CrossMark

Journal of Global History (2021), 16: 3, 415–434
doi:10.1017/S1740022821000103

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

ARTICLE

From converts to cooperation: Protestant internationalism, US missionaries and Indian Christians and 'Professional' social work between Boston and Bombay (c. 1920–1950)

Michael Phillipp Brunner[†]

Department of Religion, Tufts University, 302 Eaton Hall, Medford, MA, 02155, USA
Corresponding author. E-mail: michael.brunner@tufts.edu

Abstract

The 1920s and 30s were a high phase of liberal missionary internationalism driven especially by American-led visions of the Social Gospel. As the missionary consensus shifted from proselytization to social concerns, the indigenization of missions and the role of the 'younger churches' outside of Europe and North America was brought into focus. This article shows how Protestant internationalism pursued a 'Christian Sociology' in dialogue with the field's academic and professional form.

Through the case study of settlement sociology and social work schemes by the American Marathi Mission (AMM) in Bombay, the article highlights the intricacies of applying internationalist visions in the field and asks how they were contested and shaped by local conditions and processes. Challenging a simplistic 'secularization' narrative, the article then argues that it was the liberal, anti-imperialist drive of the missionary discourse that eventually facilitated an American 'professional imperialism' in the development of secular social work in India. Adding local dynamics to the analysis of an internationalist discourse benefits the understanding of both Protestant internationalism and the genesis of Indian social work and shows the value of an integrated global micro-historical approach.

Keywords: Protestant internationalism; American missionaries; Indian Christianity; social work; secularization

For 2 weeks in early 1928 more than 200 delegates – theologians, missionaries, church leaders – from around the world gathered on the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem. Organized by the International Missionary Council (IMC), the widely publicized conference talked about the future of global Christianity and its relevance to a modern world facing social and economic issues like industrialization, agricultural development or racial relations. As recent research has emphasized, the early decades of the twentieth century and especially the period between the two World Wars were a heyday of liberal Protestant internationalism.[1] The 1920s and 30s experienced a sharp

[†]I would like to thank Heather D. Curtis and Harald Fische-Tiné for reading and commenting on early drafts of this article. Valuable feedback from the three anonymous peer reviewers and from Heidi Tworek helped to significantly improve the quality of the piece. I am indebted to Mircea Raianu for generously sharing source material from the Tata Central Archives in Pune with me. Finally, I am very grateful to Leslie A. Morris, Gore Vidal Curator of Modern Books & Manuscripts, Houghton Library, Harvard University, and Karen Georgia A. Thompson, Associate General Minister of Wider Church Ministries, United Church of Christ for the permission to quote from the ABCFM archives.

[1]Dana L. Robert, 'The First Globalization: The Internationalization of the Protestant Missionary Movement Between the World Wars,' *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 26, no. 2 (2002): 50–66; Michael G. Thompson, *For God and Globe. Christian Internationalism in the United States between the Great War and the Cold War* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 2015). On the broader context of inter-war internationalism, cf. Daniel Gorman, *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

increase in debates and activities, many born out of the international missionary sphere, that discussed the nature of the mission, global Christianity and the role of the growing Christian communities outside of Europe and North America. In tandem with the heightened internationalism went a topical shift that moved attention to a number of rather 'worldly' and in particular social and socio-economic concerns.[2] This shift had been fertilized by the emergence of the Social Gospel a few decades earlier, a reinterpretation of Christian ethics – especially prominent in North American Protestantism but influential worldwide – that understood Christian duty not only in a quest for individual salvation but also in social justice, the betterment of human conditions and the building of the Kingdom of God on earth.[3] In an extended form, many liberal internationalists in the 1920s and 30s added to these concerns an outspoken rejection of imperialism and racism.[4]

These groups considered solving various modern societal problems a Christian task and saw science from early on as a productive partner in their plans. In the USA, key figures of early sociology had strong ties to the Social Gospel movement and the discipline in various ways was tied to and grew out of programmes and debates of religious reform organizations. To Christians interested in social welfare, academic sociology provided tools like surveys and statistical compilations to analyse critical conditions and ideally offer solutions. In applied social work and areas such as the settlement movement, the work of academics and religiously motivated practitioners blended and fuelled each other.[5] Early leading figures of sociology put much effort into discarding these connections and emancipate as a professionalized, purely academic field.[6] However, this was not necessarily a mutual separation. The 1910s had seen an 'internationalization of the Social Gospel',[7] which was inherently tied with the missionary and ecumenical movements and their appropriation of social science. As we will see, for the internationalist Protestant discourse confronted with global inequalities of a post-First World War world, a 'Christian sociology' promised a way to approach these problems and compete with secular ideologies.

Only recently have scholars started to interpret the interwar Protestant internationalist movement and its discourse not only as a stage in the history of the ecumenical movement or missiology but as an indication of shifts in global constellations in general and – in view of its heavy North American missionary bias – an early expression of the US soft power extension in particular. These studies have provided significant insights into a liberal Protestant and missionary milieu torn between the contradictions of imperialism, nationalism, universalism, liberalism and secularization. Too often, however, their analyses have remained on a mostly discursive level. Seldom have there been attempts to connect the 'high politics' debates on the international level with their effects on the ground. Often, the scholarship remained more interested in the repercussions of the

[2]Cf. Peter Kallaway, 'Education, Health and Social Welfare in the Late Colonial Context: The International Missionary Council and Educational Transition in the Interwar Years with Specific Reference to Colonial Africa,' *History of Education* 38, no. 2 (2009): 217–46.

[3]Susan Curtis, *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Christopher Evans, *The Social Gospel in American Religion: A History* (New York: New York University Press, 2017).

[4]Thompson, *For God and Globe.*

[5]Gina A. Zurlo, 'The Social Gospel, Ecumenical Movement, and Christian Sociology: The Institute of Social and Religious Research,' *American Sociologist* 46, no. 2 (2015): 177–93, here 181ff.; Cecil E. Greek, *The Religious Roots of American Sociology* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1992).

[6]Thomas L. Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: the American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977); Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy & Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865–1905* (Lexington: Kentucky University Press, 1975).

[7]Greek, *The Religious Roots*, 196. Cf. Harald Fischer-Tiné, Stefan Huebner and Ian Tyrrell, eds., *Spreading Protestant Modernity: Global Perspectives on the Social Work of the YMCA and YWCA, 1889–1970* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2021).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

debates back in the USA.[8] Ironically, while the discourse of the internationalists in the early twentieth century shifted slowly from the 'sending' to the 'receiving' countries and from foreign control to indigenization, the historiography has not followed suit and considered the 'receiving countries' only marginally.[9] As recent global approaches in intellectual history have highlighted the multilaterality and interconnectedness in the flow of ideas, such a distinction seems problematic. Proponents of a global intellectual history have argued for an extension of the scope of actors and regions considered beyond a canonical North Atlantic intellectual milieu.[10] This extended geographical scope must be supplemented with a shift in analytical scale(s). A 'decolonisation' of intellectual history implies looking at how international(ist) discourses were negotiated in diverse local contexts.[11] Refining the potential of global history after its initial boom, many commenters now agree that a productive analysis acknowledges the dialectic nature between macro- and micro processes, and they emphasize the worth of focusing on individual organizations and persons.[12] Although not yet sufficiently acknowledged in global intellectual history, religious internationals by the early twentieth century had transformed 'from communities of believers into communities of opinion'[13] that should be considered as significant parts of the global public sphere and civil society. In this article, I show how bringing together the analysis of global intellectual discourse with local social programmes and practices benefits the understanding of both Protestant internationalism and the genesis of Indian social work.

There was a considerable tension haunting the interwar Christian internationalist and missionary movement in a world still structured by colonialism and imperialism, between claims to internationalist universalism and nationalist aspirations, between religious purpose and 'secular' activities.[14] This article probes into the repercussions and limitations of the (American-led) liberal internationalist Protestant missionary discourse. As the interwar attempts for a Christian sociology and social work schemes in British India will show, these enterprises faced considerable resistance despite a broad liberal missionary consensus. India was of much importance to internationalist organizations and associated missionary bodies, next to China the biggest field of American missionary activity, and in post-First World War deliberations often considered to be one of the future Asian global players.[15] In late-colonial British India, imperialist, nationalist, missionary and secular visions and aspirations clashed. South Asia thus constitutes a productive

[8]David A. Hollinger, *Protestants Abroad: How Missionaries Tried to Change the World but Changed America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019); Gene Zubovich, 'The Global Gospel: Protestant Internationalism and American Liberalism, 1940–1960' (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2015); David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Ian Tyrrell, *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

[9]Important works with a strong focus on the local effects on American missions, on the other hand, often engage only partially with the internationalist context; cf. Jeffrey Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines: Christianity and Colonial Power in India, 1818–1940* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002); Heather Sharkey, *American Evangelicals in Egypt: Missionary Encounters in an Age of Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Ussama Makdisi, *Artillery of Heaven: American Missionaries and the Failed Conversion of the Middle East* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).

[10]Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori, eds., *Global Intellectual History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013).

[11]Dag Herbjørnsrud, 'Beyond Decolonizing: Global Intellectual History and Reconstruction of a Comparative Method,' *Global Intellectual History*, online (2019).

