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In March 1917 Rev. George A. Simons, an American Methodist who had lived in the capital of Russia for almost ten years, witnessed what he considered ‘one of the greatest wonders in the history of the world’. Describing the overthrow of the ancient Romanov autocracy to Methodist mission leaders in New York, Simons exulted, ‘The dear, long-suffering Russian people and also patient Finland have finally become free!’ Anticipating that the miraculous removal of the obstructive tsarist government would clear the way for ambitious missionary work, Simons predicted, ‘Surely Christ’s Kingdom can and will now begin a new and bright era in Russia and Finland.’

Over the following year and a half Simons’ faith in the ‘glorious future’ of ‘this second largest Christian democracy in the world’ was sorely tested by the increasing radicalism of revolutionary forces. Already in July 1917, after ‘a nerve-racking reign of terror’ prevailed in Petrograd for a few days, Simons had ‘a rather serious nervous breakdown’. Although he recovered and persevered in Russia, following the Bolshevik seizure of power he grew more and more exasperated by the way the majority of Russians, who ‘believe in a government of, by and for the people’, apathetically waited for the time when ‘the hoi poloi [sic] would waken out of this terrible nightmare!’ Finally, in August 1918, as American and Allied troops moved to intervene at Arkhangelsk and Vladivostok, Simons cabled the Methodist missionary board:

POOR BLEEDING RUSSIA HAS ALREADY SUFFERED ENOUGH UNTOLD AGONY UNDER TERRORISM OF RABID SOCIALISM. MAY FUTURE REUNITED RUSSIA BE CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY LIKE AMERICA ... ASSURE WASHINGTON OUR OPINION HEART OF RUSSIAN NATION BEATS WARMLY FOR AMERICA.

How did an American missionary come to be in a position to hail the collapse of autocracy and endure the turmoil of revolution in Russia? Out of all the possible mission fields in the world, why did Simons and other Americans attach great importance to evangelistic campaigns in Russia, especially given the intense opposition from Orthodox priests and persecution by tsarist police? How did American mission-
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aries think about the relationship between their evangelism and the political and economic transformation of Russia? Was Simons’ hope that Russia would become a ‘Christian democracy like America’ unusual or typical of American religious leaders in the last decades of tsarist rule?

In addressing those questions, this essay seeks to contribute to a broader understanding of American missions to tsarist Russia, which previous scholars have treated primarily as episodes in the histories of specific denominations. Drawing particularly on the archival and printed records of three of the most active groups – the Adventists, Baptists and Methodists – this article focuses less on telling the stories of those denominations’ activities than on illuminating their missionaries’ basic assumptions about Russia and their views of her future. While discussing the missionaries’ dreams and disappointments in the pre-Soviet era, this essay also seeks to build a foundation for comparisons with the post-Soviet era, when many more evangelists have flocked to Russia and Western observers have once again been concerned with whether Russia can become a Christian democracy.

Early American Missions to Russia (1886–1905)

In the summer of 1886 – the year the journalist George Kennan completed his epochal investigation of the Siberian exile system – Ludwig Richard Conradi, a Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) missionary from the Great Plains region, made his first visit to Russia and soon found himself in prison, gloomily facing the prospect of being ‘sent to Siberia’ and ‘committed to a lifetime of slavery in the mines’. In an account published after his release Conradi admitted that he had deceptively described himself as a printer in order to enter Russia and that he had spoken in southern Russia ‘on the Sabbath question’, which immediately ‘excited opposition’ and provoked someone to smash the windows of the room where he preached his next sermon. However, in appealing for rescue from his prison cell Conradi protested his innocence, claiming that he had not sought to convert any adherents of the Orthodox faith, insisting that he ‘never spoke a word against any church or attacked any doctrine’, and pointing to the charge of ‘teaching the Jewish heresy’ as evidence of a misunderstanding of Adventist views. Although the American consul at Odessa scolded Conradi for bringing himself ‘in conflict with the Russian authorities on a question of religion’, about which they were ‘very sensitive’, the American minister at St Petersburg intervened on Conradi’s behalf, in part by explaining that he was a Christian, not a Jew. After 40 days in prison that showed Conradi how far he was ‘as yet from what the Apostles were or the early Christians’, he was freed in September.

