposed the rights of women. The two had in common some striking personal traits. Each was capable of deep empathic identification with human beings very different from themselves; each was an indefatigable critic of American provincialism. The prejudices that the average American had against foreign peoples were anathema to these two, especially in Eddy’s case regarding the Arab peoples and in Yard’s case, especially regarding the Chinese peoples. Eddy and Yard both grew up as the children of Protestant missionaries. Yard’s career is better known today partly because she was of a slightly later generation and partly because she was a more public figure, a national presence in second wave feminism. Eddy’s career is less well known, not only because he was a part of a slightly earlier generation but because CIA officers tend to be less forthcoming about what they do, and their careers usually require a little more digging from historians. But Eddy’s case is well worth dwelling on for a moment because it was he who arranged for and did the translating at the remarkable but rarely recalled meeting of Franklin D. Roosevelt and King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia in 1945 right after the Yalta Conference. Now Saudi Kings almost never leave their country and it may be that this is the only time that that has happened, but Eddy, as a missionary child from Beirut, happened to know the King personally, and after all he’d spent the previous several years on a variety of secret missions trying to counteract the influence of the Axis powers in the Arab world and he was able to arrange this meeting on the deck of the USS Quincy on the Red Sea. Eddy’s biographer calls him the American Lawrence of Arabia, and there’s something to that, although Lawrence of course was a great self-promoter and Eddy after all, was a spy. Eddy was concerned about the British Empire’s Balfour Declaration and the facilitating of Jewish immigration from Palestine, and this was a major topic in the discussion between the two heads of state. The king told the president that the Jewish problem, the Jewish question, was a European one, not an Arab one, and if there was gonna be a Jewish state, why not take the land from the Germans? This was an idea of course that didn’t go anywhere, imagine Israel in Swabia or Pomerania or Silesia, but FDR was at least impressed with the King and historians are not sure what would have happened in the years immediately following had Roosevelt survived and in good enough health to follow his own notorious penchant for personal diplomacy.

But apart from that speculation, the episode of Colonel Eddy and the Arab resistance to a Jewish state in Palestine contains a significance to which I will refer toward the end of the lecture but for now let me place the cases of Eddy and Yard in a larger context. "The mission's boomerang has come back to smite the imperialism of the white nations as well as to confound the churches" wrote congregational ethics professor Buell G. Gallagher in 1946 in the book *Color and Conscience: The Irrepressible Conflict*. The missionary enterprise had been so certain of the superiority of its faith, the superiority of Western culture, and of the divine destiny of the white man to rule the world that the men and women who supported and staffed this enterprise did not expect to have the practices and policies of their own culture challenged by the indigenous peoples to whom the missionaries were sent. But the Gospel of inclusive brotherhood, the notion of a single species wide solidarity turned out to be a boomerang. The Gospel, in the form of sharpened egalitarian claims and charges of prejudice flew back at those who had thrown this Gospel across Asia, Africa, and the islands of the seven seas. When the boomerang came home, according to Gallagher, it dealt a smart blow to inequalities at home and raised questions and doubts about the wisdom and morality of the missionary enterprise itself. The missionaries, for all their cultural imperialism and arrogant paternalism, associated themselves with egalitarian ideals, the illogic of which, Gallagher explained, drove them, the missionaries, to side with the anti-imperialist thrust of colonial peoples. Experience in the field with real human beings who inhabited India and China and other exotic locales eventually generated respect for indigenous peoples and demanded a rethinking of the whole relation of us to them. I quote Gallagher at such length because I have adopted from him a figure of speech that conveys the historic dynamic I want to address. The American Protestant foreign missionary project produced a deep provincializing effect on the United States in the 20th Century. That missionary project called back on its designers and supporters a set of ideas about foreign peoples very different from the ideas that had launched the project in the nineteenth century and continued to inspire its support by millions of rank and file churchgoers well into the twentieth. The experience of foreign missions in the long run yielded relatively generous dispositions toward the varieties of humankind. The experience promoted initiatives to diminish the mistreatment of people of non-European ancestry within American borders as well as beyond them. An enterprise formidably propelled by ethnocentrism and cultural imperialism and often linked closely with imperialism of the military, diplomatic, and economic varieties generated dialectically a profound counter-reaction among many missionaries themselves and especially among their children. This profound counter-reaction also embraced highly educated Protestants like Gallagher, who had not personal missionary connection, but whose assessment of Christianity and of the United States depended heavily on the reports, testimonies, and recommendations of these missionaries.

Now the drift toward diversity, affirming cosmopolitan perspectives, in the middle decades of the twentieth century as far as it went was stimulated by many conditions including the popularization of cultural anthropology by people like Margaret Meade and Ruth Benedict, the influence of immigrant intellectuals from Hitler's Europe, the new prominence in the arts and in academia of American Jews who as non-Christians brought a new diversity to public space. But one source of this trend rarely taken into account is the missionary project of the so-called mainline churches. Access to this important aspect of the history of the United States is often impeded by persistent ascription to missionaries of an arrogant refusal to engage with indigenous cultures. This image of missionaries as conceited, narrow-minded souls oblivious to the humanity of the people to whom they ostensibly ministered was reinforced by Barbara Kingsolver's best-selling novel of fifteen years ago *The Poisonwood Bible*. Some missionaries have indeed resembled Kingsolver's description of them. This is especially true of the pre-millennial dispensationalists who went into the field in the 1890s, famously mocked by Mark Twain and many others—people believing that a quick conversion of the world was necessary because the last times were coming. One had no reason to think in long-range terms of the building of social apparatus. But the missionaries who inspired Gallagher were very different. From the 1910s and 1920s onward, the missionaries sent abroad by the mainline churches—the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists and so forth—were quite well educated. And they were well equipped with the social gospel and with the higher criticism and other theologically liberal perspectives that made them more responsive to indigenous cultures than their predecessors had been. These liberals were the missionaries through whose careers the boomerang took its most faithful course.