[12]Cf. Richard Drayton and David Motadel, 'Discussion: The Futures of Global History,' *Journal of Global History* 13, no. 1 (2018): 1–21, here 11f.; Harald Fischer-Tiné, 'Marrying Global History with South Asian History: Potential and Limits of Global Microhistory in a Regional Inflection,' *Comparativ* 29, no. 2 (2019): 52–77.

[13]Abigail Greene and Vincent Viaene, eds., *Religious Internationals in the Modern World: Globalization and Faith Communities since 1750* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 1.

[14]Cf. Gene Zubovich, 'The Protestant Search for 'the Universal Christian Community' between Decolonization and Communism,' *Religions* 8, no. 2 (2017): 1–12.

[15]Silke Martini, *Postimperiales Asien: Die Zukunft Indiens und Chinas in der anglophonen Weltöffentlichkeit, 1919–1939* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

field for integrated macro/micro studies that see considerable analytical potential in shifting between global and local scales.[16]

This article argues that the same Christian internationalist debates and schemes that initially set out to face the threat of 'secularism' and to reform and relegitimize Christian mission facilitated the emergence of secularized professional fields of social research and work in India. This process implies both a waning and persistent influence of religious institutions and purpose and complicates global narratives in either direction. Rather ironically, the sympathetic and cooperative, if not anti-imperialist attitude of liberal missionaries towards non-Christian traditions eventually paved the road for an American 'professional imperialism'. Poignantly framed in the 1980s, the latter concept has been used by authors to describe the problematic and persisting dominant role of Western social work theory and practice in countries of the Global South and is still discussed in international social work today.[17] The role played by the USA has been emphasized for places like Latin America or the Philippines that experienced significant direct or indirect American influence throughout the twentieth century.[18] The case of India and the Protestant missionary milieu puts the spotlight on two aspects that refine the historicization of the issue: its missionary roots before the Second World War and a late-colonial culture of cooperation enabled through a shift in missiology necessitated by local dynamics such as nationalism and changing concepts of social service.

In the first section, the article looks into the IMC, its Department of Social and Industrial Research (DSIR), as well as the Rockefeller-funded Institute of Social and Religious Research and their work on India. This provides a background into missionary and internationalist discourse and changing approaches and concerns, especially their attention to industrial issues and the appropriation of social scientific methods in response to 'secularism'. It highlights the complexity of 'secularization' as a historical concept and process. 'Christian sociology' in the form of research institutes worked not in competition with but alongside and in mutual fertilization of a differentiated, emerging 'secular' field of science, characterized by a marked drive for professionalization.

Settlement sociology and social work were both fields and tools developed in tandem with applications of Social Gospel theology around the globe. The article thus examines the application of 'Christian social science' in missionary social work in the local context of late-colonial India. Zooming in on Bombay (today's Mumbai) in two subsequent sections, it engages, first, with the experience of a select participant of the 1928 missionary meeting in Jerusalem, the Indian social worker Tara N. Tilak, and second, the activities of the American Marathi Mission (AMM) and its Nagpada Neighbour House, directed by Clifford Manshardt, in Bombay. Global intellectual historians have argued for shifting historical focus on processes of intermediation.[19] Both Tilak and Manshardt represented intermediation in different ways; between internationalist debate and local translation, between religious motives and secular purposes. As will become apparent throughout

[16]Cf. Fischer-Tiné, 'Marrying Global History with South Asian History'.

[17]James Midgley, *Professional Imperialism: Social Work in the Third World* (London: Heinemann, 1981); id., 'Promoting reciprocal international social work exchanges: professional imperialism revisited,' in *Indigenous Social Work Around the World: Toward Culturally Relevant Education and Practice*, edited by M. Gray, J. Coates and M. Yellow Bird (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 31–45; Lynne M. Healy, 'Global Education for Social Work: Old Debates and Future Directions for International Social Work,' in *Global Social Work: Crossing Borders, Blurring Boundaries*, edited by Carolyn Noble, Helle Strauss and Brian Littlechild (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 2014), 369–80.

[18]Gianinna Muñoz Arce, 'Latin American Social Work and the Struggles Against Professional Imperialism,' in *Routledge Handbook of Postcolonial Social Work*, edited by Tanja Kleibl et al. (Oxon: Routledge, 2019), 163–73; Jem Price and Kepa Artaraz, 'Professional 'Imperialism' and Resistance: Social Work in the Filippines,' *Global Social Work* 3, no. 5 (2013): 28–53.

[19]Sudipta Kaviraj, 'Global Intellectual History: Meanings and Methods,' in *Global Intellectual History*, edited by Moyn/Sartori, 295–319; David Armitage, 'The International Turn in Intellectual History,' in *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, edited by Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014) 232–52.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the essay, the intersection of intellectual and social history in the analysis of international Christianity and its local venues provides a productive field for global historical research.

Industrialism and 'Christian sociology': The International Missionary Council and religious research departments

The IMC was founded in 1921 and served as a linking body to several interdenominational missionary organizations of 'sending countries' as well as, increasingly, national associations outside of Europe and North America such as the National Christian Council of India (NCCI).[20] The IMC's 1928 Jerusalem world conference signified and accelerated substantial transformations in missiology, Protestant internationalism and the global ecumenical movement.[21] The conference recognized 'secularism' as a growing threat to the legitimacy and relevance of religion.[22] Secularism was understood not just as unbelief/irreligiosity but a 'system of thought and life'[23] bearing both societal meaning and authority and distinctively based on 'science'. 'Anti-secularism' offered a strategy for the ecumenical (and internationalist missionary) movement to challenge new worldviews emerging from modern industrial civilization.[24]

Simultaneously, the devastating First World War had substantially challenged notions of the moral and cultural superiority of 'Western' civilization.[25] Social, economic and racial concerns and their relation to the Christian mission took on an unprecedented focus in the discussions in Jerusalem in 1928. The turn towards both industrial and rural concerns had its parallels outside of the missionary discourse. The effects of industrialization and labour welfare and legislation concerned many countries not at least in the face of the 1917 October Revolution, while extensive programmes for 'rural reconstruction', too, were debated globally.[26]

However, not all missionary bodies and individual missionaries and theologians felt comfortable with this shift in missionary approach and scope. Despite a substantial transformation in the liberal Protestant sphere, these ideas were not hegemonic. There was a rift between what has been called 'modernists' and 'fundamentalists' views.[27] Sceptics of the new approach often tied their criticism to a general disregard for American 'activism', the Social Gospel and its implications. The rift in missionary views affected also the 1928 Jerusalem conference. Some delegates feared that calls to unite religious traditions against the threat of secularism bordered on syncretism.

[20]William R. Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundations: A History of the International Missionary Council and its Nineteenth-Century Background* (New York: Harper, 1952).

[21]Jan Van Lin, *Shaking the Fundamentals: Religious Plurality and Ecumenical Movement* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002); Jonathan S. Barnes, *Power and Partnership: A History of the Protestant Mission Movement* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 170–82; Thompson, *For God and the Globe*, 108–13.

[22]David M. Gill, 'The Secularization Debate Foreshadowed: Jerusalem 1928,' *International Review of Mission* 57, no. 227 (1968): 344–57.

[23]International Missionary Council, ed., *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council, March 24th–April 8th, 1928*, Vol I: The Christian Life and Message in Relation to Non-Christian Systems (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), v. Cf. Rufus Jones, 'Secular Civilization and the Christian Task,' in *ibid*., 284–338.

[24]Justin Reynolds, *Against the World: International Protestantism and the Ecumenical Movement between Secularization and Politics, 1900–1952* (PhD diss., Columbia University, New York, 2016).

[25]Barnes, *Power and Partnership*, 179–84.

[26]On the convergence of these concerns, cf. Amalia Ribi Forclaz, 'A New Target for International Social Reform. The International Labour Organisation and Working and Living Conditions in Agriculture in the Interwar Years,' *Journal of Contemporary European History* 20, no. 3 (2011): 307–29.

[27]James Alan Patterson, 'The Loss of a Protestant Missionary Consensus: Foreign Missions and the Fundamentalist-Modernist Conflict,' in *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880–1980*, edited by Joel A. Carpenter and Wilbert R. Shenk (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 281–300; Barnes, *Power and Partnership*, 179.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Further, they felt that advocating social reform programmes as means to redeem society went far beyond the purpose of evangelism and lacked theological–missiological justification.[28]

The conference's session on 'Christianity and the Growth of Industrialism' and its final statement though eventually bore much of the concerns reiterated by social gospellers and Christian socialists, declaring that 'the Gospel of Christ contain[ed] a message, not only for the individual soul, but for the world of social organization and economic relations in which individuals live.'[29] Following plans conceived in Jerusalem, the IMC set up a Department of Social and Industrial Research (DSIR) in 1930, headquartered until 1935 in Geneva. Its purpose was to gather and provide social science-based information. It conducted surveys and research projects on concerns considered especially crucial for the working of the 'younger' churches, such as industrialism, forced labour, child welfare, education or the trafficking of narcotics.[30] The department was not undisputed. IMC secretaries like William Paton and John R. Mott had to defend the enterprise against numerous critics that consisted mainly of the same groups that expressed their critique of Social Gospel theology in the working of the Jerusalem conference. They were not happy that through the participation of their regional and national mission boards in the IMC they would co-fund the DSIR and missionary approaches they were not willing to support.[31]