Despite the ordeal that made ‘the experience of Peter and Paul seem so real’ to him, Conradi did not immediately return to the United States. Instead, he decided to ‘visit some of the German colonies in Eastern Russia’ in order to preach to relatives of the immigrants among whom he had laboured in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa and the Dakotas. Although Lutheran ministers in the Volga region opposed and stopped the Adventist meetings they did not diminish Conradi’s enthusiasm and determination. ‘The Russian Mission has been opened’, Conradi triumphantly announced upon the completion of his journey. ‘Dangers and difficulties are still in the way’, he continued. ‘Imprisonment and persecution threaten the labourer. The preacher is not at liberty to present the message. But as it is God’s cause, who can hinder? As little as men could prevent the spread of the gospel in its earlier stages, or stay the progress of the Reformation, so little can this truth be held.’
Conradi was not the first American missionary to work in Russia: as early as the 1860s Methodist F. W. Flocken had ministered to Russians in the Danube delta before opposition and persecution forced him to flee. However, Conradi appears to have been the first to make a long-term commitment to evangelism in Russia, and his dedicated efforts contributed significantly to the growth of Adventism in Russia between 1886 and 1905, years when converting members of the Orthodox faith remained illegal. It is therefore appropriate to begin discussion of the origins of American missionary interest in Russia with an examination of Conradi’s experiences and views.

As Conradi’s visit to German colonists in southeastern Russia suggests, the migration of German-speaking farmers from Russia to the Great Plains was a crucial precipitant of Adventist missionary work in the Russian Empire. After learning about Adventism in America some of the immigrants sent SDA publications to their relatives while others returned to Russia and began spreading the Adventist message there. As a result, Conradi recalled, ‘Soon the Macedonian cry was raised, “Come over and help us”. It was in answer to this call that I decided to visit Russia.’

For Conradi, as for many subsequent evangelists, Russia’s enormous territory and population were crucial inducements. ‘The Russian empire is the largest in the world’, Conradi pointedly observed at the outset of his account of his first visit. ‘As the last message of warning is to go to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, we would certainly expect it to be proclaimed among the millions of inhabitants of this great empire.’ The sheer size of ‘this immense field’ created a sort of economy of scale. ‘I know no field where I might have accomplished the same amount of good in the same time’, Conradi explained in 1890, pleased that in four years the Adventist flock had grown so that ‘now instead of forty we have over four hundred Sabbath-keepers …’

Emphasis on the tremendous scope of missionary opportunities in Russia would remain a hallmark of religious perspectives in the following decades. In 1908, for example, the secretary of the SDA European Division declared that Russia was ‘our largest field in the world’, while a leader of the Foreign Mission Board of North America spotlighted the fact that the Russian Empire contained ‘one-eleventh of the world’s population’. The next year an article in The Missionary Review of the World, a key interdenominational monthly, stressed that Siberia was ‘an enormous field for Christian activity ripe for harvest’. And in 1910 a Baptist leader who visited Russia reported that it was ‘one of the greatest mission fields of the world’, while Conradi clarified that ‘not only the vastness of the territory appeals to us, but also the immense population, of over 150,000,000, which increases faster by natural growth than the United States by all its immigration.’

Beyond the staggering number of Russians and their rate of reproduction, at least five additional features of Russia attracted special interest. First, Americans tended to think that since most Russians had been superficially Christianised they were already partially prepared to receive the Gospel, while at the same time many were alienated from the Orthodox Church, whose regular services were held in allegedly incomprehensible Slavonic. Second, the vast expanse of the tsar’s domain, combined with the limits of Orthodox missionary work, signalled to American evangelists that much Russian territory was ‘virgin soil’, where few, if any, had ever heard a Gospel sermon. Third, for some missionary leaders, such as the Baptist firebrand William (Wilhelm) Fetler, race greatly enhanced the significance of the quantity of Russians. ‘Russia is bound to become the first nation in Europe for Baptist work’, the Russian-born, British-educated Fetler declared at a conference in the United States in 1911,
'because there has never been a nation of white people of such a population, of such numbers, in such a wide area, as the Russian nation.' Fourth, biblical prophecies sharply intensified the fascination of Russia, particularly for Adventists. Citing Ezekiel 38–39 and Daniel 11, prominent Adventists argued that God had proclaimed his opposition to the tsar (‘Gog’) and that Russia was destined to ‘play an important part in the closing work of this world’s history’, specifically by expelling Turkey from Europe. Finally, many others were convinced of Russia’s future importance by geopolitical considerations. Thus John R. Mott, a leader of the Student Volunteer Movement and Young Men’s Christian Association, agreed with former president Theodore Roosevelt that no country held the fate of the coming years more than Russia, since it was ‘located in the belt of power’ and on the frontier between East and West.

