Chapter Eleven

Colonial Agents

German Moravian Missionaries in the English-Speaking World

Felicity Jensz

Christian missions throughout the colonial period stood as complex sites of cultural exchange, not only between missionaries and the indigenous peoples amongst whom they toiled, but also between missionaries and the colonial governments under whom they worked. There is no simple formula for the history of missions. Despite the common aim of missionary organizations to follow the instruction of Mark 16:15 or Matthew 28:19–20, which states: "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature", the manner in which this was undertaken, and the situations in which missionaries from various organizations found themselves, differed in complex ways. Within this chapter, the experiences of German-speaking evangelical Moravian missionaries within British colonies and ex-colonies in the nineteenth century are examined to demonstrate that missionaries from the same institution reacted differently to particular cultural and political situations, despite having similar backgrounds and instructions. Moreover, such actions had wide-ranging effects on the indigenous people amongst whom they worked. By following the activities of one Moravian missionary in the British colony of Victoria, Brother Friedrich August Hagenauer, the tensions between missionaries, local governments, mission supporters, local settlers, missionary administrative bodies, and indigenous people are made apparent, demonstrating the historical specificities of these cultural exchanges.

Throughout the world, relationships between colonialism and Christian missionaries were complex. Jane Samson has taken this into account when she cautioned historians of missions not to "marginalize human spirituality and the role of religious belief in influencing attitudes and actions".[1] By contemplating how the belief systems of missionaries impacted upon their work within colonial frameworks, the relationship between missionaries and the state can begin to be clarified. Within the nineteenth-century colonial period there were differences not only between missionaries and the state, but also between colonial officers, traders, settlers and missionaries and the differences between these groups cannot be unambiguously elided. Andrew Porter has noted that missionaries often "saw themselves much of the times as 'anti-imperialist', and their relationship with empire as deeply ambiguous at best".[2] Relationships between imperialism, colonialism, and the Christian missionary outreach were just as complex

as those between the different groups within the colonial world mentioned above. In spite of the intricate nexus between imperialism and Christianity, there were common aims of both government and missionaries, such as those of "civilization" and control of the so-called "native". The rationales behind these aims, however, were often different. Thus, to understand the motives for missionaries entering into indigenous affairs, their cultural heritage, relationships with government, and above all, their faith, must be considered. There were also differences between various missionary organizations in terms of spiritual, cultural and intellectual heritage. The historian Timothy Keegan has argued that a fundamental difference existed between British and German missionaries in the nineteenth century, with British missionaries more likely to mirror the contemporary discourses of imperialism in matters such as race, whereas German Moravian missionaries, somewhat more distanced from imperialism, were more inclined to relegate decisions to providence.[3] For example, Keegan has argued that British missionaries were more likely to ascribe social Darwinian aspects to ethnographic descriptions of heathen people who had failed to convert to Christianity, whereas Moravian missionaries were more inclined to ascribe events to providence, such as that it was not yet God's will.[4]

Such differences between missionary organizations are steeped in the histories and self-perceptions of the churches. The Moravian Church saw itself as a missionary church, and was intent on sending out missionaries to heathen people around the world, especially those judged to be "the lowest of the low", as one Moravian Brother described the Australian Aborigines in 1896.[5] Over decades the Moravians gained a reputation for being successful missionaries through their substantial missionary activity, with many heathen people converting to the Christian faith and many Christian communities formed. The church was not afraid, according to the mission historian Stephen Neill, to send out missionaries to the "most remote, unfavourable, and neglected parts of the surface of the earth", including mission fields where other denominations had failed to convert a single heathen to Christianity.[6] Yet in order to do so, the church relied on the involvement of all members to support its large mission field, as they needed both financial support and personnel to sustain the missions. A large minority of the church's membership worked as missionaries — one in sixty, compared to one in 5,000 for the rest of the Protestant world — and almost everyone within the church contributed in some way to the missionary movement.[7]

