

**Seeking Balance between the Church and State:
A Review of Christian Higher Education
in China in the 1920s**

Chen-Main Wang

National Chung-Cheng University

I. Introduction

Even since its missionaries came China in large numbers in the late Ch'ing, Christianity has found it very difficult to shake off the color of "foreign religion" because of its close relationship with foreign governments and because of the lack of indigenization of its Christian culture and rites. Although Christian churches have also engaged in many charitable, educational and technical enterprises, these "good works" have not changed the image of Christianity to the Chinese public. Because of this background, every rising tide of nationalism would possibly trigger an examination of the role of Christian churches and of their related institutions in China.

The period of the 1920s was the highest stage of the anti-Christian movement in the Republican period. Among many anti-Christian activities, the appeal and measures of Educational Rights Recovery Movement was new and outstanding. The significance of this movement was the participation of many educators with rational and scholarly arguments in criticizing missionary education in China and in urging the recovery of educational rights by the Government. This challenge effectively gave impetus to church schools and Chinese Christians and also promoted a dialogue among churches and also between academic people and Christian

educators. This became an important feature of the Anti-Christian Movement.

In the past, a few scholars have paid attention to the Educational Rights Recovery Movement, but, few of them have done research on this topic through the approach of nationalism.¹ Therefore, the response of church people to the national sovereignty and nationalism has remained obscure. Furthermore, previous studies on this Movement usually gave a general survey of the criticism and response of all Christian schools and, thus, failed to illustrate the uniqueness of Christian higher education .

This paper will examine the response of Christian colleges to the challenge of nationalism in the 1920s. The scope of the discussion will be limited to the exchange of viewpoints without dealing with the more popular topic of anti-Christian activities against Christian schools. In fact, the difference of the Educational Rights Recovery Movement from other anti-Christian movements was that the former had a set of educational principles which originated from the educational ideals of the "nationalistic school" (Kuo-chia chu-i p'ai), which challenged the position of church schools and provoked the subsequent reflections of church educators. The first part of this paper will provide a short introduction to the origin and development of Christian colleges with the purpose of showing what they had become in the 1920s. The second part will discuss how educators of the "nationalistic school" criticized Christian college education. The third part will study the reflections and improvements of college education conducted by Christian educators .

II. The Origin and Development of Christian Education

Protestant missionaries began to establish schools not long after they went to China in the early nineteenth century. From the missionary discussion on Christian education, we can sum up a few purposes:

1. Using schools as a medium to enlighten Chinese people in order to pave the way for the Truth;
2. Introducing new knowledge to China and making Chinese understand that the origin of the wealth and power of Western countries came from Christianity;
3. Making schools become preaching institutions which offered the message of God to non-believing students;

4. Offering a Christian environment to the children of believers who then would not be influenced by worldly thought;
5. cultivating students as the missionary assistants in the future; and
6. cultivating students as future leaders of Chinese churches and Chinese society, who might lead China to Christianity.²

Missionaries could only afford to establish elementary schools and high schools in the first half of the nineteenth century. They did not have a smooth development. The major problems had come from the shortage of manpower and of financial sources as well as the antipathy of the Ch'ing government.³ Their higher education did not unfold until the second half of the nineteenth century. Although they had the name of colleges or universities, they had not reached the standard of full colleges.⁴

There was a major change in Christian education in late Ch'ing. One of the reasons of this change was the new atmosphere in Chinese society. Because of frequent contact between Chinese and Westerners, the Chinese now had better understanding of Western nations and church schools. Western knowledge at this time has become the secret of wealth and power in the eyes of Chinese reformers. Church schools which offered Western knowledge therefore had great appeal to Chinese youth. Another reason is that the Ch'ing government abolished the civil service examination in 1905 and the traditional schools lost their attraction in the competition for receiving students. Job opportunities for the graduates of church schools were also enlarged in government, industry, and commerce. All the above had made for increased enrollment of students in church schools, even to the extent that some schools could not issue more admissions because of their limited capacity.⁵

Encouraged by this environment, missionaries advocated the development of higher education which caused the vigorous growth of Christian colleges in China.⁶ Some denominations adopted the policy of the incorporation of high schools into colleges, some combined colleges into a university, and others established new universities. We may say that the fifteen major Christian universities were all founded in the early twentieth century.⁷

When missionaries founded church schools in China, these schools did receive the recognition of the Ch'ing government because of their discrepancies with Chinese educational system and with the requirement of

the civil service examination. Later, when it established the imperial system of schools in 1902, and adopted a new school and educational system when it abolished the civil service examination in 1905, the Ch'ing government did not pursue jurisdiction over foreign schools in China.⁸