The Doors Open: American Missions to Russia from the 1905 Revolution to the Great War

While some denominations showed substantial interest in Russia even in decades when proselytising the Orthodox faithful was prohibited, a dramatic increase in missionary activity was triggered by the tsarist government’s movement after 1903 toward allowing greater religious freedom and by the revolution of 1905. Together, those developments suggested to many American religious leaders that the Orthodox Church was losing its stranglehold upon millions of Russians and that the gates to the great empire were swinging open. As the Presbyterian editor of The Missionary Review of the World commented, the ukaz of 1903 ‘aroused considerable interest in the religious make-up of that nation’, and the promises of freedom in 1905, including the edict on religious toleration in April, seemed ‘great with possibilities for the progress of civilization and Christian truth in Russia’. After journeying through Russia in the autumn of 1905 Conradi glowingly reported that ‘we never enjoyed greater liberty’ and that ‘the field is opening before us as never before’. Thanks to the tsar’s decrees the Adventists finally felt it safe openly to extend their efforts beyond German colonies and to organise ‘the native Russian work’ better. Two years later N. J. Rosen, superintendent of the Methodist mission in Vyborg, enthusiastically described how the ‘national awakening’ in Finland had ‘opened the doors’ and facilitated Methodism’s eastward march. ‘The great masses begin to shake off the fetters of the state church and to ask for spiritual life and freedom. For the Methodist Episcopal Church this is of very great importance.’

Soon after Nicholas II issued the edict on religious toleration Bishop William Burt, director of Methodist missions in Europe, arranged an additional allocation of funds for Russia and encouraged Dr George A. Simons (1874–1952) to take charge of that formerly languishing field. Simons, who briefly worked as a bank clerk before following his father into the ministry, hesitated to go to turbulent Russia. However, upon arriving in St Petersburg in autumn 1907 he was exhilarated by ‘the wonderful opportunity our Church has in this great territory’. Within a year Simons confidently concluded that ‘The old Russia is practically a thing of the past’ and that ‘The Greek Orthodox Church has lost her grip upon the people.’ As he explained to the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions, ‘The Russo Greek Church does not preach. Hers is a religion of male singing, ritual and image-worship. Like other branches of paganized Christianity, she offers a stone to those who are hungering for the Bread of Life.’ In the wake of the edict on religious toleration, Simons continued, ‘large numbers are drifting away from this pagan institution into agnosticism and licen-
tiousness. Now is the time to go to them with a gospel of life, light, liberty and truth." Simons remained fervent through the following years. In 1909 a Russian magazine he launched reported 'many conversions' to Methodism and announced: 'Many Europeans have the conviction that the next great religious awakening is to come about in Russia.' In 1911, when Simons grandiloquently claimed to be 'the only missionary from America in the whole Empire of Russia', he boasted that 'our growth and development have been remarkable' and demanded more aggressive investment by the Methodist missionary board.