Despite the criticism, the various national councils associated with the IMC made ready use of the department. Headed by the American John Merle Davis, previously a YMCA missionary in Japan and general secretary of the Institute of Pacific Relations in Honolulu, the department produced, often commissioned, material for various institutions.[32] On many occasions, the department worked closely with the International Labour Office and the League of Nations. In the 1930s, it prepared extensive studies, statistical compilations and directories, and published its findings in reports and regular bulletins. In anticipation of the Jerusalem meeting's successor, the 1938 IMC conference to be held in Tambaram near the Indian city of Madras (today's Chennai), the DSIR moved its offices first to Shanghai and later to Nagpur, India. There, Merle and his correspondents produced a series of preparatory studies on the economic and social conditions in Asia, published in 1938 as 'The Economic Basis of the Church'.[33]

The department's trajectory was shared by another institution, the Institute of Social and Religious Research, founded in 1921. This institute was financed by the American industrialist and philanthropist John D. Rockefeller and chaired by John Mott. Its purpose, according to Mott, was 'to apply to religious phenomena the methods of social research without the distorting influence of ecclesiastical or theological bias.'[34] Guided by both religious motivation and academic rigour, the institute during its lifetime conducted forty-eight research projects and published seventy-eight reports and surveys addressing matters close to social gospeller concerns such as the church in rural and urban settings, education, race relations or the missionary enterprise.[35]

The institute's most controversial project was the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, a large-scale survey of the American missionary enterprise in Asia conducted by a lay commission independent of the mission boards. Guided by the Rockefeller Institute, it gathered data in India,

[28]C. Howard Hopkins, *John R. Mott, 1865–1955: A Biography* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 660f.; Eleanor Jackson, *Red Tape and the Gospel: A Study of the Significance of the Ecumenical Missionary Struggle of William Paton, 1886–1943* (Birmingham: Phlogiston, 1980), 158.

[29]IMC, *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting*, Vol. V: Christianity and the Growth of Industrialism in Asia, Africa and South America, 181.

[30]Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundations*, 271f.: Barnes, *Power & Partnership*, 198ff.

[31]Jackson, *Red Tape and the Gospel,* 184–91.

[32]Cf. Tomoko Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific: The United States and Japan, and the Institute of Pacific Relations in War and Peace* (London: Routledge, 2002).

[33]Barnes, *Power & Partnership*, 211.

[34]Cit. in Hopkins, *John R. Mott*, 604.

[35]Zurlo, 'The Social Gospel, Ecumenical Movement, and Christian Sociology'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Burma, China and Japan. In its conclusive report, *Re-Thinking Missions* (1932), it painted a rather critical picture of contemporary missionary practices of both its proselytizing theological imperative and the missionaries' technical and professional expertise. The inquiry, though controversially discussed amongst the missions, was representative of both the attitude of the most liberal circles in (especially American) Protestantism and the contemporary strong connection between social sciences and religion. The inquiry was an example of a 'missionary social science'[36], combining both the experiences and work in everyday mission with forms of academic and professionalized social inquiry. These networks found resonance beyond American sociology in places such as imperial Japan where Japanese Christians with ties to missionary networks conducted related social scientific inquiries and experiments.[37] Though critics like the Danish theologian Frederik Torm considered it is not 'the task of the Christian Church and missions to create a Christian sociology'[38], organizations like the IMC's research department or the Rockefeller Institute aspired to exactly that. Richard H. Tawney, economics lecturer at the London School of Economics, in 1928 on the Mount of Olives had called for such a 'Christian Sociology', as had others before him.[39] Indeed, both the Rockefeller Institute of Social and Religious Research and the DSIR linked academic and missionary sociology, introducing American pragmatism, corporate organizational strategies and promoting missionary efficiency.[40] The persistent entanglements and the missions' insistence on 'scientificity' reveal the difficulty to uphold claims for an institutional and functional separation of the spheres of the 'religious' and the 'secular' – i.e. here the professionalized academic scientific. The complex intermingling was even more visible in the local reverberations of the missionary debates on industrialism and in their applied form as social work.

Prior to the 1928 IMC conference, the NCCI (with the help of the Institute of Social and Religious Research) had commissioned a 'comprehensive survey of the industrial field'[41] to inform discussions in Jerusalem. Led by Marie Cécile Matheson, a British social work expert and former warden of the Birmingham Settlement, the survey resulted in a quantitative and qualitative study covering 'industrialism' through myriad topics, from workers' conditions, labour legislation, employment and income statistics to India's social structure.[42] While Matheson's observations and recommendations mostly did not reference religion, she accorded missions a contributory role in social work as long as they were willing to employ secular, professionally trained personnel. Further, she urged Indians to pursue professional courses in Britain and North America and considered India 'ripe for a settlement movement'.[43] Shortly after the Jerusalem conference, the IMC secretaries Mott and Paton participated in a meeting of the NCCI on industrial problems in Pune. The NCCI was well entangled with the IMC, as William Paton himself had been a secretary of the Indian Council for many years before working for the IMC and had contributed heavily to setting up the Jerusalem conference.[44] Following the opinion of Matheson, the meeting advocated for missions to look for specifically qualified staff for whose acquisition the meeting envisioned the IMC to have a consulting role in. Two of its resolutions called for an emulation of two recently

[36]Gregory Vanderbilt, 'The Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, the Omi Mission, and Imperial Japan: Missionary Social Science and One Pre-History of Religion and Development,' in *The Mission of Development*, edited by Catherine Scheer, Philip Fountain and R. Michael Feener (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018), 59–81.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Frederik Torm, 'The Place of Social Questions in Missionary Work,' *International Review of Missions* 19, no. 76 (1930): 593–603, here 595.

[39]Richard H. Tawney, 'The Bearing of Christianity on Social and Industrial Questions, I,' in *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting*, Vol. V, edited by IMC, 159–69. Cf. David Lyon, 'The Idea of a Christian Sociology: Some Historical Precedents and Current Concerns,' *Sociological Analysis* 44, no. 3 (1983): 227–42.

[40]Kallaway, 'Education, Health and Social Welfare,' 222.

[41]IMC, *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting*, Vol. V, 41.

[42]M. Cécile Matheson, *Indian Industry. Yesterday, To-day and To-morrow* (London: Oxford University Press, 1930).

[43]Ibid., 173.

[44]Jackson, *Red Tape and the Gospel*, 146f.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

started, promising missionary enterprises in Bombay: the Nagpada Neighbourhood House, directed by Clifford Manshardt and the Social Work Training Centre, directed by Tara Tilak.[45] Both these schemes had already been singled out in the Jerusalem meeting's report.[46] A close look at them will shed light on the local realization of missionary social science and social work in a late-colonial Indian context. It highlights the value of a global micro perspective – refining our view of both idealist internationalist discourse and the genesis of a professional field by juxtaposing broader developments and connections with thick description and local contextualization.[47]

The American Marathi Mission, Indian Christianity and social work in Bombay

While figures like John Mott and William Paton dominate most accounts of the 1928 IMC meeting in Jerusalem, other attendants have received little attention. Amongst these 'low profile' participants was Tara N. Tilak, a social worker from Bombay associated with the AMM. The case of Tilak and the Marathi Mission's activities in its community centre in Byculla show the implications but also limitations of the missionary discourse on industrialism, sociology and social work, and the relation of the mission in the field to the internationalist discourse. While a liberal pluralist attitude eroded convictions in Christian exceptionality and encouraged cooperation, many felt that Indian Christianity was not sufficiently involved in the Indian national project.

The AMM intensively debated the major topics of Jerusalem. The Mission and its Congregationalist parent organization, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), headquartered in Boston, discussed matters like indigenization and social work in the 1920s. The Marathi Mission from early on participated in the NCCI and its tie in with the IMC and the internationalist and ecumenical movement.[48] In a report to the ABCFM's prudential committee in 1926, the AMM committed the mission to the Social Gospel, and called for a synthesis of intellectual–physical and spiritual well-being in order to establish an ideal social order on earth and build 'a Christian (Christ like) civilization in India.'[49] However, the report also acknowledged that in many ways the Social Gospel resulted more from practical necessities in the field than a coherent theory and urged the mission not completely to renounce the 'aim of winning individual souls for the Kingdom [of God]'.[50] Around the 1928 Jerusalem conference, the AMM drafted similar statements devoted to both the Social Gospel and indigenization, claiming the strong belief that missionary agencies 'should ultimately be controlled and administered primarily by Indians.'[51] Still, while missions such as the AMM repeatedly asserted their willingness for indigenization, they often hesitated to realize that goal. An exception to this was Tara Tilak who in 1927 became director of a small social work training class in Bombay.

Bombay, the port city at the Western coast of British India, had experienced a rapid growth in the nineteenth century and become India's commercial and industrial centre.[52] By the early

[45]Cf. report of the meeting in Matheson, *Indian Industry*, 179–85.

[46]IMC, *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting*, Vol. V, 42.

[47]Fischer-Tiné, 'Marrying Global History with South Asian History,' 51.

[48]Joseph Moulton, *Faith for the Future: The American Marathi Mission, India, Sesquicentennial 1963* (New York: UCBWM, 1967), 24.

[49]"The Development of Social Work and the Social Motive in the Marathi Mission of the American Board,' February 1926, 22, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions archives, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge MA [hereafter cited as ABCFMA], ABC 16.1.1, v. 39. All quotes from the ABCFM archives are reproduced by permission of the Houghton Library, Harvard University, and the Wider Church Ministries, United Church of Christ.

[50]Ibid.