From the early eighteenth into the early twentieth century German-speaking Moravian missionaries spread across the new world to all inhabited continents, taking with them their religious fervour and desire to convert the heathen people to their Protestant beliefs, which had been shaped by the Pietist tradition of deep personal devotion. They had begun their missionary work in 1732 amongst the African slaves of the Danish West Indies and by the end of the nineteenth century there were over ninety Moravian mission stations in fifteen mission districts around the globe.[8] As evangelical missionaries, the Moravians had a great impact on the English evangelical revival of the eighteenth century, affecting missionary work beyond their own society.[9] From the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century the age of imperial Britain was at its height. British flags were raised in foreign lands all over the globe, with non-British

missionaries, including many German-speaking Moravians, aiding the British colonizers by civilizing and Christianizing the so-called native heathen in the British domains.

As interlopers in a foreign environment, with foreign languages, laws and customs to navigate — both those of the colonizer and the colonized — the writings of non-British missionaries such as the Moravians provide unique insights into the frameworks of the colonial governments amongst whom they worked.[10] Furthermore, as their mission was global, these writings provide material for comparative analyses of common issues they faced in various locations, as well as providing points of divergence. The Moravian mission was indeed varied with stations in British colonies, including those of North America, Africa, Australia, and Tibet; as well as stations in areas controlled by the Danish, Russian, American, and Dutch colonial systems, such as those found in Africa, the Americas, Europe, and Asia. The present analysis focuses upon the writings of German Moravian missionaries in British colonies and ex-colonies. Through these it can be quickly ascertained that the situations in which missionaries found themselves were complex; that personalities often dominated proceedings; and that missionaries had to respond not only to government demands, but also those from their Board at home, as well as local settlers, and the needs and wants of the Indigenous people amongst whom they worked.

Directions for Development of Mission Fields

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the general direction of the church came from its headquarters in Germany. This was also the seat of the *Missionsdepartement*, the committee in charge of the missionary activities of the church.[11] With so many missionaries scattered across the globe, the Moravian administration kept abreast of developments through prolific communications sent to and from the mission fields, adding many tomes to the extensive missionary writings that had been compiled by missionary organizations over the centuries.[12] The Moravian administration also guided the relationships of its missionaries through various instructions, including booklets of instructions to be used by missionaries in the field, booklets of general regulations with regard to the temporal position of the missionaries and booklets of instructions for congregational members in different lands.

It took some fifty years after the initial missionaries were sent out for the first missionary instructions to be compiled and published. In 1782 a German-language edition appeared, with a second and updated German version printed in 1837. English-language versions (*Instructions for the Members of the Unitas Fratrum, who Minister in the Gospel among the Heathen*) appeared in 1784 and 1840 respectively. The booklet was a template for how missions should be established and conducted across the globe, with the generic instructions devised to apply to all situations and people. Such was the applicability of the Moravian *Instructions* that the Lutheran *Berliner Missionsgesellschaft* incorporated some of them into their own instruction booklet.[13] Despite the apparent flexibility of the *Instructions*, it was obviously unrealistic to expect that they would be

universally followed, given the multitude of different people with different religious and cultural heritages amongst whom the missionaries worked and also the various political regimes under which they lived.

The *Instructions* consisted of advice including: preparation in becoming a missionary (§9); establishing schools for the heathen children (§39); how to behave amongst heathen people of the opposite sex (§41); writing detailed accounts of the mission station for the missionary board (§54); and why not to tempt converts away from other missionary societies (§59). It also advised the missionaries on how to interact with the government:

> [§61] The Brethren [. . .] demean themselves as loyal and obedient subjects, and strive to act in such a manner, under the difficult relations in which they are often placed, as may evince, that they have no desire to intermeddle with the politics of the country in which they labour, but are solely intent on the fulfilment of their official duties.[14]

This was a particularly important instruction, for, as the Moravian historian J. C. S. Manson argued, the Moravian Church's development during the latter part of the eighteenth century was "highly dependent on the attitude of governments and officials who needed to be satisfied that Moravians were neither sectarian at home nor seditious overseas".[15] Mason further argued that: in order to be as amenable to local situations as possible, the Moravians stated their objectives in inter-confessional terms, and their members were taught to hold the laws of whatever land they were in profound respect.[16]