Like Simons, missionaries from other denominations bubbled with enthusiasm and optimism in the years between the Revolution of 1905 and the First World War. Noting increases in the membership of Baptist churches, The Missionary Review of the World concluded in 1910 that 'The Baptist situation in Russia ... must be pronounced most hopeful and encouraging.' While Baptist leaders were delighted by the great 'movement throughout the Russian Empire toward evangelical Christianity' they were especially excited by reports that 'in some parts of the south' the Free Baptists had 'swept the country'. In the same spirit, Adventist pastor J. T. Boettcher assured SDA leaders that he and his wife were glad to be in Riga 'where such great opportunities offer themselves to the cause of God' that the cause forged ahead even though the country was under martial law. Adventist membership jumped from just over 2000 in 1905 to nearly 5000 in 1912, when Conradi expressed satisfaction with the increase and asserted that 'the prospects for future growth were never brighter ...' Although The Missionary Review of the World ignored the Adventists (focusing instead on Baptist and Methodist work in Russia), it agreed that 'no nation in Europe ... presents greater opportunity for Christian development ...'

Missionary Views of Globalisation and the Modernisation of Russia

While missionaries often trumpeted their victories in the competition to convert Russians, that frantic contest did not prevent them from observing how missions were part of the broader phenomenon of globalisation and reflecting upon connections between the spiritual liberation, political emancipation and economic development of Russia. Adventists, for example, remarked how the evangelisation of Russia wonderfully benefitted from the way the peoples of the world were being connected more and more closely. Massive immigration to the United States was one part of the process. 'God drew the races of the Earth to one country', an Adventist writer commented, 'in order to reach them with the last glorious message', which some would then take 'back to their fellow countrymen'. A second divine method for accelerating the evangelisation of the globe, SDA secretary W. A. Spicer declared, was the amazing revolution in transport, with the sudden invention of 'the steamship, the railway, the application of steam and electricity to locomotion, production, and communication'.

God's hand could be seen not only behind the waves of immigration and technological innovation but also over the thrones of monarchs. Much as in 1898 the stunning American defeat of decadent Spain had shown 'how God deals with a cruel and despotic power', the 'lawlessness and terror' in Russia following her defeat by Japan demonstrated 'how God's judgments are visited upon the nation that overrides and subverts the principles of religious and civil freedom'. Although Adventists passed resolutions of thanks to the tsar for the degree of freedom he granted in 1905, they tended to believe that their evangelism would contribute to the political liberation of his realm, much as the extension of the Protestant Reformation to the Baltic region in
the sixteenth century had ‘brought with it freedom, enlightenment, and education …’37 Commenting on the seemingly foreordained ‘Doom of Despotism’ The Missionary Review of the World editorialised in 1908 that ‘Reforms in Russia, Turkey and Persia practically bring all the nations under modern methods of government’ (though because of backsliding since 1905 ‘the least success is in Russia’).38

If religious writers sometimes doubted Russia’s progress toward democracy and feared that Russia’s ignorant peasants were ‘utterly unfit for universal suffrage’39 they tended to be more confident about the reciprocal relationship between spiritual and economic advances. A leading missionary in Korea enunciated the conventional wisdom when he asserted in 1904 that religion was ‘the first great essential to progress’ and ‘the mummeroy of the Greek Church forms a bar to true progress’.40 Five years later Baron Woldemar Üxküll, a Baptist convert from Estonia, declared in a widely noted article that Russia presented ‘great possibilities and opportunities in religious as well as in business regard. For the development of Russia the influence of the Gospel is the most necessary blessing and the most needed thing.’41 The conviction that spiritual enlightenment and economic modernisation proceeded hand in hand was sometimes reflected in startling juxtapositions, as when the Adventist F. I. Richardson called Peter the Great Russia’s ‘material Moses’.42 In a more mundane way, religious leaders frequently showed their awareness of the relationship between the wealth of tithing church members and the growth of their denominations. Thus during the great surge in Russian migration across the Urals Adventist missionary J. T. Boettcher urgently sought ‘to have some of our older Sabbathkeepers settle in Siberia’, which he predicted ‘will soon be a well-organized and self-supporting field’, thanks to the relative prosperity of farmers in Siberia.43 While evangelists attracted many poor peasants, workers and students to their meetings they frequently showed a keen desire to reach the higher or ‘better’ classes of Russians.44 Soon after assuming leadership of the largely poor and elderly Methodist congregation in St Petersburg, for example, George Simons noted that ‘there is a vast wealth here in Russia’ and predicted that ‘When once our Church gets hold of the well-to-do Russians, as she certainly will, then we will have large sums coming in, for the wealthy Russians are very generous and philanthropic.’45