I hasten to acknowledge that not all Americans influenced by the testimony of missionaries had views like Gallagher's. The ultra-conservative John Birch Society was named for a martyred missionary after all, and one who had in his student days demanded the disciplining of some of his own professors for holding heretically liberal theological views. China-born Henry R. Luce, the son of Presbyterian missionaries, enunciated in his influential adulthood as the publisher of *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune*, a vision of internationalism decidedly more America-centric than Gallagher's. Missionaries, the children of missionaries, and the other Americans who invoked the missionary experience as a justification or an inspiration for their opinions and conduct, displayed a wide spectrum of opinions about politics and culture.

Yet the missionary-connected Americans who made the most marks on American public life were not distributed equally along that spectrum. Quite the contrary. The bulk of missionary-connected Americans who became visible in one domain or another of American life between the 1920s and the 1970s were closer to Gallagher's end of the

spectrum, which is also illustrated by the most famous of all the missionary-connected Americans—Luce's China-born contemporary Pearl Buck. Most of them were much closer to Buck's end of the spectrum than the end of the spectrum occupied by John Birch and the Americans who campaigned in his name against Earl Warren's Supreme Court, and against Civil Rights legislation. Historians now agree that Buck did more than any other single person to diminish American prejudice against the Chinese people. This cultural contribution on Buck's part would get more recognition than it has, I think, were it not for the fact that her novels, including *The Good Earth* itself, which made her the second American to win the Nobel Prize for Literature, have not played well in English departments. I mention this not to defend the quality of her artistry, although many do, but to call attention to her huge cultural role. Indeed she is the most widely read female author in all of American history, and her books have been translated into more languages than the works of Mark Twain.

Today, I want to speak about several of the specific arenas of human activity in which we can see missionary-connected Americans playing a public role. But before I turn to some of the arenas I want to underscore the basic importance of the Protestant foreign missionary project in American life, a reality that is not widely recognized today. From the late nineteenth century until World War II, missions were central to American interaction with the world beyond the North Atlantic West. It was largely through contact with missionaries, especially by way of their writing and reports, that the bulk of Americans formed what impressions they had of non-European peoples. Newspaper correspondence, travel writers, *The National Geographic* magazine, World's Fairs, and the public representations of diplomats and businessmen also contributed to these impressions. But missions provided a more intimate and enduring connection. Religious periodicals kept foreign scenes in front of their readers constantly. The lectures delivered by missionaries home on furlough were widely attended events in local communities as well as at regional and national meetings of denominations and cross-denominational organizations. Missionaries, we must never forget, were the bullfighters of Protestant culture. Their bravery, their heroism, was the stuff of countless pamphlets and periodicals and memorials. Some of you will have seen Missionary Arch on the campus of Oberlin College, which is a memorial to the Oberlin graduates who were killed in the Boxer Rebellion of whom there were actually a great many. And this was an important shrine at Oberlin up until the mid-1960s when a number of anti-imperialist Oberlin students began to refuse to walk through it, so the commencement processional had to change in order for people to walk around this because the missionaries were such an embarrassing part of Oberlin's past.

Local churches often financed particular missionary families and personally corresponded with them over the course of decades. Moreover, the overwhelming

majority of educated and empowered Americans in the first half of the twentieth century were, after all, white Protestants and at least nominally affiliated with churches. What went on in their circles, the circles of empowered white Protestants, often had national significance.

During and after World War II, when the government of the United States and innumerable private parties took a much more active interest in the affairs of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, American ignorance about those parts of the world became perceived as problematic. In this context, missionary-connected Americans had something to offer that nobody else did. Foreign missionaries and their children were fluent in foreign languages and were familiar with the basic history and culture of one country after another. They were suddenly of strategic importance to the United States in the context of World War II, the Cold War, and the decline of the old European empires. When missionaries' son Edwin Reischauer was installed as the head of a military Japanese language-training program in 1942, he discovered when he arrived in Washington to take charge of the unit that every person in the room was either a missionary or missionary's son from Japan. The China section of the State Department and the Arab Desk were both filled with missionaries' sons by the time of the war's outbreak. The so-called China Hands in the State Department are among the most famous examples—here's John Service, the missionaries' son at Yan'an standing with the leaders of the Chinese Communists in 1944, later purged in 1954 in the McCarthy era for participating in what was described as the loss of China. Another missionaries' son John Patton Davies, from the China Inland Mission, is shown here also when he was at Yan'an in those early years.

Now these men and women constituted a distinctive and substantial pool of professionals and proto-professionals equipped to answer newly recognized needs of government agencies, universities, foundations, the media. Missionary-connected Americans were already active in many domains prior to World War II, but that war and its aftermath suddenly expanded the market for their skills. Hence the impact of the Protestant missionary project on American life actually increased during the mid-century decades, exactly the same years, ironically, during which the relative role of contemporary missions in the American interaction with the non-European world decreased on account of the rise of other modes of interaction and the simultaneous decline of actual missions in the face of withering self-critique offered by liberal anti-imperialist Protestants such as Buell Gallagher.