[51]'Suggested Statement of Policy presented to the General Council for its Consideration in 1928 with a view to possible action in 1929 and 1930,' January 1928, 1, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 40.

[52]Cf. Prashant Kidambi, Manjiri Kamat and Rachel Dwyer, eds., *Bombay Before Mumbai: Essays in Honour of Jim Masselos* (London: Hurst & Co., 2019).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

twentieth century, cotton trade and a quickly industrializing textile production had given the city a growing population of labourers and factory workers employed in the city's many textile mills. These working poor and, often migrant, labourers and their families lived in crowded neighbourhoods, such as Byculla in Southern Bombay, often in *chawls,* high-density residential buildings that were built en masse in the early twentieth century. Often, these impoverished neighbourhoods in Bombay were characterized by the co-existence of different religious and ethnic communities.[53]

As in other places around the world shaped by rapid urbanization and industrialization, both government and private actors addressed labour welfare, legislation and relief measures for the poor. In addition to the global moment attentive of the problems of industrialization, the first decades of the twentieth century in Bombay and other places in India also saw a transformation in the national culture. Early Indian organizations engaged in socio-religious reform were superseded by a newer understanding of social activity as a middle-class enterprise of nation building.[54] One of these organizations was the Servants of India Society, founded in 1905 by the educationist and early Indian nationalist Gopal Krishna Gokhale. The society was invested in a wide array of welfare and other activities.[55] Prior to the Jerusalem IMC conference, the Servants of India had helped in the realization of the industrial survey prepared by the NCCI and the Institute of Social and Religious Research.[56] In Bombay, a member of the society established in 1911 the Social Service League, a non-denominational middle-class association. Already in the 1910s, the league started small social work centres that were inspired by the concept of settlement houses such as Toynbee Hall in London or similar institutions in the USA developed at the turn of the century.[57] As the director of the Social Work Training Centre in Bombay, Tara Tilak took a pioneering part in an interconnected milieu of Indian social service, Christian transnational networks and internationalized American social gospel visions.

Tara Tilak was the daughter of the Christian converts Laxmibai and Narayan Vaman Tilak. Both Laxmibai and N.V. Tilak had been prestigious 'trophies of grace'[58] for the Christian mission in India; they came from well-respected Hindu families and were born as high-caste Chitpavan Brahmins. N.V. was renowned as a great Marathi poet even before his conversion to Christianity. The Tilaks were closely associated with the AMM. N.V. Tilak wrote extensively for the *Dnaynodaya*, the mission's newspaper widely read not only amongst Christians. He was considered a pioneer in developing indigenous expressions of Christianity deeply rooted in Indian culture.[59]

The attitudes of Indian Christians towards the Indian national movement since the late nineteenth century had been ambivalent and ranged 'from outright support through suspicious anxiety to reactionary opposition.'[60] For a long time, more political compatriots had accused Indian

[53]Prashant Kidambi, *The Making of an Indian Metropolis: Colonial Governance and Public Culture in Bombay, 1890–1920* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007), 204–33.

[54]Carey A. Watt, *Serving the Nation: Cultures of Service, Association and Citizenship in Colonial India* (New Delhi/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Priyanka Srivastava, *The Well-Being of the Labor Force in Colonial Bombay: Discourses and Practices* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 109–52. Cf. Kidambi, *Making of an Indian Metropolis*, 231; id., 'From 'Social Reform' to 'Social Service': Indian Civic Activism and the Civilizing Mission in Colonial Bombay c. 1900–20,' *Civilizing Missions in Colonial and Post-Colonial South Asia: From Improvement to Development*, edited by Michael Mann and Carey Watt (London: Anthem Press, 2011), 217–38.

[55]Srivastava, *The Well-Being of the Labor Force*, 111f.

[56]IMC, *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting,* Vol. V, 41.

[57]Kidambi, *Making of an Indian Metropolis*, 221–32, id., 'From 'Social Reform' to 'Social Service',' 230–5.

[58]Robert E. Frykenberg, *Christianity in India. From Beginning to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 414f.

[59]H.L. Richard, *Following Jesus in the Hindu Context: The Intriguing Implications of N. V. Tilak' Life and Thought* (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1998); Laxmibai Tilak, *I Follow After: An Autobiography*, transl. by E. Josephine Inkster (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950).

[60]Jeffrey Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines: Christianity and Colonial Power in India, 1818–1940* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 253. Cf. Geoffrey A. Oddie, 'Indian Christians and National Identity, 1870–1947,' *Journal of Religious History* 25, no. 3 (2001): 346–66, here 346f.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Christians of having an uncomfortably close relationship with their imperialist Western co-religionists. Maintaining social relations for Indian Christians, especially recently converted ones, often proved to be difficult. Attitudes amongst Indian Christians shifted somewhat after the First World War. A more outspoken identification with the national cause emerged due to the work of figures such as N.V. Tilak as well as changing convictions amongst younger, second-generation Indian Christians. Further, the general national movement had assumed a more both integrative and secular character after figures like Mohandas 'Mahatma' Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru had taken leadership, which to some extent transcended earlier Hindu-centric conceptions.[61]

N.V. Tilak died in 1919 but the family retained its association with the mission. Tara, after attending a non-Christian high school in Pune and the mission's Wilson College in Bombay, went to England where she completed a B.A. degree in Social Work in the University of Birmingham's Selly Oaks Colleges. Upon returning to Bombay in 1927, Tara Tilak started working for the AMM in its social service committee.[62] Further, she became the directress of the Social Work Training Centre for Women, a small joint project of the AMM, the YWCA, the United Free Church Mission and the Women's University Settlement in Bombay. The Training Centre, the first of its kind in India, offered a systematic programme for Indian women to study social work, both theoretical and practical. The course's small group of students was made up of women from all of Bombay's communities with an educated, urban middle-class background. Apart from classroom teaching of topics such as (social) history, economics, psychology or public administration, the 10 months programme included a multitude of practical activities like work in play centres, nursery schools for factory women's children, visit labourers' families at home, etc.[63] It featured also cooperative programmes with other institutions such as a sewing class in the women's block of the local jail.[64] In her work for the Training Centre, Tara Tilak emphasized the necessity of a professionalization of women's social work, as she had enjoyed it herself in Birmingham. The function of the trained social worker, according to Tilak, would be 'not just a health visitor or a nurse or teacher or organizer but something of each.'[65] Tilak's engagement in Bombay was widely acknowledged by contemporaries and peers, both from social work and the mission field.[66] In 1931, she was presented as the face of Asian Christian women in *The Orient Steps Out*, a publication intended for American Sunday schools and showcasing the progress and success of Christianity in Asia.[67] Next to Tilak, the book portrayed two other prominent non-Western Christian leaders, the Chinese YMCA secretary, educationist and rural reconstruction advocate Y. C. James 'Jimmy' Yen, and the Japanese convert, social reformer and labour activist Toyohiko Kagawa, both Princeton graduates.[68]

Since the late nineteenth century, there had been a growing presence of women in American Protestant missions around the world, from the Middle East to India, China

[61]Oddie, 'Indian Christians and National Identity,' 359f.

[62]'Minutes of the American Marathi Mission, General Council Meeting at Ahmednagar, January 18–25, 1928,' 2, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 38.

[63]Tara Tilak, 'Further Openings for Social Work,' in *Women in Modern India: Fifteen Papers by Indian Women Writers,* edited by Evelyn C. Gedge and Mithan Choksi (Bombay: D.B. Taraporewala Sons & Co., 1929), 149–61; B.A. Engineer and Mithan Choksi, 'Seva Sadan and Other Social Work in Bombay,' *Women in Modern India*, 43–52, here 49f.; Mary Jenness, *The Orient Steps Out* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1931), 29–33.

[64]Maisie Wright, *Under Malabar Hill: Letters from India 1928–1933* (London: BACSA, 1988), 56.

[65]Tilak, 'Further Openings for Social Work,' 160.

[66]For example, A.R. Caton, ed., *The Key of Progress: A Survey of the Status and Conditions of Women in India* (London: Oxford University Press, 1930), 173, 177; John McKenzie, ed., *The Christian Task in India* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1929), 60, 64.

[67]Jenness, *The Orient Steps Out.*

[68]Robert Schildgen, *Toyohiko Kagawa: Apostle of Love and Social Justice* (Berkeley: Centenary Books, 1988); Charles W. Hayford, *To the People: James Yen and Village China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Japan.[69] This development coincided with the rise of the Social Gospel and the shift in priorities. Often excluded from preaching, new generations of college-educated women found opportunities to work in missionary areas like education, medical work or social service.[70] For long, crucial to the mission's rationale had been a narrative of missionaries 'rescuing' native women from heathen oppression. By the 1920s, more pluralist understandings led many missionary women to work on women issues together with native, non-Christian female activists and reform organizations.[71] Consequently, viewed with particular interest were indigenous Christian women. Women like the activist and educationist Pandita Ramabai, a generation before Tilak, rose to prominence as they participated in transnational networks and were celebrated by contemporary missions and their supporters in the West.[72]

Figures like Ramabai and Tara Tilak had to face many challenges in shifting environments as they navigated between tensions of faith, imperialism, gender and nationalism. Internationalist vision and missionary experience did not always comply smoothly. The Social Gospel and similar social theologies resonated well with Christians in the Global South. Asian ecumenists like the South Indian M.M. Thomas developed anti- and postcolonial visions and networks suited for an emancipation of the 'younger' churches in a de-colonizing and polarizing early Cold War environment.[73] In Catholic Latin America, Liberation Theology emerged in the late 1960s and shared much of the socio-economic and emancipatory trajectory Protestant liberal internationalists and ecumenists pursued.[74] During the transitional 1920s and 30s, there was much contestation in still heavily mission-dominated non-Western Christian communities. The indigenization of mission agencies was a complicated issue, as has been shown, for instance, also in regard to Africa.[75] While her education in Birmingham enabled Tara Tilak to take a leading role, other young Indian Christians were not considered actual alternatives to take responsibility. While some internationalist visions remained unfulfilled, others had unexpected side effects.