Although the Adventist board sternly disapproved of its agents ‘entering into any outside enterprise’, missionaries like L. R. Conradi habitually used the language of business, predicting that specific publishing ventures ‘would pay’, promising ‘ample returns for our outlay’, and reporting ‘a very profitable time in Russia’.46 Adventists did not have a monopoly on such vocabulary. In requesting a special grant for a printing press to compete with the Baptists, for example, George Simons assured the Methodist leadership that ‘from a business point of view this thing will not be a fizzle’ and guaranteed ‘wonderful returns within the next two years’.47 More than a linguistic quirk, the frequent employment of business terminology marked how the missionary quest for rapid and numerous conversions resembled and overlapped with the capitalist drive to tap the most profitable markets and fields for investment. Like sales representatives, missionaries often quantified their results, especially the numbers baptised, and like corporations churches produced quarterly and annual reports that tabulated not only membership growth but also tithe receipts, average offerings per member and the retail value of book and periodical sales.48

Closing Doors: Political Reaction and Orthodox Backlash (1911–1916)

Despite the ebullience of evangelists in Russia, many religious leaders in the United
States remained cautious about missionary ventures. Responding to Simons’ insistent requests for funds, Rev. Homer Stuntz explained that he was ‘anxious’ to ‘build up a church there that will be native in the truest sense, adjusted to the life and giving ability of our Russian converts’. Instead of putting ‘the enterprise under glass and turn[ing] in steam heat’, Stuntz vastly preferred ‘a slower growth in order that we may get hardier plants’. Like Stuntz, others were wary that hothouse-cultivated churches would not be able to withstand a change in the unpredictable Russian climate. A committee appointed by the Foreign Mission Boards of North America reported in 1907 that the time was ‘not ripe’ for a direct missionary ‘advance upon Russia’, recommended that denominations strive instead ‘to raise up in Russia itself a large force of well-educated preachers and evangelists’, and reiterated that ‘the leaders of all of this advance should be Russians’.

Such concern that aggressive foreign missionary campaigns could provoke a backlash proved prescient. Towards the end of 1910 Adventist leaders began complaining about stricter censorship and new regulations against proselytising. By 1912 a much colder climate seemed to be returning as the tsarist government ordered the Adventists to close their publishing house in Riga and refused to grant land in Siberia to ‘sectarians’. Disillusioned, the editor of The Missionary Review of the World bitterly complained that there was ‘no such thing’ as religious freedom in Russia. As Simons explained in early 1914, the preceding years brought ‘a strong political reaction and religious repression, under which practically all Free Church bodies have had to suffer more or less’. Following the outbreak of the First World War the government cracked down more severely. In August 1914 a new law prohibited sectarian ministers from preaching at any place except their approved home church, and in subsequent months police officials investigated, arrested and jailed many preachers, particularly in denominations that had close ties to German colonists and Germany, such as the Adventists and Baptists. While Simons continued to enjoy ‘a certain amount of liberty’ in Petrograd that he attributed ‘to a quiet, tactful mode of activity and our having American connections’, the more aggressive Baptist leader Fetler was banished, many other preachers were suspected of being spies, and even Simons felt it ‘best to “lie low” and bide our time’.

A New Birth of Freedom: Missionary Responses to the Revolutions of 1917

Having endured harassment, prosecution and incarceration in the last years of Romanov rule, American evangelists joyfully hailed the overthrow of the tsarist government in March 1917. From Saratov, where he had been exiled and under virtual house arrest, Adventist pastor O. E. Reinke proclaimed that ‘The Great God of Heaven and Earth has at last visited in great mercy this people to deliver them from the bondage which held them for so long a time .... The Gospel minister has now an open field to let the light of heaven shine ... ’ In Petrograd, George Simons declared that ‘the most thrilling thing’ he had witnessed in his ten-year sojourn in Russia was ‘the truly miraculous resurrection of this great Slavic nation, almost two hundred million strong, rising in power and majesty from the gloomy tomb of despotic tyranny and mediaeval terrorism into the joyous light and life of freedom and democracy’.