And I want to tell you a little bit more about this guy. *Color and Conscience* was published by Harper's two years after that house had brought out Gunnar Myrdal's *American Dilemma*. But unlike Myrdal and most of the other voices that we now

remember from that historical moment, Gallagher nested anti-black racism in a global context, argued that European imperialism and Jim Crow were part of the same evil, and credited the Protestant missionary experience with having better enabled Americans to recognize the inequity of both domestic racism and foreign imperialism. At a time when liberal anti-racists were slow to demand that government power be mobilized against racism and often confined themselves to moral suasion and to the invoking of abstract principles, Gallagher called for legislation and court action against the Jim Crow system. He even ran for Congress in 1948 and almost won. He lost by one percent in a Congressional election. And historians who have studied this think that the only reason he lost is shortly before the election he invited the Progressive Party candidate Henry Wallace to speak at one of his rallies, and this tainted him so much as a red that it very much diminished his constituency. In an era when the issue of miscegenation was usually avoided by advocates of racial integration, Gallagher insisted that there was no sound basis for restrictions on interracial marriage and he reminded his readers of the extent of race-mixing that had already taken place, but was conveniently, conventionally denied through the deeply racist “one-drop” rule. In a milieu in which most liberals represented the American race problem as primarily Southern, Gallagher condemned it in every region of the country and provided examples of its ordinance. Gallagher even observed that the Communist Party of the United States was much more active in fighting racism than the Christian church.

Now, Gallagher explained that the whole of this book is nothing but an elaboration of the critique of Western ethnocentrism that he learned about at a missionary saturated ecumenical conference at Oxford in 1937. Gallagher was deeply affected by the writings of missionaries and the personal testimony that they offered at one church conclave after another. The one person that Gallagher thanked for a critical reading of his entire manuscript was a man named Galen Fisher. And Gallagher doesn't say anything about this guy but I looked him up and found that he had spent twenty years as a missionary in Japan. And here's picture of him with some of his colleagues at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley. And I found out that also Fisher was the guy that organized and led the movement to protest the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. And indeed the defense of Americans of Japanese ancestry against internment is one of the several specific arenas that I want to talk about in which missionary-connected Americans like Fisher were demographically overrepresented. Fisher is described by today's best historian of the opposition to internment, Robert Schafer, as the most important organizer nationally on behalf of Japanese Americans. Fisher's organization, the Committee for National Security and Fair Play, linked religious, academic, and secular liberal opposition, managing alliances between the Society of Friends and the American Civil Liberties Union, the two major national organizations that were in the struggle. Fisher, along with UC Berkeley's Jewish Provost Monroe Deutsch, the most

prominent of the Bay Area's secular defenders of the Japanese Americans, testified before the Congressional Committee that held hearings on the issue in San Francisco. The committee also held hearings in Portland, Oregon, where the only voice raised against internment was that of a woman who had recently returned from 25 years as a Presbyterian missionary.

The national magazine that paid the most attention to the issue was *The Christian Century*, and the leading opponent of internment in its pages was E. Stanley Jones, who only a few years before had been hailed by *Time Magazine* as the world's greatest missionary. Missionary child Pearl Buck, I mentioned her before, who was then a household name, she wrote personally to her friend Eleanor Roosevelt condemning FDR's executive order and described it to the first lady as, "this is more German than American." And it's important to note that the missionary support for the Japanese Americans was not limited to those from Japan, but as the cases of Buck from China and Jones from India illustrate, included missionaries from all over the experience of the missionary field. Schafer's exhaustive study of the movement to defend Japanese Americans concludes the prominence of return missionaries in this movement indicates that many of them developed through their work abroad a concern for human equality, which led them to return to the U.S. with a penetrating critique of American racism.

Now, it's a striking fact that anthropologists, a tribe we normally think of as very liberal and cosmopolitan and pluralistic, compared with the racist and imperialist missionaries, the anthropologists by and large supported the internment of the Japanese Americans and here's a picture of one of the most famous of them, Robert Redfield, who wrote reports praising the government's handling of the Japanese Americans as a model for dealing with alien peoples.

Now, protests against the internment of the Japanese Americans constituted a tightly bounded chronological and political event. But the movement against Jim Crow racism was a large, multi-decade episode in which missionary related Americans were also prominent. Here in this second of the several specific arenas that I will discuss today, missionary-related Protestants were repeatedly in the vanguard of those white Protestants who worked against racial segregation. As early as the 1920s, when criticism of Jim Crow was not common, Northern-based missionaries were among Jim Crow's most vocal critics. Sherwood Eddy, no relation to the marine captain, no relation to William Eddy so far as I know, a missionary, this guy was a missionary to India and one of the most widely quoted and indefatigable of the YMCA's lecturers, who'd go around the world giving inspirational lectures about the gospel and about liberalism, this guy condemned as "pagan," that's his word, as pagan, the racial practices of the United States. He mocked white supremacy, "it makes no sense," insisted Eddy, this is an

