Historical studies have made of missionaries a false dichotomy: the academy has portrayed them as the vanguard of imperialism, and Christians have lionized them as the grandest heroes of the faith. This paper will examine the motivations of an early 19th century American missionary, Adoniram Judson, in the attempt to show that, while traces of cultural imperialism and Christian heroism were present, most motivation came from a melding of Christian and American doctrines as his political, cultural and theological contexts combined to emphasize specific Biblical concepts: the universality of God’s love, the inerrancy and necessity of Scripture, and the Great Commission. By contextualizing one missionary’s experiences, perhaps we can understand him—and missionaries generally—in a more human light.

In the first decades of the nineteenth century, American missionaries gathered around the words of this hymn and others like it. The lyrics suggest at the same time devotion and militancy, “noble goals” and “manifest destiny.” It has been along these two tracks that most historians have analyzed missionary efforts, in the process either canonizing or demonizing the men and women who went out to spread the gospel. But the hymn itself does not distinguish between the motivations. There is one goal: “The thunder of thy praise to roll.” How then should we approach the question of missionary motivation? Were they

good people serving their God, or were they the vanguards of imperialism? This paper will seek a more nuanced answer through an examination of the first U.S. missionary, Adoniram Judson. Judson went as a missionary to Burma in 1812 and serves as a case study of early 1800’s missionaries. While Judson and his contemporaries testified primarily to going for the sake of Jesus and his Gospel, there were also hints of the extra-Biblical ideal of civilization. Yet beyond these two extremes, most motivation came from a melding of Christian and American doctrines, as missionaries’ political, cultural and theological contexts combined to emphasize specific Biblical concepts: the universality of God’s love, the inerrancy and necessity of Scripture, and the Great Commission.

For the missionaries themselves, the dominant and even all-consuming motivation was to obey and glorify Jesus Christ. They desired to please God, answer the call of duty, and share in Christ’s affliction. Judson testified to this in a letter to his betrothed, Ann Hasseltine, in 1810: “I have some hope that I shall be enabled to keep this in mind, in whatever I do—Is it pleasing to God?” This goal developed into a strong sense of dutiful obedience, especially in light of eternity. One scholar notes that the belief in an eternal destiny in heaven or hell for each soul, and their responsibility in that destiny was “overpowering.” Judson admitted to a year-long growing “deep conviction” that is was his duty “personally to engage in this service.” To fulfill this responsibility, Judson and his fellow missionaries had to sacrifice comfort and home. “Packing their belongings in a coffin” was not just a turn of phrase. A contemporary hymn described the missionary life as an “arduous track... through regions dark as death.” A particularly poignant example comes from a letter from Judson to the father of Ann, asking for his blessing on their marriage:

I have now to ask whether you can consent to part with your daughter..., to see her no more in this world? Whether you can consent to her departure to a heathen land, and her subjection to the hardships and sufferings of a missionary life?... Can you consent to all this, for the sake of Him who left His heavenly home and died for her and for you; for the sake of perishing, immortal souls; for the sake of Zion and the glory of God? And in another letter to Ann he wrote “O, we shall wish to lie down and die. And that time may soon come.” For Ann, these words turned prophetic in 1826 when a fever took her life at the age of 37. The commitment of missionaries to suffer and even die for their Lord was certainly admirable.

While Christian service was first on their minds, missionaries brought with them more than the Gospel, and one cannot ignore the civilizing undercurrents of American missions. The most prevalent examples are those references to “bar’brous” nations and “heathens.” Of course, as John Worst has noted, these terms must be understood in their own context, as they served primarily to stir pity in the missionary heart. Regardless of purpose, the ubiquity of this vocabulary underscores a perceived need to civilize—albeit through the gospel. Reverend Leonard Woods touched on this idea during his sermon at the commissioning of Judson in 1812 in Salem. In speaking of the reasons for missionary endeavor, he noted several challenges of the mission field, speaking of “how difficult it is to instruct even a small number of heathens, and to guard them from apostasy, when they become proselytes; how difficult to civilize savages.” Yet fearing these hardships, he told his listeners, would “dishonor” God, whose
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power knew no limits. Although well-intentioned, such conversation created a gap between missionary and “savage.” Persecution of missionaries on the field only heightened the sense of pagan cultural inferiority.

With this cultural mindset, it might be supposed that American missionaries would want to establish American, or at least Western, styles of education or government. Yet if Judson's ministry gives any indication, civilizing was a by-product—not a motivation—of American missionaries. Judson focused exclusively on the Bible. “Judson did not believe that Christianity should follow in the wake of civilization. He did not propose to spend his time in teaching the arts and sciences of the Western world… He had his schools, indeed, but they were quite subordinate to the work of preaching the Gospel.”