Because of the governmental discrimination against the church schools and their graduates, missionaries did try to get the government recognition through diplomatic approaches. Both the ministers of the United States and Great Britain had informed the Ch'ing government at different times about missionary proposals in which they were willing to give the supervision of their schools to the government in exchange for the equal treatment of their graduates by the government. However, the Ch'ing government did not accept these suggestions.⁹

But in the Republican period, the government did try several times to include church schools into the national system of education. In 1917, 1920 and 1921 the Peking government had openly expressed their gratitude for the missionary contributions to Chinese education and agreed to treat church schools as ordinary private schools and their graduates in the same way as those of other Chinese schools if church schools should register themselves with the government and followed the rules and regulations set by the Ministry of Education. However, not many church schools responded favorably to the government's suggestion because they either were not satisfied with the educational system of China or wanted to keep their special privileges in China.¹⁰

The alternative for church schools on this matter was to secure charters from an American university, a state government of the United States or other foreign governments. The advantage of this measure included: 1) to confer recognized Bachelor degrees; 2) to facilitate the acceptance of their graduates by Western colleges and graduate schools; 3) to better their position to solicit funds in the United States.¹¹

Since church schools did not ask the recognition and supervision of the Chinese government, they were not subject themselves in any way to the educational system of China. The management and administration of church schools were in the hands of foreign missionaries and denominations which usually adopted the school model of their home countries or their denominational church education.¹² Moreover, because of their failure of understanding Chinese customs and culture and because of their lack of

efforts towards contextualization of their schools, missionary teaching and administration had often made church schools a controversial subject in China.

Since the purpose of church schools was in tune with the mission, the contents of their education had a large share of religion, Bible, and ethics. They also offered some courses in humanistic fields and, later, courses in social sciences. Some universities placed special emphasis on law, medical science, or agriculture. Generally speaking, their teaching was out of balance because their teaching staff was filled by missionaries who in turn were sent by different denominations. Therefore they could not maintain the stability of their teaching and sometimes left certain courses offered in name only. A veteran Chinese educator has commented that the only course which was practical to students was English, the others could not meet the need of the time.¹³

English education became one characteristic of church schools of the time. In the World Missionary Conference of 1910, missionaries were sharply divided in their opinions about teaching English.¹⁴ While some schools urged to adopt Chinese as the teaching medium in their education, others advocated the use of English because of the convenience of teaching Western knowledge and its popularity.¹⁵

The great majority of missionaries went to China without a good background in Chinese language and Chinese culture. Consequently, they were not able to teach in Chinese when they took part in educational services. Another reason for them to place strong emphasis on English was that more and more Chinese students had become interested in studying English. Most church schools wanted to maintain this great advantage in attracting or keeping students.¹⁶ In the meantime, in order to study English, students were willing to pay a high tuition which monies could lessen the economic burden of church schools. Under these circumstances, English had become an important subject in church schools, some schools did not even use Chinese language except for teaching Chinese. Therefore, Chinese students there usually were poor in Chinese language and literature. This policy in teaching English and its subsequent results had later incurred criticisms from nationalistic scholars and anti-Christian activists in the 1920s.

Another problem was that missionaries often adopted a seminary-like system for their church schools. In addition to necessary courses in religion, students also had to participate in chapel services, prayer meetings, YMCAs,

and evangelical meetings. ¹⁷ Professor Jessie G. Lutz points out that education in many instances was even subordinated to religion. ¹⁸

Since Christian colleges and universities opened their doors to all Chinese students, Christian students were only a rather small percentage of the whole student body. Those non-Christian students felt a great deal of repulsion against missionary administration, compulsory Christian courses, as well as religious activities. ¹⁹ Since the Christian colleges did not properly accommodate themselves to the changing students and society, these early customs and traditions of church schools became a liability during the rising tide of nationalism in the 1920s.

III. The Educational Philosophy of Nationalistic Scholars and the Educational Rights Recovery Movement

The origin of nationalistic education could be traced back to educational discussion in early Republican China. This kind of educational philosophy was strengthened in the anti-religious discussion of the New Cultural Movement. ²⁰ However, most criticisms of religious education or Christian education before 1922 were based on its unscientific spirit, its contradiction of the freedom of thought. ²¹ A great number of essays concerning nationalistic education did not appear until 1922. The foundation of these essays which promoted anti-Christian education and the Education Rights Recovery movement was based on the concern for the Chinese People and Chinese nation-state.