article of 1924 in *Christian Century*, "it makes no sense to worry about the yellow peril, or the black peril, or the brown peril, when it's the white peril that has actually caused most of the world's problems." This is very radical language for the United States in 1924. By 1936, Eddy, inspired by the work of the interracial Southern tenant farmer's union, organized a cooperative farm in Arkansas, focusing on black farmers who had been evicted from their sharecropping livings and he mobilized, Eddy mobilized, a national board to sponsor it, headed by a no less a personage than Reinhold Niebuhr himself, and he put his own secretary, a former missionary from Japan, to head the thing up locally. Now this farm did pretty well economically and it existed for 20 years. It was closed in 1956 largely due to the increase of threats of vigilante violence from locals and the sheriffs explained they would not protect the farm against the locals and so they had to shut it down because the threat of violence was just too great. But the distinctness of the missionary crowd was mostly evident within the denominational organizations that dominated the white south, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, and the Baptists. The missionary boards of these denominations were again and again the institutional source of resolutions calling for an end to the racial segregation of congregations and for an end to the violence against black citizens in local communities that after all were totally dominated by members of the local Methodist church, the local Baptist church, the local Presbyterian church. These missionary boards which were usually populated by former missionaries, often combined their doctrinal objections to racism with an overwhelmingly practical consideration. News of racial discrimination and violence in Texas and Mississippi and Georgia was widely publicized in foreign lands, especially after World War II when nationalists and Communists sought to discredit the United States by publicizing the reluctance of American Protestants fully into the body of Christ the dark skinned citizens of their own communities. Now after Emmett Till's murder in 1954 and again at the time of the Little Rock Crisis of 1957, missionaries wrote back to their boards that it was virtually impossible to get any of the Nigerians and the Congolese to pay any attention at all to what they as missionaries were trying to do. Protests from the field like this increased during the 1960's. Denominational leaders almost always kept these protests under wraps. A particularly striking example in 1964 when 200 southern Presbyterian missionaries in Africa sent a petition to the national denominational leaders asking that at the very least the churches should be integrated but the petition was shelved by the adamantly segregationalist leaders of the Southern Presbyterian church.

That institution, that denomination, created in slavery days, refused to rejoin the Northern Presbyterians in a unified body until 1983, when a church official, who was the son of missionaries negotiated the reconciliation. When the United Methodist Church finally in 1968 ended its discriminatory administrative structure, which had been designed to keep black churches separate so that no white congregation or white

minister would ever have to report to a black bishop. When this was changed in 1968, it was almost entirely organized by missionary-connected Methodists.

“Foreign missions were much more central to white southern Protestants than most historians have realized,” writes Davids L. Chappell in *A Stone of Hope*, the most widely appreciated single study of the role of religion in the civil rights movement. Chappell points out that there existed within white southern Protestantism the identical dynamic that Mary Dudziak and others have identified in the Cold War State Department. Specific pressure against domestic racism was created by rivalries abroad. Dudziak and others have shown that we cannot understand the civil rights revolution without taking account of government’s, especially the state department’s, eagerness to present an attractive face to the peoples of the decolonizing world. But neither Dudziak nor any of the other scholars who have worked on this relationship seem to realize that the same thing was going on in the churches, and had been going on for a very long time.

Prior to the time that the liberal Protestant Martin Luther King Jr. developed his alliances in the 1950s, prior to that time, missionary connected men and women were among the most conspicuous among the white who defended the rights and welfare of black Americans. A prominent example is Edwin Soper who spent the first twenty years of his life in Japan as a child of missionaries and then after a distinguished career as a seminary professor and college president, spent the last two decades of his life again in east Asia as a missionary teacher in colleges in India and the Philippines. I mention Soper because his book of 1947, *Racism: A World Issue*, although cited as a landmark by Thomas Borstelmann and other scholars of anti-racism and anti-imperialism, has never, to my knowledge, been confronted in its missionary context. But Soper’s book, even more than Gallagher’s, was the culmination of liberalized missionary thinking. Not only was Soper himself prominently involved in missions, but Soper thanks, for reading the entire manuscript, no fewer than six of the nation’s leading missionary theorists and heads of missionary boards. He wrote the book, moreover, exactly during the years when he was carrying out on his Northwestern campus, a series of workshops on racism commissioned by the head of the national Methodist missionary board. *Racism: A World Issue*, is written in a spirit of great compassion and promotes impressive empathic identification with non-white peoples, but it ends with a long term historical vision, according to which, more and more of world power will eventually be in the hands of non-whites. “Should we of the West, the white man of Europe and America persist in our attitude of superiority toward the people of color and treat them with disdain as inferiors, we can only expect in due time to reap the whirlwind of retaliation and vengeance. No power in the world can prevent the colored races, the peoples of Asia and Africa from uniting because of common grievance against centuries of