In 1931, Tilak's success story of Protestant internationalism and Christian social work took a turn. On June 24, the AMM missionary and *Dnaynodaya* editor James F. Edwards received a letter from Tilak in which she announced: 'I am no longer a member of any organized Christian Church. I am a Hindu and belong to the whole of India. My religion is love and service of the whole humanity.'[76] Tilak had married a Hindu 'according to Aryan rites' and went now by the name Mrs. Hemangini Joshi. Tilak's (re-)conversion caused a big fuss in the AMM and her marriage was considered 'a great blow to the Christian movement in Western India and indeed all over India.'[77] In view of Tara's family's exalted social position, her decision bore the potential of

[69]Barbara Reeves-Ellington, Kathryn Kish Sklar, and Connie A. Shemo (eds), *Competing Kingdoms: Women, Mission, Nation, and the American Protestant Empire, 1812–1960* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010); Jane Hunter, *The Gospel of Gentility: American Women Missionaries in Turn-of-the-century China* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).

[70]Dana Robert, *American Women in Mission: A Social History of Their Thought and Practice* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1996); For a non-American example, cf. Julia Hauser, *German Religious Women in Late Ottoman Beirut. Competing Missions* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

[71]Susan Haskell Khan, 'From Redeemers to Partners: American Women Missionaries and the "Woman Question" in India, 1919–1939,' *Competing Kingdoms*, edited by Reeves-Ellington/Sklar/Shemo, 141–164.

[72]Padma Anagol, 'Indian Christian Women and Indigenous Feminism, c. 1850–c. 1920,' in *Gender and Imperialism*, edited by Clare Midgley (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 79–103; Claire Midgley, 'Indian feminist Pandita Ramabai and Transnational Liberal Religious Networks in the Nineteenth-Century World,' *Women in Transnational History: Connecting the Local and the Global*, edited by id., Alison Twells and Julie Carlier (London: Routledge, 2016), 13–33.

[73]Justin Reynolds, 'From Christian anti-imperialism to postcolonial Christianity: M.M. Thomas and the ecumenical theology of communism in the 1940s and 1950s,' *Journal of Global History* 13, no. 2 (2018): 230–51.

[74]T. Howland Sanks, 'Liberation Theology and the Social Gospel: Variations on a Theme,' *Theological Studies* 41, no. 4 (1980): 668–82.

[75]Elisabeth Engel, 'The Ecumenical Origins of Pan-Africanism: Africa and the 'Southern Negro' in the International Missionary Council's Global Vision of Christian Indigenization in the 1920s,' *Journal of Global History* 13, no. 2 (2018): 209–29.

[76]Cit. in a letter from J.F. Edwards to Alden H. Clark/secretaries ABCFM, 27 July 1931, 1, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1., v. 46.

[77]Mabel E. Emerson to J.F. Edwards, 22 August 1931, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1., v. 46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

considerable embarrassment for the mission and the latter was anxious that the Hindu press would get wind of Tilak's 'relapse'. This fear was accelerated by the fact that the 1920s and 30s in India saw a peak in religious rivalry marked by heated debates about the conversion of religious communities, revolving around Hindu (re-)conversion campaigns, Muslim reactions and Christian mass conversion schemes.[78]

Tara Tilak's conversion shows both the contradictions inherent in liberal Protestant internationalist and missionary thought and its limitations when faced with local dynamics. In a letter to his missionary colleagues in Bombay and Boston, J.F. Edwards provided a detailed analysis of Tilak's decision.[79] As he wrote, he had noted for a few years that Tilak 'was deeply ashamed of the aloofness of so many of the Indian Christians from India's national aspirations'[80] and that her social work had brought her into close contact with many non-Christian activists. Indeed, co-operation had been a key element in her approach to social work. Tara Tilak urged the 'women of the Christian Church [to] seek close co-operation with non-Christians',[81] and she and her class were involved with numerous other agents for social welfare such as the Servants of India.

Indian Christians' relationship to Indian nationalism remained a complicated issue. While Gandhi's earlier receptive stance towards Christianity had facilitated the inclusion of Indian Christians into the mainstream national movement, he became more confrontational towards Christianity and Christian missions in the late 1920s and early 30s. Criticizing missionary strategies of mass conversion that he deemed predatory and imperialistic, Gandhi was engaged in discussions with Indian Christian leaders as well as non-Indian missionaries, amongst them John Mott who met Gandhi while touring India in 1928/29.[82] At the same time, the national movement reached a new phase of radicalization and activity in Gandhi's Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930. Younger generations of Indian Christians too participated in these movements, amongst them the Byculla Christian community.[83] Tara Tilak was involved in a leading role in these activities in early 1930. She held speeches in rallies of the young Christian Nationalist Party, where she appealed to Indian Christians to support the Indian National Congress and the Swadeshi movement.[84] She participated also in other, non-Christian groups such as the Bombay Youth League or the Desh Sevika Sangh.

It was shortly after the Civil Disobedience Movement in mid-1930 when Tilak apparently first turned her back at Christianity and the mission.[85] J.F. Edwards speculated that Tara Tilak had been influenced by recent writings of Manilal Parekh and Gandhi who criticized missionaries and the organized and proselytizing church. Manilal Parekh had learned about Christianity through the Brahmo Samaj and the writings of Keshab Chandra Sen and was baptized in 1918 into the Anglican Church. He developed a Christo-centric theology, attacked institutionalized and organized church, condemned Western churches and missionaries as imperialist, materialist as well as racist. During his lifetime, he oscillated between Christian and Hindu traditions,

[78]Yoginder Sikand, 'Arya Shuddhi and Muslim Tabligh: Muslim Reactions to Arya Samaj Proselytization (1923–1930),' in *Religious Conversion in India: Modes, Motivations and Meanings*, edited by Rowena Robinson and Sathianathan Clarke (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2003), 98–118; Laura Dudley Jenkins, *Religious Freedom and Mass Conversion in India* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019), chapter 1.

[79]F. Edwards to Alden Clark/secretaries ABCFM, 27 July 1931, 2–6, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1., v. 46.

[80]Ibid., 2.

[81]Cit. in Jenness, *The Orient Steps Out*, 61.

[82]Lalsangkima Pachuau, 'A Clash of 'Mass Movements'? Christian Missions and the Gandhian Nationalist Movement in India,' *Transformation* 31, no. 3 (2014): 157–74; Jenkins, *Religious Freedom and Mass Conversion*, chapter 1; Hopkins, *John R. Mott*, 671.

[83]J.F. Edwards to Alden Clark/secretaries ABCFM, 27 July 1931, 3, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1., v. 46. Cf. Oddie, 'Indian Christians and National Identity,' 361.

[84]K.K. Chaudhari, ed., *Source Material for a History of Freedom Movement*, Vol. XI: Civil Disobedience Movement, April–September 1930 (Bombay: Government of Maharashtra, 1990), 176f., 266f., 279, 431, 490.

[85]Wright, *Under Malabar Hill*, 72f.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

advocating for a universal religion containing elements from various religious traditions.[86] It does not seem like a stretch that Tara Tilak might indeed have been attracted to similar positions. At the Jerusalem conference in 1928, during a discussion on the value of non-Christian religions and their relationship to Christianity, Tilak had opinionated against voices that expected from converts a complete break with their earlier faith.[87] Instead, she pointed to the devotional Hindu tradition of *bhakti* and its parallels to Christian devotion to Christ and a personal God. Tilak's reference to *bhakti* was a common trope that had many followers amongst more vocal, indigenizing Indian Christians – amongst them Manilal Parekh and Tara's own father N.V. Tilak – as well as liberal Western authors and missionaries.

Tara Tilak was fully aware of the hurdles that non-Western Christianity faced despite internationalist assertions of indigenization and equality. In Jerusalem, she spoke out against racial prejudice and lamented that some Indian Christians felt more at home amongst Hindus than in the church and that Indian Christianity would not sufficiently cherish its Indian heritage.[88] Tara Tilak's (/Hemangini Joshi's) new husband, Hem Chandra Joshi, had a similar background as her. He came from a Brahmin family and had been a Christian convert of the Church Missionary Society who had reconverted to Hinduism. Joshi, too, had spent time in England for studies where he and Tara Tilak probably first met.[89] Tara and Hem Chandra's relationship was further complicated by the fact that Joshi was already married. The fact that Tilak's husband too was a 'relapsed' Christian convert added another layer to the mission's anxiety, as it fuelled the ongoing debate about the indigenization of mission agencies and the role of Indian Christians therein.