Although Simons had been dismayed by the Methodist board’s unwillingness to increase appropriations for Russia a few years earlier, leaders in New York showed much greater eagerness in 1917. As Frank Mason North explained in July, he sought ‘to develop a stronger program’ because he believed ‘that Russia is opening wonder-
fully to the message of the Gospel’ and he was ‘convinced of the deep religious nature of the Russian people’.61 Such enthusiasm extended well beyond denominational mission boards. En route to Scandinavia and (he hoped) Russia in May 1917 Sherwood Eddy of the International Committee of Young Men’s Christian Associations glowingly predicted that the YMCA would ‘have an opportunity in the period of reconstruction in Russia that is incalculable’.62 Similarly excited by ‘the thousand-fold enlarged Gospel possibilities in Russia’ after its simultaneous ‘political and religious emancipation’ the editor of The Missionary Review of the World, Delavan Pierson, dreamed that ‘The time may even come when a congress of evangelical Christians may gather in the winter palace of Petrograd to discuss the needs and opportunities for aggressive missionary work in Russia’.63

Americans tended to assume that they had special opportunities and responsibilities in Russia not only because they were progressive Christians but also because they represented a wealthy modern country that Russians admired. Attempting to convince Russian workmen of the need to work, like their American comrades, ‘in a most energetic and intensive manner’, George Simons felt compelled to debunk the Russian myth that nearly every American was a millionaire and to stress that America’s ‘greatest wealth’ was ‘in its moral consciousness’.64 Disturbed by deteriorating economic and political conditions in the autumn of 1917 Simons invoked not a generic Christianity but a specific Anglo-Saxon Protestant ethic as the cure for Russia’s ills. ‘Only vital, practical Christianity, sane evangelism and Christian education with Anglo-American ideals and spirit’, he advised The Christian Advocate, ‘can purge Russia’s benighted millions of semi-pagan superstitions, evil practices, matriarchy, saint and icon worship.’65 The Bolshevik seizure of power did not shake the conviction that American evangelism could reshape Russian politics. Declaring that Russians needed ‘enlightenment as to the real meaning of life, liberty, and religion’, Pierson announced in March 1918: ‘It is time to prepare for entering Russia with the pure Gospel of Christ, unhampered by formalism and superstition; a time to plan for Christian education for the future leaders of Russia.’66 Even as the Civil War intensified missionaries continued to buttress faith in the americanisation of Russia. Thus, urging Pentecostals to go to Russia, Andrew Urshan asserted in late 1918 that ‘over one hundred and eighty million souls in Russia are eagerly looking toward America for political, commercial and religious help’.67

While the Red victory against White armies and foreign troops in the Civil War offered little opportunity for American political influence, missionary leaders tended to disregard the lack of democracy and to focus instead on opportunities created by blows to the Orthodox Church.68 Even as he derided the ‘terrorism of rabid socialism’ in 1918 Simons noted that the Soviet authorities were ‘extremely kind to American Methodism’ and predicted that the radicals’ antipathy to the Orthodox Church would lead Russian Christianity to ‘become purified’ (a view shared by John R. Mott and others).69 Three years later Simons reported that the victorious Bolshevik officials were still friendly and underlined that ‘the doors are open for Methodism in Russia’.70 Bishop John L. Nuelsen, who succeeded Bishop Burt as supervisor of Methodist work in Europe, was even more enthusiastic than Simons about the tremendous ‘mission opportunity’ in Soviet Russia, where he sought to collaborate with the ‘Living Church’ faction of Orthodoxy.71 Although Adventists suffered grievously during the Civil War and the post-war famine they welcomed the way ‘the great revolution … brought about the much-desired separation of the church from the state and the school from the church’. Like Methodists, Adventist leaders found the Bolshevik authorities ‘very kind and helpful’, praised the greater religious freedom
than in tsarist times, and hailed their rapid growth to 14,000 members by the late 1920s. Only after 1929 would Adventists lament a new round of religious persecution in Russia.72