domination by the white man and ending this domination by the use of the means that we have taught them so well.” Now this passage, from *Racism: A World Issue*, can serve also to turn us to a third but closely related arena in which missionary connected individuals and groups were conspicuous, which is the discourse of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism as such apart from the connection to Jim Crow in the United States that I’ve been emphasizing. Many American missionaries to China had been critical of the treaty ports even before about 1920, after which date missionaries were more consistently castigating these concessions of sovereignty along the China coast, often to the consternation of the diplomatic corps. Missionary sympathy for Indian independence grew steadily after General Dyer’s amritsar massacre of 1919 although the British empire required missionaries to promise to stay out of politics, they didn’t. Missionary support for the Congress Party was often poorly concealed. Gandhi was truly the darling of the American missionaries, often presented to Americans back home as the most Christ-like man in the world. The legendary E. Stanley Jones who I mentioned earlier in relation to the internment of Japanese Americans was periodically delayed in his reentries into India because of his close connection with Gandhi and the Congress Party. I might mention parenthetically that Jones was such a big deal in those years that during the summer of 1941, he had the brass to write to Hirohito and FDR, offering his services as a mediator. Now Jones’s Methodist contemporary, Ralph Templin, was recalled by his board in 1940 when he endangered the whole missionary project by publishing an inflammatory article in an Indian magazine demanding that the British grant full independence to India in return for the Indian support of the war against the Japanese. Missionaries routinely asked the United States to speed up the timetable for Philippine independence. One of the largest summit meetings of liberal Protestant leaders ever held in the United States, a conclave of 1942, called by the Federal Council of Churches, outlined a plan for the post war world. What would the post war world look like if informed by Christianity was what this meeting was about. And this meeting denounced imperialism and colonialism explicitly and at length, demanded the freeing of all colonial peoples from their European masters. This three day summit meeting of four hundred top Protestants was infused with missionary experience, featured the leaders of the major missionary societies and was chaired by the eminent Presbyterian layman and internationalist, John Foster Dulles. Dulles, a grandson of missionaries was, prior to his conversion to sweeping anti-communism at the end of World War II, a vigorous and loquacious critic of European colonialism, and he was an ally, believe it or not, of Vice President Henry Wallace, who, along with Dulles, was enlisted by the federal council of churches as a major speaker throughout the United States exploring and advocating world government. At another missionary saturated conference of 1945 again shared by Dulles, the body endorsed a resolution about how bad imperialism was, and it listed the Belgian Congo, Japanese occupied Korea, and Puerto Rico. Soper was not as famous as Wallace or Dulles, but he is a convenient

point of entry, not only into this anti-colonial, anti-imperialist discourse, but also into a fourth arena that I will take up very briefly. This is the debate over missions, and more specifically, the movement to critically revise the missionary project itself in directions that repudiated ethnocentrism. But the big point here, is that, missionaries in the field and the missionary boards they influenced, were the prime movers of two massive and portentous reforms in the character of the missionary project. Both of these reforms were opposed, often vehemently, by the majority of rank and file Protestants. One reform was caught in the title of another book by Soper, the one appearing in 1943, *A Philosophy of the Christian World Mission*. That book was the most cogent, elaborate, and detailed articulation of the belief that the very concept of foreign missions violated Christian universalism and should be replaced by the concept of world mission. The indigenous Christians in India and China and Japan in this view should be full and equal partners with the Americans and the Europeans in the missionary endeavor. This reform turned out to be an unintentional key step in the phasing out, of course, of the missionary project because by the 1950's and 60's, fewer people in the pews were willing to give money for a project that was no longer explicitly designed to make foreigners into copies of the good Christians in Michigan and Missouri. The second reform missionaries generated was the change from preaching to service, that is, the change in emphasis from seeking converts to seeking to implant an infrastructure of schools, hospitals, colleges, technical apparatus that would help the populations to modernize. This second reform, from preaching to service, was, like the first, grounded in a growing respect for the indigenous peoples that missionaries in the field registered increasingly. Both of these changes in the character of missions were worked out within the classic tensions of cosmopolitanism and provincialism. The missionaries and their elite supporters in the seminaries and on the mission boards struggled against rank and file Presbyterians and Methodists and so on who thought the liberal elite was turning away from the faith as once delivered to the Saints. "We did not send you to China to come back to Peoria to tell us how interesting the Chinese are."

A fifth arena to touch on briefly but also particular to Protestantism was the ecumenical movement that produced the Federal Council of Churches and then the National Council of Churches and then the World Council of Churches and called forth the ferocious opposition, the deeply anti-ecumenical National Association of Evangelicals which dominates today's news about religion and politics in the United States. The big point about the ecumenical movement in American Protestantism is that it was massively driven by missionary experience. Missionaries in the field found it a challenge to convince residents of Syria or Silan or Korea that they should become Missouri-centered Lutherans, not Wisconsin-centered Lutherans or German reformed Christians instead of Dutch reformed Christians or Northern as opposed to Southern Presbyterians. Missionaries of different denominations cooperated with one another

under the conditions of the field, and their success in the field had an enormous impact on their own denominational fellowships back home. Facing heterogeneity abroad generated a greater recognition of homogeneity at home. Were the differences between these denominations so important? Of course, said the provincials; not at all, said the cosmopolitans. All historians of Protestant ecumenism in the twentieth century, including those who think the whole ecumenical movement was a terrible mistake, suicidal for the faith, agree that the liberal missionaries were the people who most made ecumenism happen.