Civilizing, then, was not a part of Judson’s personal goal; nevertheless, even Judson could not be free of the westernizing effects of his ministry. Even if classes were subordinate to the work of the gospel, these schools nevertheless came. Such education was an inevitable partner to mission activity.

Judson, then, manifested in himself those dichotomized tracks of missionary activity: a tendency to civilize and a desire to serve God. Missionaries like Judson were simultaneously civilizers and evangelists. Thus Judson shows that the common dichotomy breaks down. But if these two different motivations coexisted, how did they influence each other? Where did imperialist and saint, American and apostle, meet? For Judson and his fellow missionaries, their desire to please God was always at the fore, and one scholar has noted that Judson's biography gives little indication of motivation beside “the romantic spirit of the movement and…the persistent evangelical belief in a divinely inspired Bible.” Missionaries were men and women heeding God’s call on their life through scripture. Granted, but they were also people “whose bodies occupied space in the world, whose activities were influenced by the civil order, and who came to care greatly about the secondary effects.” Therefore, one can expect to find a correlation between American missionaries’ political-cultural context and their sources of motivation in the Bible. Three Biblical themes in particular give evidence of this. Specifically, the universality of God’s love lined up with democratic ideals, the infallibility of Scripture went along with the rise of individual choice (which in turn created denominational motivation), and the Great Commission with expansion.

The early missionaries went in part out of the motivation that God’s love extended to all people, a doctrine that coincided with the ideal of American democracy and the new theology of Arminianism. The idea of God’s universal love can be seen in Reverend Woods’s sermon. He noted that “Jesus tasted death for every man” and “[t]his great atonement is as sufficient for Asians and Africans, as for us.” So Christ’s blood applied to all, and his teachings did as well. “The doctrines of Christianity are applicable to all men; because all have the same nature, and stand in the same relation to God and to one another.” Woods thus compelled Judson to go in part because of a common humanity in the eyes of God.

This idea had Biblical grounding. At a basic level, humans are made equal by a shared propensity to sin: “For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God.” However, it received special emphasis from Americans due to its democratic ideal. All deserved God’s love just as “all men were created equal.” The American and Enlightenment philosophy
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of democracy was supplemented by theological trends, with the broader acceptance of Arminianism during the Second Great Awakening. These new doctrines challenged the Reformed notion of election and predestination. By giving all people the power to choose or reject God, and by emphasizing that Christ's death was not only for his elect, the new theology went along with and reinforced a democratic view of the world. By extension it also underscored the missionaries' responsibility. Yes, God's love was for all, but now all humans had an equal opportunity to respond to His love, and missionaries needed to present them with such an opportunity. In this way an American theological development combined with deeper political philosophy to give weight to biblical ideals.

Missionaries went to spread God's love, and they pursued this goal through their confidence in the all-importance and infallibility of scripture. Scripture, of course, testifies to its own value, and Jesus himself said: “Heaven and Earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away.” The focus on God's written word can also be traced back to Martin Luther and John Calvin. Luther especially emphasized the authority of scripture in the face of Catholic doctrine. But neither Luther nor Calvin used the doctrine of sola scriptura to upend all notions of church authority. Calvin said, “I acknowledge that Scripture is a most rich and inexhaustible fountain of all wisdom; but I deny that its fertility consists in the various meaning which any man, at his pleasure, may assign.” Later, the American Jonathan Edwards echoed this perspective, arguing that approaching the scriptures without guidance could lead to self-deception.

In American circles sola scriptura took on new importance. John W. Nevin in 1848 remarked that the most notable aspect of American Christianity was its “exclusively Biblical form.” Judson himself lived a life that bore testimony to a supreme confidence in the inerrancy of Scripture. Wrestling with the decision to commit his life to missions, he one day felt impressed by the simple verse: “Go into the world and preach the gospel to every creature,” and with firm belief in the Word of God, committed himself to go. It was not only Judson who revered the Bible, as a contemporary verse also cried out: “Hail! Precious book divine.” But Nevin also noticed that this phenomenon had its roots in the particularly American notions of individualism and democracy, as “private judgment” superseded church history and authority.

Thus sola scriptura did not stand in isolation but correlated with an American ideal of individual freedom. One scholar points out that from 1780 to 1820, people became convinced of popular sovereignty which challenged existing systems of authority. To properly understand the significance of the rise of popular sovereignty, it is necessary to take a brief detour into the political context of the early nineteenth century and particularly the rise of Jacksonian democracy.

1812, the year Judson departed for the mission field, also saw the outbreak of war between Great Britain and the United States. The War of 1812, and in particular the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, thrust the young Andrew Jackson into the national limelight. The rise of Jackson during this period saw also the rise of Jacksonian Democracy and, what is significant for our purposes, a new belief in popular sovereignty. These trends culminated in the presidential elections of 1824 and 1828.