However, sometimes the local governments did not hold the Moravians, or any other missionary society, in great respect. In 1823 Governor Cass of Ohio in the United States reclaimed land that the Moravians had been granted for missionary purposes in Tuscarawas country, desiring to give primacy to commercial farming over mission stations, through his intent to sell the "valuable" land on which the missions were located.[17] Five years later in the State of Georgia a similar situation arose, demonstrating the governing body's unfavourable stance towards the use of land for missionary purposes and more broadly the political conditions in North America towards indigenous people. Until 1829 the Georgian Government had tolerated missionary attempts amongst the Cherokee, after which Andrew Jackson was elected the seventh President of the United States of America. The Federal Government however actively tried to dissuade such work, due in part to the European settlers' coveting Cherokee land that was previously protected by federal treaties. Regarded by Jackson as "savages" not "able to meet the standards required for equal citizenship", the Cherokee were effectively turned into second-class citizens as laws were passed in the Georgian legislature that took away all native title, abolished their tribal government, and denied them their right to testify in court.[18] The Moravians, as well as other missionaries, had difficulty in responding to these laws. In analysing the situation, the historian Andrew McLoughlin has suggested that "the missionaries felt trapped. If they spoke out against removal, whites would accuse them of meddling in politics. If they

did not at least let the Cherokees know where they stood, they would lose all respect and influence among them."[19] The Moravians, although allowed to criticize the government rulings, were instructed not to meddle in state politics.[20] They turned for advice to their governing body, which told them to vacate the mission field if they could not pursue missionary labours peacefully. They complied, leaving the Cherokee to their own devices.[21]

Methodists also worked amongst the Cherokee at this time and for them a similar key article in their Discipline stated that it was the missionary's duty to abide by the laws of the land in which they resided, and to keep the laws of state and church separated.[22] Although the Methodists risked their personal freedom to support the Cherokee and stay on as missionaries, McLoughlin concluded that the Methodists ultimately failed the Cherokee Nation on "the critical issues of dignity and patriotism".[23] Yet, as other historians have noted, the Georgian Government was also to blame for hindering the mission stations.[24] Combined with the active interference of the Federal Government, the result was a relatively small and ineffectual mission to the south-eastern Native Americans.[25]

Conversely, where governments did support Moravian mission fields, Moravians were often considered successful in terms of the spiritual and material longevity of mission. This was evident in the British Government's support of the Moravian south-eastern mission to the Inuit, which resulted in effective and successful missions in both far North America and Greenland. In Labrador, moreover, the Moravian success was seen to be due to the British Government's support for the mission, which was partly given as a way to secure the land mass for the British Crown; the inhospitable landscape also deterred any competing interests for the land.[26] The success of the Labrador mission stations was aided by the fact that they had exclusive, Crown-granted trading rights on the lands surrounding their mission stations.[27] Another example of the symbiotic relationship between Moravian missions and colonial governments was the South African field, where the Cape Colony Government invited the Moravians to establish a mission in the 1820s. As they were well aware of their "status as aliens on sufferance in a British colony", they acted in a deferential and politically conservative way, winning them the support of the government in the early nineteenth century to expand their missionary activity.[28]

Moravian Perceptions of the Australian Government

In the Australian mission field the Moravians had responded to a request in 1841 to send missionaries to colonial Victoria, which had come through the secretary of the British arm of the church, Brother Peter La Trobe, who himself was the brother of the first Lieutenant Governor of the Colony of Victoria, Charles Joseph La Trobe.[29] Peter La Trobe put forward three reasons as to why a mission field should be established in Australia. The first was that it was the church's desire to bring the word of God to what he described as "poor, despised creatures, who are on the lowest level". The second reason was that current opinion amongst the English, and even of the Archbishop of