Tilak's decision was shaped by her personal situation as well as the convergence of social and political dynamics of late-colonial British India and the possibilities the internationalist Christian discourse provided. Her (re-)conversion confirmed the fears fundamentalist theologians and missionaries were expressing in response to the liberals and Social Gospellers. Tilak's estrangement from the mission's work came through professionalization and a cooperative outlook based on both pluralist religious discourse and nationalist inclinations. Her story speaks to the benefits of a micro-analytical approach: With her departure from the missionary milieu, Tara Tilak, unfortunately (and suspiciously) vanished from historiography. Despite her contemporary prominence, Tilak has been omitted in later missionary and secular historiography and not much is known about her post-Bombay work.

Better documented is the life of Clifford Manshardt, a colleague of Tilak who directed the Nagpada Neighbourhood Centre in Bombay. Manshardt shared many of Tilak's attitudes that caused anxieties amongst other missionaries. His understanding of Christian mission had almost completely abandoned the necessity for individual conversion. As American sociology and social work ripened as professionalized science, Manshardt grew out of missionary work to tackle the socio-economic problems of India in secularizing and irreligious contexts.

Cooperation and beyond: The Nagpada Neighbourhood House and the Sir Dorabji Tata Graduate School of Social Work

The AMM's Neighbourhood House was started in 1926 in Byculla's small neighbourhood of Nagpada in South Bombay. Clifford Manshardt, a graduate from the University of Chicago's Theological Seminary had been chosen for the task of directing the centre.[90] Manshardt had joined

[86]R.S. Sugirtharajah, *Jesus in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018), 143–66.

[87]IMC, *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting,* Vol. I, 383.

[88]Ibid.

[89]Devdutt Tilak to R.E. Hume, 31 July 1931, 6, ABCFMA, ABC 77.1, Biographical Collection, Box 7: Tilak, Mr and Mrs Narayan V.

[90]Clifford Manshardt, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers in India* (Bombay: Lalvani Publishing House, 1967), 11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the army during the First World War and his experiences in Europe shook his religious outlook and questioned earlier convictions of Christian superiority and morality. Though unorthodox in many of his views, he was ordained as a minister of the Congregational Church after finishing his studies. Shortly after, he applied for missionary service.[91]

The Neighbourhood House, set in an impressive four-storey building, featured numerous recreational opportunities, offered various classes for adults, provided medical aid with a dispensary and an infant welfare centre, and supported local labourers.[92] Since 1929, Tara Tilak held her classes in the Neighbourhood House, while Manshardt was also chairman at her Social Work Training Centre. The Centre's practical activities supported the House's efforts in women's work. Tilak and her students helped in the House's infant welfare centre and run numerous clubs for women. As Manshardt noted, this was a very satisfactory arrangement. In the Neighbourhood House, Tilak's activities could attract social groups who would otherwise probably not go to more explicitly missionary agencies such as the AMM's women's hostel.[93] Indeed, the Neighbourhood House had a marked non-denominational outlook. Since its inception the institution presented itself decidedly open in its reach, claiming that '[t]he only creed of the House is a genuine respect for the best that is found in all creeds.'[94]

The AMM's Bombay mission station initially had not favoured the idea of transferring Tilak's training centre to the Neighbourhood House. When they eventually agreed, they wanted one of the American (female) missionaries engaged in the mission's women's hostel to help at the new location. Manshardt vehemently rejected this suggestion. Rather bluntly he expressed his doubt that the proposed missionary would have the skills necessary for social work, because she – in contrast to Tilak – was not a trained social worker.[95] Further, he referred to the 'Christian tradition' behind the main mission's work that he felt might conflict with the decidedly non-denominational outlook of the Neighbourhood House. A few years later, Manshardt confirmed his position that an evangelistic approach would not suit a social settlement, assuring that 'you cannot be evangelistic worker in one block, and a social worker in the next.'[96]

Manshardt's position was radical but did find support amongst liberal missionaries and observers. Both the Neighbourhood House and the Social Work Training Centre were addressed in the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry's *Re-Thinking Missions* amongst a shortlist of existing social work enterprises, mostly social settlements by mission agencies in China and Japan.[97] The inquiry acknowledged the controversy around the question of whether an evangelistic emphasis should be given to missionary social work and, in view of the experiences in the field and growing Asian nationalisms, considered it 'exceedingly inexpedient, if not actually impossible, to combine aggressive evangelistic efforts with welfare work.'[98]

The cultivation of professional social work and the development of sociological methods were close to Manshardt's heart. Shortly after arriving in Bombay, he published *Facing Facts in Nagpada: An Illustration of The Technique of the Social Survey* (1928). The book served as a preparatory study for his further work in Nagpada. Further, as its title implies, the booklet was supposed to 'help to illustrate the use of the social survey.'[99] Three years later, Manshardt wrote

[91]Ibid., 8.

[92]Nagpada Neighbourhood House, various annual reports, 1928–1938, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 39 and 45.

[93]C. Manshardt to W.E. Strong, 2 August 1929, 2, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 42.

[94]'Nagpada Neighbourhood House Completes First Year of Service,' February 1928, 4, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 39.

[95]C. Manshardt to W.E. Strong, 20 September 1929, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 42.

[96]C. Manshardt to Alden H. Clark, 8 December 1931, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 46.

[97]Hocking, *Re-Thinking Missions*, 269f.

[98]Orville A. Petty, ed., *Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, Supplementary Series, Vol. IV: Fact-Finders' Report: India-Burma* (New York/London: Harper & Bros., 1932), 153.

[99]Clifford Manshardt, *Facing Facts in Nagpada: An Illustration of the Technique of the Social Survey* (Bombay: Nagpada Neighbourhood House, 1928), foreword.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Social Settlement as an Educational Factor in India. There, Manshardt presented to the reader the sociological ideas underlying the work of the Neighbourhood House and how they were to be adapted to the Indian environment.[100] Amongst his colleagues of the Marathi Mission, however, the book was received with mixed feelings. In a letter to his missionary colleague Alden Clark, J.F. Edwards noted that he felt uncomfortable that Manshardt had left out in his book all 'the dynamic of Jesus on social work'.[101] Alden Clark complained about a 'considerable group of social workers in India who ha[d] reacted against religion, and hence would naturally tend to overemphasize the modern trends in the world against religion.'[102] At Manshardt's study, Clark consequently looked with some anxiety: Manshardt had 'gone further than was necessary in applying to his work in India the principle that seems to be recognized in most settlement work both in England and America'[103], namely, that in view of religious differences social settlements should keep away from religious activities and influences. In his approach Manshardt had, in Clark's eyes, even departed from other, initially similar progressive examples such as the influential social-religious work of the Wesleyan Church in London's East Ham. The concept of the social settlement, a social meeting place in an impoverished urban area open to persons of all classes, races and genders, was the guiding model of the Nagpada Neighbourhood House.

The settlement method had been developed in the late nineteenth century in England, institutionalized in the founding of Toynbee Hall in London's East End in 1884. The movement quickly spread to the USA where social reformers started settlements first in New York and Chicago. In the latter city, where Jane Addams had founded the famous Hull House for women in 1889, the concept also took hold in the University's Theological Seminary where Manshardt received his education.[104] Tara Tilak, too, had been a disciple of the ideal of the social settlement.[105] This was no surprise; the University of Birmingham and its social work class in the Selly Oaks Colleges that Tilak had attended had strong ties to the Birmingham Settlement established in 1899.[106] Since its early days, the settlement movement had provided a venue for a growing number of educated women. This was not restricted to the early centres of the movement in Britain and the USA,[107] but, especially through missionary networks, extended into countries like Japan[108] or, as Tara Tilak's involvement shows, India.

While settlement sociology turned into 'social work' sometimes distinguished from academic sociology, later on, there had been a constitutive and continuing intersection between Protestantism and early sociology, especially in the American context.[109] A 'drive for factual data that could be put to use in alleviating social problems'[110] linked the Social Gospel, the settlement, as well as early academic sociology. Not surprisingly, ABCFM missions had set up settlement experiments in Asia – though much smaller in scale than the Bombay enterprise – even before

[100]Id., *The Social Settlement as an Educational Factor in India* (Calcutta: Association Press, 1931).

[101]J.F. Edwards to Alden H. Clark, 14 August 1931, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 46.

[102]Alden H. Clark to J.F. Edwards, 17 September 1931, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 46.

[103]Ibid.

[104]Mina Carson, *Settlement Folk: Social Thought and the American Settlement Movement, 1885–1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990); Robert Hamilton, 'Social Settlement Houses: The Educated Women of Glasgow and Chicago,' in *Britain and Transnational Progressivism*, edited by David W. Gutzke (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

[105]Tilak, 'Further Openings for Social Work,' 155.

[106]John Glasby, *Poverty and Opportunity: 100 Years of the Birmingham Settlement* (Studley: Brewin Books, 1999).

[107]Hamilton, 'Social Settlement Houses,' 185–214.

[108]Konomi Imai, 'The Women's Movement and the Settlement Movement in Early Twentieth-Century Japan: The Impact of Hull House and Jane Addams on Hiratsuka Raichō,' *Kwansei Gakuin University Humanities Review* 17 (2012): 85–109.

[109]Joyce E. Williams and Vicky M. Maclean, 'In Search of the Kingdom: The Social Gospel, Settlement Sociology, and the Science of Reform in America's Progressive Era,' *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 48, no. 4 (2012): 339–62, here 349; Greek, *The Religious Roots*. For a case study, cf. Elizabeth N. Agnew, *From Charity to Social Work: Mary E. Richmond and the Creation of an American Profession* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004).