The promotion of nationalistic philosophy mainly came from the Nationalist Youth Corps and its official organ, *Hsing-shih chou-pao* (Awakening Lion Weekly). ²² They often used the term "kuo-chia chu-i" (nationalism) for the substitution of "min-ch'u chu-i" (people-ism). In other words, they paid more attention to the concept of nation and urged the identity of the individual consciousness with that of the nation. ²³ The leader of that group, Ch'en Ch'i-t'ien, stated: "The real spirit of the 'kuo-chia chu-i' is just to pursue the unity of the nation domestically, and to pursue the independence of our nation in the world. " ²⁴

Most of the leaders of nationalistic group were educational people who paid extraordinary attention to the importance of education in the promotion of nationalism. They were also convinced that education would produce

useful results in the restoration of the nation. Therefore, they affirmed that education should be planned and executed by the government in order to have a nationalized and unified system of education. Ch'en Ch'i-t'ien presented their suggestions to the government in four points: (1) to declare a clear and definite principle of national education; (2) to firmly establish a policy of national education; (3) to mark out the budget for national education; and (4) to supervise national education under strong discipline.²⁵

These concepts gradually developed into the theory of the "National Rights of Education." They suggested that since education had become a must to save and strengthen the nation, the educational task should be in the hands of the government. Ch'en Ch'i-t'ien gave four reasons to support the theory of the "National Rights of Education." The four reasons could be summarized to say that education was an kind of national sovereignty, a national business, a national instrument, and a national system.²⁶ For the above reasons, he held the opinion that education should not be in the hands of any individual, foreign people, church, political party, or local government, or chaos or even the downfall of the nation might happen. If an educational institution was not yet under the supervision of the nation, the government should recover its educational rights as soon as possible .

The practical actions of the recovery of educational rights were unfolded through the stimulation of two incidents in 1922. The first one was the publication of two Christian books, i.e., *The Christian Occupation of China* and *Christian Education in China*.²⁷ The former was an investigative survey of the development of Christianity in China in the first two decades of the twentieth century. According to this survey, the number of Christians grew four times, church schools developed very fast and the enrollment of students increased three times to reach 240,000.²⁸ The latter was a report of the China Educational Commission of 1921-1922, in which it stated that the purpose of the education of church schools in China was, either directly or indirectly, to preach the Christianity and to reach eventually the stage of a Christian China.²⁹ These two books immediately alarmed the nationalistic scholars and became the evidence they cited when they criticized church schools.

Another cause of alarm to the Chinese educators was the schools which were sponsored by the Japanese in Mukden. The Japanese had established more than four hundred and fifty schools (from kindergartens to universities)

there, which stressed the education of Japanese language and culture, and even adopted a colonial interpretation in teaching history and politics.³⁰ This state of affairs also became a focus that the activists of the Educational Rights Recovery Movement often mentioned and discussed.

The earliest response to the rapid expansion of church schools was the *Hsin chiao-yü tsa chih* (New Education Magazine), which cited several Christian sources, including *The Christian Occupation of China*, to show that the enrollment of students in church schools had grown from 4,000 in 1876 up to 245,000 in 1920.³¹ Although the editor of that magazine did not add any words to this chart, these statistics were enough to draw the attention of educational circles to Christian schools. Three months later, criticisms from the nationalistic viewpoint have been launched. Yü Chia-chu wrote an essay entitled "The Problem of Church Education" in which he said,

The most dangerous to the Chinese people is church education. The most sorrowful thing in Chinese history is that [foreign] churches obtained the rights of preachment and education.... The loss of educational rights was the natural result of [foreign] armed invasion.... What is the purpose of church education?.... Taking the report of the China Educational Commission [i . e . *The Christian Education in China*], . . . "Now is the hour of opportunity so to strengthen the Christian schools of China that from them shall come the men and women who will make China a Christian nation.... But this is not yet settled whether Christian education is to be the determining force or a relatively insignificant and diminishing factor in Chinese factor.... On the answer to this question will largely hang the decision whether China will become a Christian nation, perhaps the stronghold of Christianity in future centuries." From these two sections, [we] can see that church schools were established thoroughly for the purpose of preaching the religion .³²

Since he thought that church education de-nationalized Chinese, and hindered the unification of Chinese education, Yü Chia-chu then suggested to add an article on the neutrality of education in the constitution and establish the law to prohibit religious teaching and activities on campus.³³ Yü's article not only combined all the viewpoints of anti-religious educators but also definitely presented a set of measures to recover the educational

rights. It received the attention of various people and was often cited by other scholars.