Dublin, was that *only* the Moravian Church could be successful amongst the "degraded" Aborigines. The third reason was that:

> So many favourable conditions for the Mission concern come together and that is; that the Colonial government in England and besides from that, 3 of the 4 Colonial Governors of [Australia] are completely interested and they are using their influence.[30]

Thus, the three reasons related to internal perceptions, external perceptions and perceived material and government support. After much discussion and time, two Moravian missionaries arrived in Australia to establish a station that they named Lake Boga in 1850, almost ten years after La Trobe's initial suggestion. The mission closed in 1856 without converting a single Aborigine to Christianity and with the failure blamed, by both the missionaries and their supporters in Australia, on the government's lack of support.[31]

The critical stance towards the government in this particular case was also broadly levelled towards British colonial policy in later situations. For example, in an 1882 history of the Moravian Church in Australia, the German Moravian historian H. G. Schneider wrote critically of English colonial rule:

> England came into the possession of the continent of Australia in a very cheap way. Cook travelled there and declared it property of the English crown; with that it belonged to the same. That he did not ask the male Papus [Aborigines] their opinion, or their agreement, one will not find astonishing. In any case, no other country would have considered to do the same if they were in possession of the power which England had. One is also not allowed to trust in any of our modern states, such [. . .] charity, that he for the sake of the unhappy, heathen Aborigines wishes to take on the colonisation of strange lands, and it is indeed the civilisation and order, which a Christian state carries along, is a blessing for heathen tribes, which tear each other to pieces and eat each other. We want, however, to keep it a little in mind, that the Papus were the actual masters and owners of New Holland, and that the land was taken from them by the white strangers, and not bought, as happened to the Indians of America from the first settlers.[32]

Schneider viewed British acts of colonization as more devastating than those of other colonial powers. This was despite many other atrocities that European powers committed towards indienous people across the globe — the Spanish in Mexico being one bloody example — and despite the fact that Germany's own oppressive colonial history had not yet been fully played out.[33] Schneider also deemed indienous people in need of Christianization, and assumed their own spiritual beliefs to be inferior to European Christian beliefs. Furthermore, he stated that Australian Aborigines were treated worse than other indienous people, such as indigenous Native Americans, notwithstanding the Moravian's own negative experiences within that country. The American experience was defined through an horrific event in which American militia

slaughtered ninety-six Christian Moravian Indians at Gnadenhutten, Ohio on 8 March 1782 during the American Revolutionary War. These innocent people were killed as they were supposedly colluding with the enemy.[34] Yet in spite of such horrendous violence levelled towards Christian Native Americans, the Australian Aborigines were deemed to be in a worse position than other indienous people as they had been forcefully dispossessed of their land and had not been given the opportunity to engage in commercial transactions over it — regardless of how unscrupulous these transactions may have been. Criticism toward the British Government's treatment of indigenous inhabitants was, it seems, permissible by the Moravian Church as long as it did not involve the missionaries contravening their instructions not to "intermeddle" in the politics of the country in which they worked.

After the Lake Boga failure, the Moravians returned to Australia in 1859 to establish the Ebenezer Mission in the north-west of Victoria. Although the Moravian Church and its missionaries had lost confidence in the colonial government, they nevertheless needed to work within the confines of government regulations. This, however, did not stop the missionaries criticizing the government in letters sent back to Germany.

Some of the first criticisms of the government were sent less than a year after the Ebenezer Mission was established. The missionaries' expectations of support had clearly not been met, with the young Brother Friedrich August Hagenauer writing back to headquarters:

> The Government – As we came to Melbourne in the year [18]58, everything seemed to go smoothly, however, experience has taught us differently . . . We still have [after a 14 month waiting period] no land! And when will we receive it? . . . We don't know what will happen, if the government won't give [us support]. This support is not always certain, in that, as far as I know, the Church Mission on the Murray received nothing last year. A tribe at the Goulbourne [River] applied for agricultural implements etc. but didn't receive any.[35]

Similar to missionaries in other parts of the globe, the Moravian missionaries in Victoria preferred to fund their mission stations through outside bodies rather than rely on their church. However, as the above quote indicates, government funding for missions of any denomination could not be relied upon in Victoria. Moreover, even if government funding was free-flowing it was often at the expense of missionary freedom, for, as Norman Etherington's chapter in this volume argues, although government assistance was initially welcomed by missions in South Africa, it was often "a poisoned chalice" as it made missionaries beholden to the state's wants.