The sixth of the arenas I want to discuss is the development of foreign area studies in academia during the middle decades of the twentieth century where persons of missionary background played a major role in creating and leading research and teaching programs concerning the world beyond the North Atlantic West. In this domain, the de-provincializing effect of missionary connected individuals was pitted against not so much the deeply structured racism and ethnocentrism obviously present in some of the other arenas I've mentioned, but here the problem was rather a complacent indifference to the histories and cultures and languages of societies beyond Europe and the United States. That complacent indifference registered in the limited range of fields of study pursued by professors and in the relatively narrow curricula of colleges was overcome of course in the context of Cold War politics. But the resulting scholarly output and curricular transformations cannot be reduced to Cold War conceptions as David Engerman and Andrew Barshay and other historians of this academic revolution have now demonstrated, against the claims of historians still in the thrall of Cold War Positivism, according to which everything is explained by the Cold War. Missionaries and missionary children were key figures even within the small Orientalist contingent that existed in American academia prior to World War II. In regard to China, this included the missionary Samuel Wells Williams and the eventual AHA president, Kenneth Scott Latourette of Yale, Edwin T. Williams [name unconfirmed] of Berkeley, Arthur Hummel, Jr. of the Library of Congress. In 1928 when the American Council of Learned Societies established its committee on the study of the far east, now that is the parent committee to all of the area studies committees established by the ACLS and the SSRC, the vast operation in American academia for many years, this is the parent committee in 1928. Latourette was the chief guy in this and he was the spokesman and he wrote the state of the art articles on sinology in the United States for the next 20 years. The original ACLS committee included a committee of seven and it included four missionaries and two missionary children. There was almost nobody else who was part of the conversation. L. Carrington Goodrich of Columbia University was a leader of the cohort of missionary children who came into their own during and after World War II. Prominent within this cohort were other China scholars that who some of you will know about Doak Barnett, C. Martin Wilbur, others who helped in the expansion of the

Chinese studies were Lucian Pye of M.I.T., the great modernization theorist and Harriet Mills of Michigan, famous for her apparent brainwashing by the Communists in 1949 and 1950, William Lockwood of Princeton, James Claude Thompson Jr. of Harvard. Here's a list of the China scholars. Those of you who are at all familiar with the history of American sinology will understand the huge percentage of them who had this missionary connection. The most important single individual in the institutional growth of Chinese studies was, of course, John King Fairbank who was neither a missionary nor a missionary child, but whose autobiography, *Chinabound*, is forthright and detailed about how extensively his own immersion in things Chinese depended on missionaries and about how frequently in building the academic apparatus for Chinese studies he worked with persons who had missionary connections. The leadership of Japanese studies, during its early expansion, no individual looms larger in this than Edwin Reischauer, son of American missionaries to Japan, later the American ambassador to Japan, a very prominent man. Andrew Barshay has recently published a terrific article on the development of Japanese studies in 1945 which documents how Reischauer and his chief critic, E. H. Norman, these are the guys that kind of defined the terms for Japanese studies for forty years in the United States, both missionary children, even though they had completely different views about what Japanese history was really supposed to be about. Norman was accused in the McCarthy era of having been a communist and indeed he in 1953 or -4 jumped out of a hotel window in Cairo and died at that time and scholars still debate about what his politics were prior to that time. Other missionary children who played leading roles in Japanese studies I've listed here, some of you will be familiar with them. Reischauer's autobiography, *My Life Between China and Japan*, parallels Fairbank's in the frequency with which missionaries and missionary children dot the daily lives of the people who built Asian studies in the United States. Missionary connected Americans were not quite so heavily represented demographically in the scholars who did the South Asian field, but *the* central figure, W. Norman Brown of the University of Pennsylvania, was a missionary child, no less important to Indian studies than Reischauer to Japanese studies, and I've listed here some of the other missionary children who were prominent in the development of South Asian studies.

Missionary project also included leaders of Middle Eastern studies and to a lesser extent African studies and Latin American studies, but I pass over those cases to move on to yet another arena of activity, that of the State Department, the OSS, and the CIA. Now I already alluded to this arena in the cases of Service and Davies and Colonel William Eddy, and I want to emphasize now how numerous were the missionary children and even former missionaries themselves in this arena: no fewer than three ambassadors to China, three American ambassadors to China were either missionaries or missionary children and another leading case of a missionary child that became

prominent in this area is Robert Goheen, long time president of Princeton, he was the guy who brought women into Princeton, and a number of other reforms while he was president of Princeton and then he went on to be ambassador to India. Charles Cross was ambassador to Singapore. Talcott Seelye, another missionary son from Beirut served as ambassador to Tunisia and Syria. There were literally dozens who spent their careers in the State Department or the CIA, sometimes going back and forth from one to the other. But while Seelye's picture is on the screen, I want to call attention to a striking difference between the political destiny of the missionary sons in Middle Eastern affairs as opposed to the destiny of their counterparts working in the affairs of other parts of the world. The overall pattern is the same, there's a high degree of sympathy for the nationalist aspirations of indigenous peoples, there's a critical perspective on European imperialism and on American accommodations with it, but if you told your superiors in Washington that you thought that the national aspirations of the Arabs, so blatantly ignored after World War I when the British and the French divided up the Ottoman domain in their own spheres of influence, Sykes-Picot agreement and so forth, if you told your superiors in Washington that you thought Arab nationalism should be recognized and appreciated and if you said that you thought the interests of the United States would be well served by supporting Arab nationalists, you risked being called an anti-semite. The Arab nationalists were of course hostile to the Balfour Declaration and regarded British sponsorship of Jewish immigration to Palestine during the 1930's and immediately after World War II as an imperialist intervention. This brings us back to Colonel Eddy who along with Talcott Seelye and there were a number of these missionary sons from Beirut, Harold Hoskins, Arthur Close, Raymond Cose, William Stalfus, these were all missionary sons who worked in the State Department Arab Desk, and they were all accused at one time or another of being too critical of Israel.