The Nationalist Youth Corps strengthened their position in nationalistic education and the Educational Rights Recovery Movement by adding to their constitution an article on October 13, 1923, which runs as: "to promote nationalistic education in order to cultivate the spirit to love the nation and to protect the [Chinese] people; oppose the church education which denationalizes [the Chinese] and their cultural policy which is close to invasion."³⁴

The Nationalist Youth Corps had tried to present their ideas and measures to some educational societies. The first try was in the third annual meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Education in July 1924. However, their proposal met criticisms from Christian scholars and was modified into a weak case.³⁵ They failed again the next year because of the opposition of the Christian educators.³⁶

However, they gained a victory in another battle. When the United Educational Meeting of China held its annual meeting in October 1924, most members were from the Corps and therefore were easily able to pass two resolutions to recover the educational rights from foreigners. The first resolution was to ban the foreign control of schools in China and the second to prohibit the preachment of religion on campus.³⁷

Ch'en Ch'i-t'ien, the editor of the *Chung-hua chiao-yü chieh*, was also an activist of the Educational Rights Recovery Movement. Ch'en published a special issue of that magazine in February, 1925 and used the title "The Special Issue of the Educational Right Recovery Movement." The eleven essays of that issue discussed problems of various church schools from the elementary level to universities. These articles also elaborated the measures which would recover the administration of church schools. The later scholars included three points of their measures: non-cooperation, the establishment of a special institution to recover the educational rights, and pushing the government to pass related laws and ban church schools.³⁸ This appeal became louder and wider along with the outbreak of riots in church schools and the May 30th Incident.³⁹

In this situation, the Peking government issued six mandates on foreign schools. The contents of these mandates are:

- Clause 1. All grades of schools established by contributions from foreigners, if carried on according to the regulations and laws issued by the Ministry of Education governing different grades of schools, may apply to the local educational administrative offices for recognition.
- Clause 2. Such schools must have their names begin with "Private" and must have in their announcements the words "Private School. "
- Clause 3. The principal of the school should be a Chinese. If the present principal is a foreigner, there must be a Chinese vice-principal who will be responsible for the application for recognition .
- Clause 4. If the school or college has a board of directors or managers, a majority should be Chinese.
- Clause 5. Schools shall not make the propagation of religion their aim.
- Clause 6. The curriculum of the schools shall be in accordance with that announced by the ministry and religion shall not be included as a required course." ⁴⁰

The 1928 regulations of the Nationalist Government were stronger, requiring the head in all schools to be Chinese, demanding strict conformity with the curriculum standards set by the government and forcing all church schools to be registered with the government within a certain period. ⁴¹

Up to that time, the educational philosophy of the nationalistic group had been put into practice as the laws of the nation. Therefore, the discussion about the recovery of educational rights became less and less. As for the Anti-Christian Movements, their numbers had switched their interest to anti-imperialism from 1925 on. The Educational Rights Recovery Movement had come to an end .

IV. The Response of Christian Circles

Christian churches responded differently to the challenge of the nationalistic scholars because of different denominations, lack of coordination among churches, and the different stages of development of the church in China. In general, there were two phenomena among Christian churches. The first one was to adopt the attitude of rebuttal against the criticism before 1925 and the attitude of reflection after 1925. The second

phenomenon was that most open opinion was in favor of the recovery of the educational rights. Those who disagreed seldom stated their opinion in publications.

Although some Christian people had suggested in the past to register church schools with the government and to follow the regulations of the Ministry of Education, their opinion did not get wide-spread attention and discussion in Christian circles. Therefore, once the Nationalist Youth Corps raised the proposal of the Educational Rights Recovery Movement, church circles did not have a unified opinion in response to the criticism. At the beginning of the Movement, Christian educators were strongly motivated to rebut the criticisms and to defend the church schools. For example, Christian educators criticized the proposal of the nationalistic scholars in the third annual meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Education. ⁴²

The *Chen-kuang* (True Light) published Wang Pi's article in the seventh issue of the 23rd volume to question the timing of the Movement. Wang did not think China could immediately take over the educational rights from church schools. The four points he gave were: 1) Is the Chinese government strong enough to take back the educational rights? 2) How can we found established schools in substitution of church schools? 3) Do we have the ability to establish schools in rural China as many as churches? 4) How can we switch youth's admiration of the West and church schools to China and Chinese schools? ⁴³

As stated before, the voice of rebuttal declined very soon. More and more church people tended to support the accommodation of church schools to changing China and the new rules of the government. Many articles in church publications studied the measures of the Educational Rights Recovery Movement. ⁴⁴ Several Christian educational societies also passed resolutions hiring more Chinese and making schools more Chinese. ⁴⁵

The National Christian Council had done a survey of Christian educators' attitudes toward the six mandates of the Peking Ministry of Education. Two hundred and fourteen church leaders agreed to register church institutions with the government while 19 said no, 13 would decide the problem based on the category of the institutions. As for "whether private schools have the freedom of preaching," 177 said yes with the proper respect to students' freedom of faith, 54 suggested to preach outside of the

classroom and 16 thought that schools should pay attention to education and leave preaching to the church. ⁴⁶