An alternative source of funding for missions, including for the Moravians in Victoria, was the Christian public. As the Moravians saw themselves as the "handmaid of the other larger Churches",[36] they actively sought donations from members of other Protestant churches. The missionaries had hoped that the mission would be able to be self-supporting, or at least not be a burden to the homeland, yet the Christian public in Victoria was initially unwilling to provide this much needed financial support.[37] Thus, caught between an unsupportive government and an unwilling public, the

Moravian missionaries struggled economically. Furthermore, the difficulties of the early days of the mission were accentuated by the lack of Aboriginal engagement. By the 1870s, however, a number of Indigenous people had converted to Christianity for reasons that included economic necessity, family obligations, beliefs, or strengthening relationships between Indigenous people and the mission. This success, which was showing signs of promise from the early 1860s, was applauded by the Christian public, with the Presbyterian Church offering to support the establishment of a mission in the east of the colony if the Moravians supplied the missionaries. The Moravians agreed to this "experiment" and in 1862 the Ramahyuck Mission in Gippsland was established.[38]

In spite of the growing success of the missions in converting Aborigines and providing schooling opportunities, the missionaries still complained about the amount of administrative interference in Indigenous affairs in Victoria. Hagenauer, at this point the manager of the Ramahyuck Mission, was particularly vocal in his displeasure with committees, when he wrote to the *Missionsdepartement* of the Moravian Church in Germany: "You dear Brothers . . . are probably thinking, 'there was no end to committees in Australia, and that they grow like mushrooms' [emphasis in the original]".[39] He thus indicated his frustration at the multitude of administrative obstacles that he had to navigate in the running of a mission. Furthermore, the Moravian missionaries complained not only about the amount of secular administration, but also about the state's interference in the spiritual side of the mission, and what they perceived to be the un-Christian stance of the government in relation to Aboriginal affairs. This became more apparent in the later years of the mission stations, when the Moravian missionaries compared Christian work and success in converting Aborigines to Christianity on the colony's three mission stations with the work in the cultivation of souls on the three main secular government reserves. In the eyes of the Moravian missionaries, and in particular Hagenauer, the government reserves were inadequate for teaching the Christian word. He argued that "there should be only Mission Stations in the colony" as they "had been far better managed than the Government Station, and had cost nothing to the state". Christianity, he claimed, served Aborigines better than the government.[40] Strictly, however, this was problematic as the mission relied on land grants from the government and government supplies to support the mission residents.

Furthermore, Hagenauer's own religious affiliations were malleable when he saw it to be politically advantageous. In 1869 he became an employee of the Presbyterian Church, which conferred on him "the full status of a minister of [their] Church", which allowed him to be drawn into the politics of other Christian denominations in Victoria.[41] In accepting the appointment, however, he made it clear to the Moravian administration that he did so only to further his missionary work, and that "he wanted only to belong to the Moravian Church, and not to leave them", reiterating his strong commitment to the Moravian faith.[42] His association with the Presbyterian Church was congruent with the Moravian Church's view of themselves as the "handmaid of the other larger Churches".[43] This supports Porter's notion that "missionaries viewed their world first of all with the eyes of faith and then through theological lenses".[44] In 1871 the Church of England honoured Hagenauer when it appointed him superintendent of

its Aboriginal mission station at Lake Tyers, just a short distance from the Ramahyuck Mission. This appointment allowed him to participate in administrative duties pertaining to the Church of England's mission. He commented to the *Missionsdepartement* that this was "proof of the appreciation and love that the Church of England has towards the dear Moravian Church". He thus deflected recognition on his own behalf, as well as any need to justify his political or religious positioning to his own church body.[45] Through these positions Hagenauer became responsible to the administrative bodies of both the Presbyterian Church and the Church of England, as well as to the government through the Board for the Protection of the Aborigines (BPA), which was ultimately responsible for the administration of Aboriginal mission stations and reserves within the colony. Through all this, however, he remained beholden to the Moravian Church's administrative bodies, and, through his fervent beliefs, ultimately to God.