Indeed Eddy was prominent among those who argued against the recognition of Israel in 1948, and it was his disappointment at President Truman's decision that led him to leave the CIA, of which he by then was a senior officer, and to take a new appointment with ARAMCO, the huge American oil company that partnered with the Saudi government in developing the oil industry of Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf that still exists. Eddy was indeed massively committed to the Arab peoples. When he died in 1962, he was buried according to his own instructions in a little cemetery in Beirut in which every other grave was that of an Arab.

Is it fair to call these missionary sons anti-semites? Many of them did pick up a genteel sort of suspicion of Jews that was characteristic of the highly cosmopolitan Europe-focused Arab intelligentsia in Beirut, Cairo, and Baghdad during the 1920s and 30s. This Arab intelligentsia was highly secular, and rarely partook of the crudely racist anti-semitism more common among the less educated and more religious contemporaries.

The missionary sons understood this cosmopolitan elite of Beirut and Cairo as an indicator of what the Arab future might look like. They saw the creation and American support for Israel as an obstacle to the kind of Arab nationalism they hoped to foster. I can find no signs in their writings of the American-based Henry Ford and Father Coughlin type of anti-semitism, traces of which you can find elsewhere in the state department, often said to be characteristic of Breckinridge Long or Loy Henderson.

No doubt the missionary sons from Beirut did underestimate the political imperatives of 1948. When the great missionary educator Bayard Dodge, the president of the American University of Beirut, came back from Beirut to plead with his old Princeton classmate James Forrestal, then the Secretary of Defense, pleaded with him to get Truman not to recognize Israel, Dodge seemed not to have grasped the pressures on the Truman administration. But if the missionary related Americans were slow to measure the political situations in Europe and America at the time, they were at least quick to see a parallel between the driving out of the Palestinians from their homes, some 700,000 driven out by Israeli forces in early 1948 alone, and the fate of Jews at the time of the Reichsbuerger in years before. The missionary sons and their efforts to overcome American prejudice against the Arab peoples were thus caught in a contradiction that their counterparts in other parts of the world were not. It proved difficult to be pro-Arab without being anti-Israeli.

Moving out toward my conclusion, I will pass over another arena--the arts and journalism--where novelist Buck and magazine editor Luce, mentioned earlier, are important. John Hersey, the novelist, is another missionary child. In journalism, Peggy Durbin of the New York Times, is a famous example there.

What I most want to comment on in the time remaining is the role played by my cast of characters in the vast and amorphous transnational process that we scholars try to engage through the concepts of secularization and de-Christianization. In the next few concluding minutes, then, I'll simply flag this drama of modernity and indicate how missionary connected Americans might be seen as participants in it. When I described this recently to my colleague Yuri Slezkine, he remarked that my story might be seen as an account of how Protestants joined the Jewish century. And those of you who have read this Slezkine book will understand that the kind of universalism espoused by the Jewish Bolsheviks in Slezkine's cast of characters sort of fit this story.

Be that as it may, by the 1960s, the successors of Soper and Gallagher had adopted a very inclusive vision of community. Just as the distinction between denominations became less and less important, and then the distinctions between foreign and domestic within Protestant Christianity, so too did the distinction between Protestants

and Catholics eventually diminish in the 1950s and 1960s, as finally did the distinction between Christianity and other religions diminish at the end of the 1960s in the anxious debates of that era that I don't have time here to summarize.

Now if you begin with a universalist understanding of human needs Gallagher's notion of an inclusive fraternity that I invoked at the start of this presentation, if you begin with a universalist understanding of human needs, which you believe is better met by the Presbyterians than by anyone else, then it dawns on you that what satisfies those basic needs may be less Presbyterianism as such than a Christianity that has taken form in a number of Protestant denominations in the United States and Europe, and then you come to fear that this historically particular North Atlantic answer to human needs is also too narrowly configured. So you go on to embrace the versions of Christianity developed by Catholics and by Indigenous peoples incorporating elements of various local cultures. Then you go beyond even that to suppose that the original sound universalist vision of Jesus of Nazareth is best fulfilled by a solidarity of all religious believers accepting the challenge of sorting out the authentic religions from the fraudulent. By that point in your trajectory, you have expanded your circle of the we almost all the way to the species itself.

One way to make that last step, to make the circle of the we complete, will the circle be unbroken, was to join the human rights movement. Were the secularists so bad after all? Were not some of them doing what Christians were trying to do, and why put such a fine point on it? Liberal ecumenical Protestants flocked into the human rights movement during the 1970s. The movement in the United States took off just as the missionary project folded up. The liberal Protestant missionaries in the field declined by sixty percent between the early 1960s and the late 1970s, and it's just at that time that Amnesty International and other human rights organizations increased their memberships so strikingly.

An impulse to connect with the species as a whole and to establish a moral community extending to all human beings was not the only thing that drove the ecumenical Protestant missionary project, but it was one very strong imperative within it. That imperative, that impulse eventually found missions too confining and found even Christianity, whatever its merits as a particular instantiation too narrow to accommodate a universalism that claimed empathic engagement with a great range of human cultures. One of the greatest of the China missionaries, Frank Rollinson, this is the influential editor of the *China Recorder* periodical read by virtually every Western missionary in China and all of their supporters in the West, he became more and more liberal each year that he was in China, and he was often faced with heresy accusations when he was home on furlough and very narrowly escaped being censured in that

context. In his private correspondence he was much more skeptical than in his editorials and his public writings. In his last private letters to his wife, just before he was killed in 1937 when the Japanese invaded China, he confessed to his wife that he was having difficulty not only with the missionary project but with Christianity itself.