[110]Williams/Maclean, 'In Search of the Kingdom,' 349.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Nagpada Neighbourhood House, for example, in China or, as early as 1891, in Japan.[111] Concurrently, however, a major drive behind the professionalization and maturation of the field was the emphasis given by its proponents in separating it from these religious ties. By the 1920s, this demarcation had reached a particular vehemence in American sociology. It would seem natural to interpret the 'secular' work of Tilak and Manshardt – and as such the origins of Indian social work – simply as an extension of these processes. However, it was as much the result of the specific local circumstances of late-colonial India and a changing missiology necessitated by shifting global constellations as an expression of field-immanent differentiation processes.

The integrative and cooperative trajectory of settlement work fitted well with Clifford Manshardt views. He was an advocate of the indigenization of missions, not only in terms of staff but also finances. His experience in the Neighbourhood House (whose budget was raised mostly through non-Christian, Indian sources) had convinced him that there was no reason to not have Indians themselves administer the funds. The keyword in Manshardt's approach was cooperation. Already in its first year, the Neighbourhood House could report to receive funds from three institutions: Manshardt's friends from the Union Church of Hinsdale, Illinois, as well as from two Indian trusts, the N.M. Wadia Charities and the Sir Ratan Tata Trust.[112] The Nagpada Neighbourhood House regularly and eagerly reported that the building, its venues and activities were used by a variety of local associations – Christian, Hindu, Muslim, Jewish, Parsi, non-denominational.[113] In Manshardt's eyes, Indian society's deficiencies lay in illiteracy and poverty. Both these problems he – in contrast to many of his missionary colleagues – considered not rooted in Hinduism or other Indian religions and hence he opted to work together with educated, non-Christian Indians. The consequence of this for Manshardt was the following: 'Under the co-operative conception of missions the function of the church ceases to be that of proselytism. It becomes the bolstering up of Indian life. Converts will come.' To Manshardt, 'the missionary issue ha[d] shifted from converts to co-operation.'[114]

Manshardt assured his readers that he was a Christian, that cooperation would not necessarily mean syncretism, and that he agreed with the 1928 Jerusalem conference that 'in Jesus Christ the Christian religion does have a pearl of price'.[115] But for him, the missionary had to be less of a proselytizer but instead 'preach the gospel of peace, of self-reliance, of the worth of man, of the dignity of labor, of truth, of beauty, and of goodness.'[116] Manshardt's conceptions of the mission went to a point where he discarded proselytization almost completely but provided his own interpretation of 'conversion': as – in reference to Gandhi – 'self-purification' and 'self-realization', convinced that conversion would not 'of necessity involve[. . .] a change of religion'.[117] Manshardt questioned the supremacy of Christianity, criticized much of the previous mission enterprise as 'religious imperialism', and deemed the 'findings of the recent Jerusalem Conference [. . .] a stirring call to advance.'[118] However, only a few years after the 1928 conference, he already confessed disillusionment with its results and afterlife. He felt that little had actually changed in regard to the 'imperialistic missionary message'.[119] Such views mirrored the statements of Mahatma Gandhi of whom Manshardt was an admirer.[120] Many American

[111]Manako Ogawa, "Hull-House' in Downtown Tokyo: The Transplantation of a Settlement House from the United States into Japan and the North American Missionary Women, 1919–1945,' *Journal of World History* 15, no. 3 (2004): 359–87.

[112]'Nagpada Neighbourhood House Completes First Year of Service,' February 1928, 2, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 39.

[113]For example, 'The Nagpada Neighbourhood House in 1935: 9th Year of Work,' ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 45.

[114]Clifford Manshardt, 'Converts or Co-Operation: A Study in Modern Missions,' *Journal of Religion* 8, no. 2 (1928): 204–11, here 210.

[115]Id., 'What Will Succeed Religious Imperialism?,' *Journal of Religion* 12, no. 4 (1932): 526–43, here 535.

[116]Id., 'Some Observations on Mission Policies in India,' *Journal of Religion* 9, no. 2 (1929): 291–96, here 293.

[117]Id., 'What Will Succeed Religious Imperialism?,' 536.

[118]Manshardt, 'Some Observations on Mission Policies in India,' 296.

[119]Id., 'What Will Succeed Religious Imperialism?,' 528.

[120]Ibid., 535.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

missionaries in the field sympathized profoundly with Indian nationalism. At the same time, they were fully aware that their presence in India to a large extent was subject to the toleration of the British Indian government, and hence usually shied away from openly confronting colonial rule.[121]

The Nagpada Neighbourhood House quickly grew into an institution well respected in Bombay. While its success could hardly be denied, Manshardt's approach was far from uncontested. The 'irreligious' character of the schemes gained some suspicion. As Manshardt himself recalled, already when he was chosen to go to Bombay, some voices on the mission board in Boston had questioned his personal religiosity.[122] Clifford Manshardt's cooperation with other organizations went beyond the Neighbourhood House and he was on the boards of numerous of Bombay's social institutions. His most far-reaching cooperation, however, was born out of the social work education programmes in Byculla.

In addition to Tara Tilak's centre for women, the Neighbourhood House had started in 1930 its own small training class for social workers, an annual 1 month course.[123] In 1933, Clifford Manshardt approached the trustees of the estate of the late Dorabji Tata, an Indian industrialist and philanthropist from the wealthy Tata family, who had left his estate for charitable purposes. To Manshardt's surprise, the trust engaged him as an adviser and commissioned him to produce an assessment of how to use the fund's money.[124] At first, Manshardt's suggested the establishment of a 'Bureau of Social and Industrial Research'. Reminiscent not only in name of other endeavours like the IMC's Department for Industrial and Social Research or the Rockefeller Institute for Social, it was to be 'engaged in continuous and organised fact-finding', and Manshardt compared the Tatas' role to enterprises like the New York's based Russell Sage Foundation that supported social scientific research.[125] Indeed, the Tata family's work paralleled in many ways the influential large American foundations. Simultaneously, it represented both industrialist-capitalist concerns and a shift in British-India from community-based charity to organized philanthropy responding to an emerging public sphere and nationalist sentiment. By the 1930s, reluctant support from the British Indian government had pushed the Tatas towards Swadeshi ideas and a cosmopolitan outlook tapping transnational expert networks provided opportunities beyond imperial collaboration.[126]

The cooperation between Manshardt and the Tata trust eventually resulted in the Sir Dorabji Tata Graduate School of Social Work, the first institution of its kind in India, since 1944 known as the Tata Institute of Social Studies (TISS). In its first couple of years, the Graduate School, directed by Manshardt, was housed in the building of the Neighbourhood House and the two institutions worked in close cooperation.[127] In reviewing the Graduate School's programme in 1941, Manshardt himself diagnosed two broad traditions of social work, a British and an American one, the former more occupied with the theoretical and philosophical background of social welfare, the latter more practical in its approach and concerned with applied matters. The Tata School in Manshardt's early conception featured elements from both these traditions, though the director

[121]Chandra Mallampalli, *Christians and Public Life in South India, 1863–1937: Contending with Marginality* (London/New York: Routledge Curzon, 2004), 99.

[122]Manshardt, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers*, 9ff.

[123]'The Nagpada Neighbourhood House: Report of the Sixth Year of Work,' October 1933, 4f., ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, v. 45.

[124]C. Manshardt to ABCFM, 6 October 1934, ABCFMA, ABC 16.1.1, Biographical Collection, Box 48: Manshardt Mr and Mrs Clifford.

[125]'Report by Clifford Manshardt for the establishment of TISS,' 27, Tata Central Archives [TCA], Pune, Box 198, DTT/PHIL/TISS/FP/4.

[126]Mircea Raianu, *The Incorporation of India: The Tata Business Firm Between Empire and Nation, ca. 1860–1970* (PhD diss., Harvard University, Cambridge MA, 2017), 119–49.

[127]Clifford Manshardt, 'Education for Social Work,' *Indian Journal of Social Work* 2, no. 1 (1941): 12–22; J.M. Kumarappa, 'Social Work: A Profession in the Making,' *Indian Review* 42, no. 6 (1941): 346–9; Manshardt, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers*, 84f. A.S. Desai, 'Foundations of Social Work Education in India and Some Issues,' *Indian Journal of Social Work* 46, no. 1 (1985): 41–57.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

considered it slightly more on the American side, seeking it 'to be eminently practical and to apply the best of modern social thought to the solution of our present-day social problems.'[128] Following American models, the Graduate School was a postgraduate course that demanded a college degree as a prerequisite. This, however, proved difficult in India. Most of the applicants had a literary collegiate background and less so one in social sciences which were still in a miniscule state in Indian higher education. The research drive as Manshardt initially imagined it, did not get lost at the Tata School. The school's teaching faculty pursued original research on Indian social conditions and problems and started the *Indian Journal of Social Work*.[129] There was a delicate balancing between social research and practical social work in the School's first couple of decades. The Graduate School was a final step in Manshardt's quest for social work's professionalization and disentanglement from semi-professional religious schemes. It was supposed to 'put charity organization on a scientific basis and thus to eliminate the tremendous waste of much of present so called charity' and to 'make people who are at present willing to do social work, actually competent to do social work.'[130]

As later authors have noted, the influence of the USA on the development of professional social work in India – as in other parts of the world – was substantial.[131] This link continued at the Graduate School beyond Manshardt's departure in 1941. In the following years, American specialists regularly visited the institution, and its Indian faculty went to the USA for training.[132] This was a trend not exclusive to the influential Tata Institute. In the 1950s, these connections were extended through intergovernmental exchange programmes (e.g. the Technical Cooperation Mission and the Council of Social Work Education Exchange Programme) that had a great impact on the growing number of social work institutions and their curricula in India after the country's independence in 1947.