The church people were specially worried by articles Five and Six, "the goal of school education should not be evangelistic" and "the course curriculum should follow the standard issued by the Ministry of Education." The Christian educators on the one hand appealed to the government about the difficulty in carrying out the government regulations while expressing the willingness of the church to follow registration requirements; on the other hand, they asked the government to clarify articles Five and Six. ⁴⁷ The reply of the Peking Government of July 6, 1926 showed that the Government only forbade the regulation of required religion courses and required attendance at church services, but allowed the existence of religious courses as elective courses and the existence of religious bodies on campus which still could preach the Gospel through some personal contacts. ⁴⁸ Then, after understanding the position of the government, articles often appeared in church newspapers urging bodies to get in tune with governmental policies on education. ⁴⁹

A few articles were published in Christian magazines to support including religious courses as elective courses. For example, Wu Lei-ch'uan said that if students did not take them because they were elective courses, the schools then had no reason to enforce students to study what they were not interested in. The school administrations should find good teachers and improve the way of teaching. ⁵⁰ Another Chinese author said that compulsory instruction would produce "verbalism and formalism." ⁵¹

The significant point of the response of Christian schools was that school authorities changed their way of campus evangelism and adopted some indirect ways to preach, such as putting Biblical literature into the English courses, putting Bible history in the history course, adopting preaching by personal example instead of preaching by giving lessons, and offering elective courses on Christianity as distinct from the required courses in the past. ⁵² Chinese Christians not only gradually took over the school administration but also paid attention to Chinese history and literature. Yenching University was the most successful example. It not only began from June 1926 to publish the "Yenching Journal," which concentrated on the studies of Chinese culture, but also established the Harvard-Yenching

Institute to promote and expand research and academic activities on Sinology . 53

Under these positive responses, the criticism from the outside of the schools gradually declined and so did the opposition from the inside of the school also decrease. According to a later investigation, about one third of students voluntarily attended services and took religious courses. 54

Conclusion

The exchange of thoughts between Christian circles and nationalistic scholars in the 1920s might be considered a beneficial interaction by and large. On the one hand the goal of the Educational Rights Recovery Movement had been reached, on the other Christian education had been improved and had become more Chinese and more suitable to modern China. The change in Christian schools paid consideration to both nation and religion.

It was quite clear that whether one considers the in contents of teaching, the mission or the school administration, Christian college education of the 1920s were not in tune with contemporary China. Although this issue had been raised in some investigative reports or articles, school administrations had adopted no action, measure or remedy for these problems. The awakening to the problem and the subsequent reforms of Christian colleges did not start until the nationalistic scholars launched their criticisms and attacks on Christian education in the wave of the Educational Rights Recovery Movement. Looked at from this angle, Christian colleges lacked foresight, initiative, and an understanding of the tide of the time.

Christian colleges in China, like Western denominations, were not actively adopting the policy of contextualization. That is the reason that Christian colleges in China seemed to be no different from Western colleges or seminaries. As critics often pointed out the whole campus was full of a Western atmosphere and did not have enough respect for Chinese culture and politics. This point proved that contextualization should not only be a matter of the church, but also the church schools as well as other Christian institutions.

In response to the criticisms, churches and church schools usually displayed a tendency of self-examination. However, in the early period of the Recovery Movement, Christian educators and the graduates of church

schools rose up, defended Christian education and clarified some misunderstandings. These actions effectively restrained the rampant development of criticism of Christian education. However, in church publications, this kind of defence and clarification could only be seen in the later period, and therefore not only lessened the effect of their function, but also could not properly reflect the standpoint of Christian educators .

The major impact of the Educational Rights Recovery Movement on Christian higher education was on the college administration and on the contents of the curriculum. In the field of college administration, most colleges decided to follow the government rule by appointing a Chinese as the head of the educational institution and organizing a school board with a Chinese majority. Although some missionaries might have been unwilling to accept the devolution and some Chinese educators might lack training and experience in administration, Christian colleges registered themselves with the government and became accredited higher education institutions in China. ⁵⁵

As for the conformity with curriculum standards set by the government, although a segment of church people opposed this policy, Christian educators were aware that the compulsory study of religious courses would arouse great antipathy both within and without the campus. A number of students of Christian colleges had joined the Anti-Christian Movement because of it. Church people also understood that Christian faculty and staff were the people who played the crucial role in campus evangelism. ⁵⁶ One Christian university later found that Christian teachers and students in their joint effort in campus evangelism could produce a more satisfactory result than under the old system. ⁵⁷

One more point which is worthy of mention is that the result of Christian education should be tested by its fruit. Many nationalistic scholars in their criticism suggested that church education would de-nationalize Chinese and could only produce "yang-nu" (foreign slaves). This has proved to be an incorrect prophesy. Christian colleges cultivated many distinguished Chinese leaders who have made significant contributions to modern China. For example, Wei Cho-min, the President of Hua-Chung University, later said that according to his knowledge no graduate of the two Christian universities that he was familiar with had served the Japanese government in the later Second Sino-Japanese War. ⁵⁸

In general, the examination of Christian education in China in the 1920s decided the relationship between church and state on Christian campuses in the future. As for Christian higher education, this examination was healthy and useful. It not only determined the future role of Christian colleges in Chinese society but also pushed them to contribute more to Chinese education. Another significant point is that the reflection of church people on maintaining a balance between the church and state represented progress in Christian education in China and also offered a good reference to future development of church education in China.