The concept of human rights was almost perfectly suited to deal with the dilemma of these liberal Protestants, whose efforts to define the human universal through the Christian particular had proved to be ever more challenging in the face of a more genuine appreciation for diversity. The missionary project adopted a thinner and thinner conception of Christianity, while using Christianity as a container for a vision of what it meant to be human. But the project found itself riding in a vehicle, Christianity, that could not meet the demands that the ecumenical Protestants place upon it. The missionary endeavor lacked the division of labor the human rights movement offered. The liberal Protestants asked Christianity to be thin enough to serve as a stand in for a species wide “we,” and thick enough to distinguish between Christians and non-Christians.

The human rights movement promised relief from this tension. The movement frankly offered humanity itself as the ideological frame. The Christian/non-Christian line did not have an analog in the human rights movement except perhaps in relation to the animal rights movement. It was the species, not the community of faith, that had become the frankly acknowledged, theoretically vindicated solidarity. The human rights movement represented for the Protestant tradition the secularization at long last of the universalism of Galatians: 3:28 and of the second chapter of Acts when all the diverse tribes endowed with tongues of fire heard each other as if speaking in their own languages. So the liberal ecumenical missionary Protestant project transformed itself virtually out of existence as it tried to use Christianity as the answer to the question of what a species-wide solidarity should look like.

In the meantime, American foreign missions were continued with a vengeance by Protestants who were not liberals and who feared liberalism as a slippery slope to secularism. There are more American Protestant missionaries abroad today than at any time in history. But they're different. They did not go to Princeton and Oberlin and Yale and Holyoke, they went to Wheaton and Biola and Pepperdine and Baylor. These conservatives remain convinced that the versions of Christianity rejected by the liberals as too narrow were quite good enough for the world. The conservative denominations are proud of having avoided the liberal drift toward generality, and they claim more and more of American Protestantism as their own. Just as the Evangelical megachurches flourish now while the vassal sanctuaries build by the Methodists and the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists are rarely full, so have these conservatives continued to

heed the Macedonian call, Acts 16:9 “come over to Macedonia and help us,” just translated into the African call and the Chinese call and so forth. They translated it, so the liberals translate that into secular terms, but the folks who left those big downtown churches did not just disappear. They and their children and grandchildren are formidable parts of the life of the United States today as I’ve insisted in this book *After Cloven Tongues of Fire*, visible in sites other than the church.

And when it comes to success and failure in dealing with the challenge of foreign missions, one could argue that the liberal Protestants succeeded in critically engaging at least some of the contradictions of the missionary endeavor that their Evangelical successors have been slow to confront. The liberal Protestants of the mid-century decades subjected themselves to a self-interrogation that their Evangelical rivals have scarcely begun. And one of the most fascinating questions in the study of American religion today is just what will happen to the Evangelicals in this global context. Will they follow the path of the liberal Protestants or not?

The scholarship on the history of American religion, which is the larger context in which the history of Protestant missions is usually written, is much affected by a Christian survivalist bias that focuses on how a given initiative or behavior has advanced or retarded the fortunes of Christianity itself. But if we emancipate ourselves with a preoccupation of what is good for Christianity, the picture can look quite different. Ecumenical Protestantism in the United States during the first two-thirds of the twentieth century can be seen as a means by which many persons of Protestant origin negotiated challenges that they, given their social circumstances, were simply not prepared to confront in a secular context. It was and of course remains a mechanism by which a lot of people got from one place to another, including in some cases to a post-Protestant orientation. The idea of liberal Ecumenical Protestantism as a halfway house, as a stepping stone to modernity, even as a slippery slope out of Christianity is problematic only if one looks at the twentieth century as a Christian survivalist. But this gets me into the terrain of my Wednesday lecture and the very last word today should go to Gallagher, one of the Protestants who tried his hardest to discover his duty in a multitudinous world and to act upon it and who was among the most severe in challenging his fellow Protestants to confront the capacious diversity of the human species. Insofar as Gallagher is remembered at all today, it is for his role as an academic administrator in the crisis over open admissions at the City College of New York in 1969. By then, Gallagher had long since departed from Berkeley and was serving as the president of CCNY, and here he is at one of the commencements with Martin Luther King, a post he resigned, Gallagher resigns as president of CCNY in 1969 amid disputes with his board of trustees who found him too sympathetic with the largely African American and Puerto Rican demonstrators who were pushing for more radical

transformations of CCNY's structure and functions. But Gallagher should have a place in history for his steadfast advocacy of open admissions and for having been crushed by the conflict over its specific dimensions and implementation, and indeed he was destroyed by that episode. It is appropriate for a man who produced and [unclear] one of the toughest and most searching antiracist treatises written by any white American at any time in American history prior to the 1960's. Yes there was John Birch, yes there was Henry Luce, but so too was there Buell Gallagher. It's too bad he didn't live to see a black man elected as president because he would have understood what it meant. Now that concludes my remarks, and I'll respond as best I can if anybody wants to ask a question or say anything.