The "Double-Position" of Victorian Moravians

The Victorian mission field was an exception for the Moravian Church. The missionaries had a "double-position" as both missionaries and government officials responsible for distributing rations to Aborigines. According to Adolf Schulze, the author of an early twentieth-century Moravian official history, the missionaries in Victoria were "rather dependent on the Government".[46] Thus, they needed to fulfil both their secular and religious functions by working closely with the government. This situation differed from that of the Moravian missionaries in North America, where from the mid eighteenth century the Moravians had undertaken mission work amongst the Delaware Indians. Due to both social and political pressures, the missionary congregations were relocated numerous times across Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York, moving when physically in danger or when unable to continue the mission due to political interference.[47] Finally in 1782 a more permanent mission station for the Delaware was established in Upper Canada (present day Ontario, Canada) as the Canadian Government offered better protection than that available in the United States.[48] The political climate of eighteenth-century North America was different from nineteenth-century Victoria. Indeed, there were no international borders for the Moravians in Victoria to cross to continue their mission under a more supportive government, nor was colonial Victoria the war zone that eighteenth-century America was. However, the Moravian experience amongst the Delaware, and their subsequent desertion of the mission field to the Cherokee in Georgia in the nineteenth century, clearly demonstrated that other options were available to the Moravian missionaries, which did not include such close connections with government bodies and active engagement within the colonial system as Victoria.

Within the Victoria colonial environment, Hagenauer became an agent of the state above and beyond his position as a public servant handing out government supplies and rations, to the extent that he became a member of the Board for the Protection of the Aborigines (BPA). The BPA, established in 1869 through an Act of parliament,

was responsible for the "management and control" of Victoria's Indigenous inhabitants.[49] In 1889 Hagenauer was offered the role as general inspector for the BPA; his responsibilities for the Board increased the following year with his appointment as its secretary. In the years leading up to his appointment he had worked closely with this secular committee, particularly in relation to its discussion over options for the future of the mission stations. By the 1880s the number of "full-blood" Aborigines, to use the terminology of the day, on the mission stations was falling, with many mixed descent Aborigines living "civilized" and Christian lives on the missions. This caused political unrest, as funding to Aboriginal mission stations and reserves was limited. Some public discontent was levelled at maintaining mission stations and reserves for "half-castes", as they were deemed capable of earning their own living. The BPA asked Hagenauer to submit a plan for "how these people would be dealt with justly and kindly", in response to which he submitted a proposal "like one used before in South America", which, he claimed, "was adopted by the Board with very few omissions".[50] The resulting piece of legislation was the so-called "Half-Caste Act" of 1886, which bore the full name of *An Act to amend an Act intituled 'An Act to provide for the Protection and Management of the Aboriginal Natives of Victoria'* (No. DCCCCXII). As a consequence of this Act, Aboriginal people were classified in racial terms. Those of mixed decent under the age of 35 were ejected from mission and government stations, and their access to rations was curtailed over a seven-year period, after which rations were completely stopped. These actions broke up families and forced many into abject poverty.[51]