Notes

1. The previous works in this field, for example, include Lutz, Jessie G. *China and the Christian Colleges, 1850-1950* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971); Yang Ts'ui-hua, "Fei tsung-chiao chiao-yü yü shou-hui chiao-yü ch'üan yün-tung (1922-1930)" (Anti-religious education and the Educational Rights Recovery Movement, 1922-1930). M.A. thesis, National Cheng-chi University, 1978; Hu Kuo-t'ai, "Tsao-ch'i Mei-kuo chiao-hui tsai-hua chiao-yü shih-yeh chih chien-li" (The Early Establishment of Educational Enterprise by American Churches). M. A. thesis, National Cheng-chi University, 1979; Li Yü-yin, "Chin-tai Chung-kuo Chi-tu-chiao chiao-yü chih fa-chan" (The Development of Christian Education in Modern China). M.A. thesis, Tunghai University, 1983; and Ku Ch'ang-sheng, *Ch'uan-chiao-shih yü chin-tai Chung-kuo* (Missionaries and Modern China) (Shanghai: Jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1981).
2. These six points are concluded from the above works.
3. Wang Shu-huai, "Chi-tu-chiao chiao-yü-hui chi-ch'i ch'u-pan shih-yeh" (The Educational Society of China and Its Publication Work), *Chin-tai-shih yen-chiu-so chi-k'an*, 2 (June, 1971): 366-7.
4. Lutz, Jessie G. *China and the Christian Colleges, 1850-1950*, p. 33.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-8.
6. For example, missionaries, in the Centenary Missionary Conference which was held in Shanghai in 1907, urged the development of higher education in China because "the effort now being put forth is in no sense commensurate with the opportunities at our door." Fenn, William P. *Christian Higher Education in China, 1880-1950* (Michigan : William B. Eardmans Publishing Co., 1976), p . 43 .
7. *Ibid.*, p. 44-70.
8. Shu Hsin-ch'eng, *Shou-hui chiao-yü-ch'üan yün-tung* (The Educational Rights Recovery Movement) (Shanghai: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1927), p. 15 .
9. The Ch'ing government seemed to want to resolve all extraterritorial rights all at once and therefore did not want to discuss the educational rights at that time. Lutz, Jessie G., *China and the Christian Colleges, 1850-*

- 1950, pp. 205-206. Of course, some missionaries did not want to have the supervision of the Chinese government .
10. "Report of the China Christian Educational Association, " *Annual Report of National Christian Council* (Shanghai, 1926), pp. 195-211.
 11. Lutz, Jessie G., *China and the Christian Colleges, 1850-1950*, pp. 53-4.
 12. For example, an all Christian education meeting was held in February 1924. Only one fifth of two hundred and fifty representatives were Chinese. Wei Cho-min, "Ssu-shih nien lai wo-kuo Chi-tu-chiao ti kao-teng chiao-yü" (Christian Higher Education in China in the Past Forty Years), *Chin-lin Shen-hsüeh yüan ssu-shih chou-nien chi-nien t'e-k'an* (Special Issue Commemorating the 40th Anniversary of the Nanking Theological Seminary) (Nanking: Nanking Theological Seminary, 1950), p. 52.
 13. *Ibid.*
 14. Fenn, William P., *Christian Higher Education in Changing China, 1880-1950*, p. 123.
 15. About discussion on this issue, see, *ibid.*, pp. 122-125; Lutz, Jessie G., *China and the Christian Colleges, 1850- 1950*, pp. 70-1, 174-6.
 16. Leger, Samuel H. *Education of Christian Ministers in China: As Historical and Critical Study*. Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1925, pp. 17-8.
 17. As for an analysis of the contents of Christian colleges, see, Miao, C. S. "The Religious Education of Students in Christian Colleges and Universities in China," *International Review of Missions* 14 (1925): 100-7.
 18. Lutz, Jessie G., *China and the Christian Colleges, 1850-1950*, pp. 71-2.
 19. Yip, Ka-che, *Religion, Nationalism and Chinese Students: The Anti-Christian Movement of 1922-1927* (Bellingham, WA: Western Washington University, 1980), p. 33.
 20. Yang Ts'ui-hua, "Fei tsung-chiao chiao-yü yü shou-hui chiao-yü ch'üan yün-tung (1922-1930)," pp. 41-51, 62-3.
 21. Lü Shih-chiang, "Min-ch'u chih-shih fen-tzu fan-Chi-tu-chiao ssu-hsiang chih fen-hsi" (An Analysis of the Anti-Christian Thought in the Early Republican China), *Chung-hua min-kuo chien-kuo-shih t'ao-lun-chi* (Proceedings of Symposium on the History of the Republic of China) (Taipei: Editorial Committee of Proceedings, 1981); and Cha Shih-chieh, "Min-kuo shih-nien tai fan Chi-tu-chiao yun-tung ch'an-sheng ti shih-tai pei-ching" (The Background of the Anti-Christian Movement in 1920s),