The election of 1824 pitted John Quincy Adams against Andrew Jackson. The close electoral results
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necessitated a Congressional ruling, in which Speaker of the House Henry Clay decided to support Adams even though Jackson had won the popular vote. Clay said that Adams was better for the nation, and so he was willing to “expose himself...for the good of the country” by backing him. His reasoning thus harkened back to the Hamiltonian vision of the ideal statesman, namely, a politician who would put the people’s good over his own popularity.

The response to this decision evidenced how much the nation had shifted from Hamilton’s ideal. The Washington Gazette published a scathing article, denouncing Hamilton for putting himself over the sovereign people and in the process grievously offending “the fundamental principle of our government.” When Jackson was finally elected in 1828, he echoed this belief in his first inaugural address. He claimed that “the first principle of our system [is] that the majority is to govern.” This put an official stamp on the rising tide of popular sovereignty and democratization.

These ideas that the will of the people had absolute power and “that the majority is to govern” were not in fact the “first” or “fundamental” principles in the nation’s founding. On the contrary, the Federalist Papers and the Constitution itself gave evidence to a different perspective. The Founding Fathers believed that the people of course must rule, but through the filter of free-acting public agents. For they were skeptical of human nature, and feared the outcome when human fancy held absolute sway. James Madison argued that “[n]o man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause, because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his integrity. With equal, nay with greater reason, a body of men are unfit to be both judges and parties at the same time.” Thus the constitution set up safeguards between popular will and public policy, notably in Article V with the electoral college and an amendment process that required the approval of three fourths of the states.

The events surrounding the elections of 1824 and 1828 thus show that a dramatic shift had taken place in the national view of public servants. Politicians should not act on their own, but should serve as the channel through which popular opinion flowed. This change revealed also an important change in opinion on human nature. If popular opinion was the highest political good, it followed that the people forming that opinion were also fundamentally good. This idea formed the basis of Jacksonian democracy, and was a significant change from the founding ideals. This is the point at which politics intersected with culture and theology to influence the broader national context, as these new positive opinions of human nature also appeared in the theological doctrines of Arminianism and relaxed Calvinism. Together, the ideal of popular sovereignty and positive human nature worked to establish American individualism. The people had power, and the people were good: these ideas placed ultimate authority—and moral authority no less—in the individual.

Here is where the implications of popular sovereignty for missionary motivations can be seen, for the belief in individualism extended also to undermine the authority of Church doctrine. Now the only way to discover God’s truth was through individual immersion in and interpretation of the Bible. An extreme example was John Humphrey Noyes, whose private excursions into the Bible prompted him to found Bible Communism and the Oneida Community. Confidence in personal choice found support in the growth of Arminianism, which emphasized free will and personal responsibility.

On the mission field, individualism combined with biblical inerrancy to create two primary motivations: biblical translation and the spreading of denominations. Translation of course took great
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significance, since the path to truth was through an individual's personal encounter with God's word. Judson's highest honor was as “the translator of the whole Bible for the millions of Burmah,” as one contemporary put it. And the Baptist church in his hometown bears the epitaph: “Malden his birthplace. The ocean, his sepulcher. Converted Burmans, and the Burman Bible, His monument.”43 Thus throughout his career Judson constantly returned to the great labor of translation, completing the New Testament in 1823 and the Old Testament in 1834, together with revisions in 1829, 1835, 1840.44

In addition to translation, the authority of the individual worked together with the authority of scripture to create a second motivation for American missionaries: spreading a denomination. Denominations assumed increasing importance because individual interpretations created many differences of opinion, and each of these personal doctrines carried the weight of God's inerrant Word. One scholar notes: “It was in the context of their faith in Biblical infallibility that evangelical[s]... argued over...which denomination was apostolically pure.”46 Judson's story provides a good example of the importance of denomination to missionaries of the period. Sent out as a Congregationalist, he acquainted himself on the voyage with Baptist teaching in order to properly explain the difference between Congregationalist and Baptist doctrine to the “natives.”47 So it was important not only to share Christianity, but Congregationalism as well.

In the process of investigating the Baptists he became convinced—through long hours of meditation—that they “had the Bible on their side,” and consequently joined them.48 This was a momentous decision in that it cut emotional and financial ties with friends and family in America. Ann expressed the weight of their denominational change in a letter to her parents: “It was extremely trying to reflect on the consequences.... We know it would wound and grieve our dear Christian friends in America.... We thought it probable the commissioners would refuse to support us.”49 Indeed, Judson did have to break ties with his supporters in the American Board while simultaneously putting out requests for a Baptist Society to be formed to support Baptist missionaries.50 Yet because of their belief in the authority of their Biblical interpretation, the Judson’s were willing to make the sacrifice. It can be seen that Biblical infallibility and personal interpretation played a large role in the Judson missionary endeavor. As a result, they were not sharing a pure gospel, but one denomination’s gospel in particular. It should be noted here that Judson’s shift to the Baptist denomination separated him somewhat from the individualizing and democratizing influences of Arminianism that prevailed in the Congregationalist Church.51 This did not remove him, however, from the overall political-cultural climate.