Hagenauer approached the "Half-Caste Act" with predominantly spiritual outcomes in mind. His role on government boards contradicted the *Instructions* but it also reflected his desire that a religious voice be heard in relation to Indigenous affairs. He was a Christian blinkered to the racial discrimination rife around him, believing that, because Victoria was a Christian land, with its churches and schools everywhere, the former mission residents would be well catered for in the sphere of religion, and that a benevolent society would not discriminate against his "flock".[52] He conceded to headquarters, however, when writing about the beginning of the end of the Victorian mission stations, that "to speak about it in human terms, it almost seems as God does whatever pleases him".[53] Moreover, when informing his administration in Germany about the Act, he diminished his own input into it by deferring responsibility to God: if God pleased, God would do the best for the "poor people".[54] He thus underscored his belief in providence above all else, further dismissing his contravention of the *Instructions.* He thereby deflected attention from his own agency in shaping a draconian and destructive piece of legislation by attributing it to God, whose attested omnipotence rendered redundant the powers of mortal believers. Hagenauer saw himself as nothing other than an instrument of God; he therefore could not conceive of the destructive consequences of his actions for the people affected by the 1886 Act. Once the Act had been approved he lamented that, although he had done his best for the "half-castes", he was sceptical of the government's ability to deal with the question and thought it "would probably be put to the side".[55] It was not, and with the Act enshrined in law, the number of Indigenous people on the missions fell further. The result was the slow fading to closure of the Moravian missions in Victoria within a couple of

decades, and the continued struggle for Indigenous people to survive in the harsh social environment of colonial Victoria.

In reflecting on the history of the Moravian mission in Victoria in the context of the Moravian Church's bicentenary of mission work, the Moravian historian Adolf Schulz wrote:

> The mission-work in southern Australia, whose short history we have just had an overview of, was, and stayed, from the very beginnings only a small twig on the world-wide mission tree. It could never show off with large numbers [of converts]. But one should nevertheless award it a mission history of no small importance. For it had supplied through deeds the irresistible proof of the efficacy of Evangelism, which was able to raise also the most deeply sunken people in both their external living standards as well as in their ability to be spiritually cultivated, and above all to raise them in their religious lives.[56]

Schulz's comments aptly describe the Moravians' experiences of southern Australia: compared to the global Moravian mission enterprise the Australian endeavour was small, yet it followed the "civilizing and Christianizing" paradigm of all Moravian stations, despite the belief that the Australian Aborigines were the most "deeply sunken" people, both materially and spiritually. Overall, the text demonstrated the Moravian notion that each of the mission sites across the globe were but one part of a broader enterprise of spreading the Christian word to the farthest reaches of the earth, including to the many inhabitants of the British colonies. As we have read, however, every single "twig on the world-wide mission tree" had its own peculiarities, despite the common goal of the Church.

Moravian missionaries around the globe faced many difficulties in their quest to convert the heathens. As men and women of devout faith and strong attachment to their church, they subscribed to the church's grand narrative of how a mission should be established and how missionaries should behave. Yet, once in the field, the missionaries had to grapple with situations that lay beyond the realms of Moravian experience, and, thus, could not be shaped through generic *Instructions* from home. Specific directions from Germany could also be discounted if found unpalatable by missionaries, with the missionaries blaming the tyranny of distance for their otherwise apparent insubordination.[57] Yet despite occasional lapses, Moravian missionaries generally identified strongly with the aims of their church. Hagenauer's own attachment to the Moravian Church profoundly shaped his work in colonial politics, and thereby influenced Aboriginal secular affairs. However, above and beyond the complexities of local politics, Hagenauer's belief in divine providence reigned supreme and it was through this lens that he viewed the colonial government. As a confidante and subsequent employee of the government, Hagenauer, unlike his North American colleagues, paradoxically could make decisions in his secular capacity that would impact on his missionary work. And, despite Schulz's characterization of Australia as being a "small twig", the secular work in which Hagenauer was involved was of no small consequence for the lives of Indigenous people far beyond the borders of the missions. Thus, although the abiding

global aim of the Moravian Church was to save the souls of heathens across the globe, the manner in which this was undertaken and the outcomes for Indigenous people were crucially dependent upon the situations in which the missionaries found themselves. There is no singular historical narrative of the Moravian Mission in the British world. Rather, what becomes evident through a comparative analysis of missionary endeavours is that a complex understanding of broad historical and contemporary positions is essential to understanding significant interactions upon multiple sites of cultural exchange.