- Chung-hua min-kuo li-shih yü wen-hua hsüeh-shu t'ao-lun-chi* (Proceedings of Symposium on the History and Culture in Republican China) (Taipei: Editorial Committee of Proceedings, 1974), pp. 381-415.
22. Lutz, Jessie G., *Chinese Politics and Christian Missions : The Anti-Christian Movements of 1920-1928* (Notre Dame, IN: Cross Cultural Publications Inc., 1988), pp. 113-4.
 23. Li Huang, "Kuo-min chiao-yü and kuo-min tao-te, " in Li Huang and Yü Chia-chü (ed.), *Kuo-chia chu-i ti chiao-yü* (Taipei: Tung-ch'ing ch'u-pan-she, 1974), p. 71.
 24. Ch'en Ch'i-t'ien, "K'an-hsin chuan-hao yin-tuan--Kuo-chia chu-i ti chiao-yü yao-i, " *Chung-hua chiao-yü-chieh* 15.1 (July 1925): 1 .
 25. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.
 26. Ma Ch'ao-lin, "Wo-kuo chin-tai kuo-min chiao-yü ssu-hsiang ti yen-pian" (The Development of the Concept of National Education in Modern China). M.A. thesis, National Cheng-chi University, 1981, pp. 144-5.
 27. For an introduction to these two books, see, Ku Ch'ang-sheng, *Ch'uan-chiao-shih Yü chin-tai Chung-kuo*, pp. 258-62, 346-50.
 28. Stauffer, M. T. (ed.) *The Christian Occupation of China: General Survey of the Numerical Strength and Geographical Distribution of the Christian Forces in China, 1918-1921* (Shanghai: China Continuation Committee, 1922).
 29. Christian Educational Commission, *Christian Education in China: A Study Made by an Educational Commission Representing the Mission Boards and Societies Conducting Work in China* (New York: Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Mission Conference of North America, 1922) .
 30. Lutz, Jessie G., *Chinese Politics and Christian Missions: The Anti-Christian Movements of 1920-1928*, pp. 116-7.
 31. "Ch'üan-kuo Chi-tu chiao-hui hsüeh-hsiao hsüeh-sheng li-nien tseng-chin piao" (The Chart of the Gradual Increase of Students of Christian Schools in China), *Hsin Chiao-yü* 5.4 (November 1922): 863.
 32. Yu Chia-chu, "Chiao-hui chiao-yü wen-t'i" (The Problem of Church Education), in Chang Ch'in-shih (ed.), *Kuo-nei chin shih-nien lai chih tsung-chiao ssu-ch'ao* (The Tide of Religious Thought in China during the Last Decade) (Peking: Yenching Mandarin School, 1927), pp. 305-9 .
 33. *Ibid.*, pp. 315-38.