Yet cutting across denominational divides was the primary impetus of the Great Commission. Joan Brumberg writes that “Evangelicals, regardless of denominational affiliation, shaped their personal and organizational lives according to Scripture, and specifically [the Great Commission].”52 It was for Judson the deciding factor in his becoming a missionary at all.53 The Great Commission had of course existed throughout Church history, but it gained increased influence over American Christians thanks to broader societal ideas of expansion.

The notion of expansion had as its foundation a confidence that America was God’s chosen nation. The practice of interpreting America as the
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typological fulfillment of Biblical passages can be traced back to the Puritan Governor John Winthrop, who referred to their new colony as a “City on a Hill.” Ministers built off this precedent, preaching “as if the stories of Scripture were being repeated… in the unfolding life of the United States.” For example, twenty different sermons mourned the death of George Washington in 1799 with David’s lament for Abner in 2 Samuel 3:28. Or again, another sermon used the Daniel 5:27 story of the writing on the wall at the feast of Belshazzar as a metaphor for God’s judgment against Great Britain. This framework spread to popular culture. Herman Melville stated, “We Americans are the peculiar, chosen people—the Israel of our time; we bear the ark of the liberties of the world.”

American Christians furthered the typological relationship between the United States and Israel by focusing their attention on the Old Testament. Mark Noll writes, “Well into the national period, the public Bible of the United States was for all intents the Old Testament.” He traces this theme from Washington to Lincoln, noting that at Washington’s death in 1799, 113 of 120 published passages came from the Old Testament. And even though the pattern had somewhat receded at the time of Lincoln’s death in 1865, still seventy percent of the texts were from the Old Testament. Judson himself deviated from this pattern and relied in large part on the New Testament, which is to be expected given the gospel-oriented goal of conversion. His translation efforts thus started with the New Testament. Nevertheless, the focus on the Old Testament correlates with typological understandings of America which in turn bolstered the American—and American missionary—focus on expansion.

This broader cultural trend was accompanied by the enabling theology of the Second Great Awakening. In particular, the new Arminian doctrines of free will and responsibility highlighted human agency in partnering with God. As Marty writes, “Such a theology… provided a large role for human participation in the divine plan.” Bolstering this theology was the post-millennialism of Charles Finney. No longer would Christ’s second coming begin the thousand years of his kingdom rule on earth. Rather, human action—through the Holy Spirit—could realize that kingdom, with Christ’s return as a climax. The knowledge that they could bring about the Second Coming of Christ gave American Christians a new sense of optimism. Judson and some of his friends expressed this hopeful confidence in their famous Haystack dictum: “We can do it if we will.” One feels a similar sense of agency in a letter Judson wrote to Ann Hasseltine, “The future is in our power. Let us, then, each morning, resolve to send the day into eternity in such a garb as we shall wish it to wear forever.”

With confidence in America’s position as a new Israel and inspired by a theology of action, American Christians considered it their duty to expand, and this gave increased emphasis to the Great Commission. Lyman Beecher claimed that of all the nations, America was the best situated “for the free and unembarrassed” evangelization of the world. Many Christians expressed the philosophy of expansion by bringing up war or conquest imagery. A contemporary verse prayed, “Nor let [scripture’s] conquests stay till earth exult to own its sway.” A hymn put it this way: “He who has called you to the war will recompense your pains; before Messiah’s conq’ring car, mountains shall sink to plains.”
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Judson himself was compared by his son and biographer to a soldier who had “made up his mind to the sufferings and privations…in store for him.”

The mission field was a battle field that needed to be conquered, and American missionaries were “the new heroes of kingdom and empire.”

Early American missionaries like Adoniram Judson thus desired above all to spread the gospel, but they—like all people—lived in a broader cultural, theological and political context. Because of American ideals of democracy, individualism, and expansion, they focused on particular biblical themes. Of course, some of these cultural inputs were helpful and others problematic. For instance, the focus on expansion helped inspire missionaries to obey the Great Commission, but it also gave a false sense of superiority through American exceptionalism. Like the missionaries themselves, motivations can not be placed into simple categories of good and evil. However, by placing missionaries and their motivations in a historical context, one can gain greater understanding of the very human complexity of their work. In this way we can perhaps liberate missionaries from the de-humanizing tropes into which the academy has placed them. They were neither devils nor saints, but real people, placed in history, who tried to honor God with the lives He had given them.
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