The substantial shaping of Indian social work curricula by American methods and approaches has been criticized retrospectively as having hindered the development of a social work theory and practice adequate for the problems and needs of India. Critics in India have deemed insufficient an approach that was mostly concerned with individual casework rather than community work and invested in curative measures and the adjustment of the individual to its social environment and less with changing the environment itself.[133] Manshardt himself had been aware of these problems and initially imagined the Graduate School to reflect 'that the cultural, economic and social conditions of India differ from those of the West and mak[e] every effort to adapt its materials to Indian conditions[. . .].'[134] In consequence, for instance, the class' orientation courses included material on the rural and village environment reflecting India's predominantly rural composition. Throughout his work in Bombay and India, Manshardt was stressing the need for social legislation and substantial reform policies, which set him apart from more strictly curative trajectories.[135]

[128]Manshardt, 'Education for Social Work,' 16.

[129]Ibid., 15–22; id., 'Education and Social Change,' *Indian Journal of Social Work* 1, no. 2 (1940): 237–44; Kumarappa, 'Social Work: A Profession in the Making'; Manshardt, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers*, 86ff.

[130]C. Manshardt to the Trustees of the Sir Dorabji Tata Trust, 15 May 1935, TCA, Box 199, DTT/PHIL/TISS/Mis/1.

[131]K.S. Mandal, 'American Influence on Social Work Education in India and Its Impact,' *International Social Work* 32, no. 4 (1989): 303–10; Vimla V. Nadkarni and Sandra Joseph, 'Envisioning a Professional Identity: Charting Pathways Through Social Work Education in India,' in *Global Social Work*, edited by Noble/Strauss/Littlechild, 71–83.

[132]Desai, 'Foundations of Social Work Education in India,' 48ff.; Mandal, 'American Influence on Social Work Education,' 305ff.

[133]Mandal, 'American Influence on Social Work Education,' 306; Nadkarni/Joseph, 'Envisioning a Professional Identity,' 71ff.; Denzil Saldanha, 'Towards a Conceptualisation of Social Action within Social Work: Teaching Social Action as a Dialogue Between Theoretical Perspectives and Between Theory and Practice,' *Indian Journal of Social Work* 69, no. 2 (2008): 111–37; P.D. Kulkarni, 'The Indigenous-base of Social Work Profession in India,' *Indian Journal of Social Work* 54, no. 4 (1993): 555–65.

[134]Manshardt, 'Education for Social Work,' 16.

[135]Manshardt, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers,* 8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the chronology of the global development of professional social work from the late nineteenth century to today, Tilak and Manshardt's stories are ones of transition. They fit in between what has been identified as a pioneering phase influenced by dynamics such as the social settlement that saw an exchange mainly from Europe/UK to North America, and the subsequent phase characterized by US leadership and the centrifugal global expansion of its sway over professionalized social work.[136] As we have seen, the Protestant internationalist movement and the search for a Christian sociology were tied to these same historical processes, both in regard to sociological research and applied social work. The consideration of their intersection adds a view outside of the mostly unilateral UK–USA axis, showing that the development of the field – subject to colonial, post- and neocolonial constellations – was substantially affected by the experiences of both Western and 'indigenous' actors. This complicates the narrative of a purely centrifugal post-Second World War spread and acknowledges the role of indigenous aspirations, global networks and local dynamics.

Conclusion

In the milieu of liberal missionaries and internationalists, Clifford Manshardt stands in contrast to figures like E. Stanley Jones, the famous founder of the Christian *ashram* movement in India, who walked a distinctively spiritual path and figured in certain ways as 'religio-cultural ambassadors'.[137] Manshardt, who rarely spoke about his own spirituality, quickly stepped out of traditional missionary work and pursued a distinctive route towards secular and non-denominational concerns, methods and partners.

While Manshardt's experience in Nagpada had made him aware of the need to contextualize and 'localize' social work, his own role can be interpreted as a harbinger of later American professional dominance and the neocolonial tendency inherent in the provision of and dependency on the USA technical aid during the early Cold War.[138] It was a universalist understanding of humanity and human social needs motivating liberal theology and missiology that led Protestant mission workers like Manshardt to develop their 'secularized' social work in distinction to earlier 'imperialist' interpretations of the mission. Ironically, it is the assumed universalism in globalized implementations of Anglo-American social work that postcolonial critics from the Global South since the 1970s have recognized as a hindrance in developing adequate 'indigenous' forms.[139]

Already Manshardt's contemporaries interpreted his efforts as a form of 'Americanism'.[140] Manshardt himself considered the shift in mission and the consequential new approach part of changing global configurations and he perceived the end of the 'isolationist theory' in missions as a parallel to an end of American political isolationism.[141] Missionary research institutes such as

[136]Doreen Elliott and Uma A. Segal, 'International Social Work,' in *Comprehensive Handbook of Social Work and Social Welfare*, Volume I: The Profession of Social Work, edited by K. M. Sowers, C. N. Dulmus and B. W. White (Hoboken: Wiley, 2008), 343–76.

[137]Mark Thomas Edwards, *The Right of the Protestant Left: God's Totalitarianism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 72.

[138]On similar examples of Cold War U.S. foreign aid and development policy in so-called 'developing' countries, cf. John H. Perkins, *Geopolitics and the Green Revolution: Wheat, Genes, and the Cold War* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 2010); Michael E. Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011).

[139]Hans Nagpaul, 'The Diffusion of American Social Work Education to India,' *International Social Work* 15, no. 1 (1972): 3–17; Kwaku Osei-Hwedie and Morena J. Rankopo, 'Globalization and culturally relevant social work: African perspectives on indigenization,' *International Social Work* 54, no. 137 (2011): 137–47; Mel Gray, 'Dilemmas of international social work: Paradoxical processes in indigenisation, universalism and imperialism,' *International Journal of Social Welfare* 14, no. 3 (2005): 231–8.

[140]For example, *The Journalist* 3, no. 6 (1941), 1, ABCFMA, ABC 77.1, Biographical Collection, Box 48.

[141]Manshardt, 'What Will Succeed Religious Imperialism?,' 543.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the DSIR or the ISRR as well as individual figures like Manshardt took part in a 'consultancy game'[142] that later would evolve into Cold War development politics. As the US government in the early phase of the Cold War set up extensive networks of technical and expert exchange not only in social work but also other areas such as agriculture, so did Manshardt's own career take a turn further away from his missionary origins towards government agency – a route from mission to intelligence and diplomacy taken by numerous individuals and organizations, as has been shown recently.[143] After directing the Bethlehem Community Center in Chicago since departing from India, in 1951 Manshardt became an officer in the United States Foreign Service and was deployed until 1963 again to both India and Pakistan.[144]

The 'anti-imperialism for Jesus'[145] displayed by parts of the interwar internationalist liberal, missionary milieu found expression in a close cooperation with non-Christian Indian groups and organizations to whom especially the USA often promised scientific modernity beyond the British Empire. In the case of social work this – ironically – led back to an American dominance in the field close to a 'professional imperialism'. The Indian case confirms this latter historical phenomenon but also complicates it. It dates back the origin story of American social work influence in India to both internationalist and missionary debates. Further, it shows that the dependency was not just indebted to a unilateral expansion of Anglo-American professional ideas, methods and networks, but grew out of local interests and cooperation inevitable in a late-colonial environment. Liberal social Christianity and its ramifications had an appeal to Indians, especially in a US modernist version tied to cutting-edge science and social research.

As missionary 'secular' schemes show, religious groups continued to be significant historical agents far into the twentieth century. Indian forms of secularism similarly were diverse and deeply intertwined with mechanisms of nationalism and late colonialism in a multireligious area.[146] Still, people like Mott, Tilak, Manshardt or the Tatas – their personal religiosity notwithstanding – represented an increasingly secular outlook that made use of science as an institutional and epistemic vessel disentangled from religion. The simultaneously global and localized case of missionary social work thus points to the multiplicity of historical 'secularizations' and 'secularisms' in different geographical, political and cultural constellations.[147]

Michael Philipp Brunner is a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Swiss National Science Foundation and a Visiting Scholar at the Department of Religion, Tufts University, Medford, USA. He completed his PhD at the Institute of History at ETH Zurich, Switzerland.

[142]Kallaway, 'Education, Health and Social Welfare,' 245.
[143]Hollinger, *Protestants Abroad*, 252–65.
[144]Manshardt, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers*.
[145]Cf. Thompson, *For God and Globe*.
[146]Nandini Chatterjee, *The Making of Indian Secularism. Empire, Law and Christianity, 1830–1960* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 4–14.
[147]Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 21.

Cite this article: Brunner MP. 2021. From converts to cooperation: Protestant internationalism, US missionaries and Indian Christians and 'Professional' social work between Boston and Bombay (c. 1920–1950). *Journal of Global History* 16: 415–434, doi:10.1017/S1740022821000103

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022821000103 Published online by Cambridge University Press