34. Yang Hsiao-ch'un, "Chi-tu-chiao chih hsüan-ch'üan yü shou-hui chiao-yü ch'üan yün-tung" (The Propagation of Christianity and the Educational Rights Recovery Movement), *Chung-hua chiao-yü chieh* 14.8 (February 1925) :4.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7; as for the discussion of this case in the meeting, see, "Tisan ts'u hsüeh-shu hui-i" (The Third Academic Meeting), *Hsin chiao-yü* 9.3 (October 1924):441-8.
36. Tsao, H. C. "The Nationalist Movement and Christian Education," *The China Christian Year Book 1928* (Shanghai: Christian Literature Society, 1928), p. 176.
37. Yang Hsiao-ch'un, "Chi-tu-chiao chih hsüan-ch'üan yü shou-hui chiao-yü ch'üan yün-tung," pp. 5-6.
38. Yang Ts'ui-hua, "Fei tsung-chiao chiao-yü yü shou-hui chiao-yü ch'üan yün-tung (1922-1930)," pp. 74-5.
39. Ch'ang Tao-chih, "Shang-hai ts'an-sa shih-chien yü shou-hui chiao-yü-ch'üan chih chi-hui" (The Massacre in Shanghai and the Opportunity to Recover the Educational Rights), *Chung-hua chiao-yü chieh* 15.6 (February 1926) :5-10.
40. Shen, T. L., "The Educational Agitation," *The Chinese Recorder* 58 . 7 (July 1926) : 475 .
41. Li Yü-yin, "Chin-tai Chung-kuo Chi-tu-chiao chiao-yü chih fa-chan," p. 211.
42. Cha Shih-chieh, "Min-kuo chiao-hui shih, III," (History of Protestant Christianity in Republican China , III), *Kuo-li T'ai-wan ta-hsüeh li-shih hsüeh-hsi hsüeh-pao* (Bulletin of the Department of History, National Taiwan University), 10-11 (1984): 443-6 .
43. Wang Pi's viewpoints were quoted in Wu Chen-ch'un's article. Wu Chen-ch'un, "Chiao-hui hsüeh-hsiao yü Chung-kuo chiao-yü ti ch'ient'u" (Church Schools and the Future of Chinese Education), *Chen-li chou-k'an* 2.20 (August 11, 1924) : 1.
44. Hsü Pao-ch'ien, "Tui-yü i-pan fan-tui chiao-yü che so-ch'ih li-yu ti fen-hsi" (An Analysis of the Reasons Which Were Held by the People of Anti-Christian Education), *Chen-li yü sheng-ming* (Truth and Life) 2.3 (March 1927):63-5; Chao Kuan-hai, "Fan-chiao feng-ch'ao chung chiao-hui yin-you ti tzu-hsin" (The Self-examination Which the Church Should Have in the AntiChristian Movement), *Wen-she Yüeh-k'an* 1.9-10 (September 1926) :33-44; Ch'en Yün, "Chi-tu-chiao tui-yü tsui-chin shih-

- chu tang-yu ti 'ai-tu ho tsuo-shih" (The Attitude and Measures that Christianity Should Have toward Contemporary Political Affairs), *Wen-she Yueh-k'an* 3.3 (January 1928) :1-13; Liu Chan-an, "Fan-tui Chi-tu-chiao chiao-yü chih i-pan p'ing-lun" (The General Comments of Anti-Christian Education), *Chung-hua Chi-tu chiao-hui nien-chien* (China Christian Church Yearbook), 8 (1925) :122.
45. Liu Chan-an, "Fan-tui Chi-tu-chiao chiao-yü chih i-pan p'ing-lun" (The General Comments of Anti-Christian Education), p. 122; and "Chung-hua Chi-tu-chiao chiao-yü-chieh hsuan-yen" (The Statement of Chinese Christian Educational Circles), in Shaw Yu-ming (ed.), *Erh-shih shih-chi Chung-kuo Chi-tu-chiao wen-t'i* (The Christian Issues of Chinese Christianity in the 20th Century) (Taipei: Cheng-chung shu-chü , 1980) , pp. 453-8 .
 46. The result of this survey was published in the *Chen-kuang* 35.11 (October 1926) :41-2.
 47. Miao Ch'iu-sheng, "Chi-tu-chiao chung-teng chiao-yü kai-k'uang" (The General Situation of Christian Secondary Education), *Chung-hua Chi-tu chiao-hui nien-chien* (China Christian Yearbook), 11(A) (1920-30): 4:52.
 48. *Ibid.*
 49. Wallace, E. W. "Christian Education in 1925," *The China Christian Yearbook 1926*. (Shanghai: Christian Literature Society), 1926. pp 220-30.
 50. Wu Lei-ch'uan, "Chiao-hui hsüeh-hsiao tang ju-jo yin-fu shih-chü" (How Should Church Schools Deal with the Contemporary Political Affairs?) *Chen-li yü sheng-ming* (Truth and Life) 2.3 (March 1927): 51.
 51. Chu, King, "Compulsory Religious Instruction," *The Chinese Recorder* 57.5 (May, 1926): 343.
 52. Yang Ts'ui-hua, "Fei tsung-chiao chiao-yü yü shou-hui chiao-yü ch'uan yun-tung (1922-1930)," pp. 131-2.
 53. West, Phillip, *Yenching University and Sino-Western Relations, 1916-1952* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), pp. 187-94.
 54. Miao Ch'iu-sheng, "Chi-tu-chiao chung-teng chiao-yü kai-kuan," p. 4:63.
 55. As for the missionary attitude toward the devolution, see Henninger, Janet Elaine, "The American Board in China: the Missionaries' Experience and Attitude, 1911-1952." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1981, chapter 6.
 56. Liu, Herman C. E., "Christian Education in China," *Chinese Recorder* 59.12 (December 1928): 765.

57. Barber, Dorothy Dickson, "What is Religious Education," *The Chinese Recorder* 59.11 (November 1928): 720.
58. Wei Cho-min, "Ssu-shih nien lai wo-kuo Chi-tu-chiao ti kao-teng chiao-yü," p. 53.