Conclusions

If American missions to Russia from the 1880s to 1917 involved only a handful of evangelists from the United States and resulted in fewer than 20,000 converts, what historical significance and contemporary relevance can be seen in those missions? Although the actual number of Russian citizens baptised did not match the grandiose dreams of American religious leaders, many Orthodox priests viewed the foreign missionaries as significant threats. American evangelists frequently complained that Orthodox priests disrupted their services, instigated police action to halt their preaching and prompted government curbs on their work. In 1909, for example, Adventist J. T. Boettcher reported that ‘the priests come and make disturbance in most every meeting’ and described how after one meeting ‘we were surrounded by about 100 men, called “The Black Hundred”, who had been sent by priests with the instruction to flog me.’73 Orthodox leaders’ fears and antipathies were most vividly illustrated in the antimissionary pamphlet Stoite v vere! (Stand in the Faith!) that was published in Kiev in 1911 with the approval of Archimandrite Amvrosi and was widely circulated on the eve of the Great War. The pamphlet featured a cartoon depicting rival faiths as agents of the devil attempting to steal lambs from Christ’s flock, and it identified Adventists and Baptists as two of the most aggressive and dangerous menaces. 74

The conflicts between American missionaries and Orthodox priests in tsarist Russia thus prefigured the more extensive clashes in post-Soviet Russia, where the weakened Orthodox Church has felt even more seriously threatened. As in the last decades of tsarism, American missionaries have been attracted in part by the sheer size of Russia’s population, and in their drive for rapid and numerous conversions some have been guilty of what has been called ‘hit-and-run’ evangelism. 75 In both eras aggressive, confrontational and contemptuous approaches by American missionaries have exacerbated the friction inherent in the Protestant–Orthodox competition. On the other hand, missionaries like George Simons who have worked in a more patient and tactful way (even though they have shown little more respect for Orthodoxy or awareness of divisions within the Orthodox Church) have provoked much less hostility and retaliation. Thus, while Baptists and Adventists were being arrested and exiled in 1914, Simons was able to comment with some amusement concerning the Stoite v vere! cartoon that ‘the Methodists have not yet found a place in the Russian Orthodox Rogue’s Gallery’. 76

A second area where one might find substantial historical significance and some connection with contemporary experience is in the overlap between the missionary campaigns, political crusades and economic drives to remake Russia. As we have seen, Simons and his counterparts in other denominations believed they were not only spearheading the spiritual enlightenment of Russia but also preparing the way for her economic advance and political transformation. In the same era businessmen imagined that American trade and technology would contribute not only to the economic development but also to the ‘awakening’ and ‘regeneration’ of Russia. 77 Meanwhile activists in the Anglo-American movement for a ‘free Russia’ denounced not only political oppression by the tsarist government but also religious persecution inspired by the Orthodox Church. Thus George Kennan, the great crusader against
the Siberian exile system, declared that Russian intolerance was so extreme that ‘if the Saviour himself should appear ... he would not be at liberty twenty-four hours’ and compared Russian revolutionaries’ admiration of America to Mary Magdalene’s anointing the feet of her Lord. Underlying the religious, economic and political aspirations to transform Russia was a common Protestant culture shared by both the editor of The Missionary Review of the World, who asserted in 1908 that ‘large numbers in Russia ... are already evangelical Christians at heart’, and by President Woodrow Wilson, who proclaimed in 1917 that ‘Russia was ... always in fact democratic at heart’. Despite the secularisation of American culture in this century millenarian currents have continued to foster unrealistic visions of an overnight transformation of Russia into a democracy, exaggerated hopes for profits from American–Russian commerce and delusional dreams of millions of converts to Protestant faiths. While the wild exuberance and bitter frustrations of the early twentieth century should serve to caution against extreme euphoric or despondent responses to post-Soviet developments, awareness of the connections between the religious, economic and political drives to reshape tsarist Russia should encourage analyses of the interplay between those dimensions in American efforts to reform the former Soviet Union. Missiologists, historians of American–Russian relations and experts on the postcommunist transition have tended to focus narrowly on separate dimensions, but, as this essay has sought to suggest, missions, economic development and democratisation need to be examined as part of a broader process of international interaction and cultural transformation.
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