Notes

1 Samson, "Landscapes of Faith", p. 93.
2 Porter, *Religion Versus Empire?*, p. 13.
3 Keegan, *Moravians in the Eastern Cape*, pp. xxii–iii.
4 Keegan, *Moravians in the Eastern Cape*, pp. xxii–iii.
5 La Trobe, *The Moravian Missions*, p. 42.
6 Neill, *A History of Christian Missions*, p. 237.
7 Hassé, *Women's Work*, p. 3.
8 Libbey, *The Missionary Character*, pp. 12 & 14–15.
9 Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, p. 40; Mason, *The Moravian Church*, p. 89.
10 This theme is explored in relation to the Colony of Victoria, Australia in: Jensz, *Influential Strangers*. Note that in reference to Aborigines current usage is to capitalize 'Indigenous'.
11 Hamilton, *The Moravian Manual*, pp. 69–70.
12 Etherington, "The Missionary Writing Machine", pp. 37–50.
13 The *Berlin Missionsgesellschaft* provided a book of instructions for their missionaries in South Africa modelled on Spangenberg's Instructions. See: Richter, *Geschichte der Berliner Missionsgesellschaft*, p. 128 and pp. 131–2.
14 Spangenberg, *Instructions for Missionaries*, p. 68.
15 Mason, *The Moravian Church*, p. 8.
16 Mason, *The Moravian Church*, p. 8.
17 *National Advocate*, Monday August 25, 1823, col F. [no page number].
18 McLoughlin, "Cherokees and Methodists", p. 51.
19 McLoughlin, "Cherokees and Methodists", p. 51.
20 Spangenberg, *Unterricht für die Brüder und Schwestern*, §61, pp. 85–7.
21 McLoughlin, "Cherokees and Methodists", p. 58.
22 McLoughlin, "Cherokees and Methodists", p. 45.
23 McLoughlin, "Cherokees and Methodists", p. 63.
24 Stock, "A Resume of Christian Missions", pp. 368–85.
25 See for example: Graham, *Medicine Man to Missionary*; Wallace, "They Knew the Indian".
26 Whitely, "The Moravian Missionaries", pp. 76–92.
27 Richling, "'Very Serious Reflections'", pp. 148–69.
28 Keegan, *Moravians in the Eastern Cape*, pp. xix–xx.
29 Mason and Torode, *Three Generations of the La Trobe Family*, p. 26.
30 Protocoll des UAC [PUAC], 1841, 23 February, #5, p. 176, Unitäts-Archiv [UA] Herrnhut, Germany.
31 Jensz, "Writing the Lake Boga Failure", pp. 147–61.
32 Schneider, Missionsarbeit, pp. 50–1.
33 For an overview of German colonial history see: Timm, *Deutsche Kolonien*.

34 For an overview of the influence of the massacre at Gnadenhutten for further missions in North America see: Westmeier, "Becoming All Things to All People", pp. 172–6.
35 Hagenauer to Th. Reichel, 11 November 1860, Papers of the Moravian Missions in Australia, Microfilm [MF] 177, AIATSIS.
36 Libbey, *The Missionary Character*, p. 7.
37 Hagenauer to Th. Reichel, 11 November 1860, MF 177, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.
38 Badham to Th. Reichel, 1860, 10 October, R.15.V.I.b.6.a (1860), UA.
39 Hagenauer to Th. Reichel, 1866, 24 May, Manuscript [MS] 3343, National Library of Australia (hereafter NLA), p. 62.
40 Hagenauer to Morris, 1875, 29 December, MS 3343, NLA, pp. 109–11.
41 Hagenaur to Th. Reichel, 1869, 2 December, MS 3343, NLA, p. 370.
42 Protocoll der Missionsdepartement, 1870, 9 March, #7, UA, p. 111.
43 Libbey, *The Missionary Character*, p. 7.
44 Porter, *Religion Versus Empire?*, p. 13.
45 Hagenauer to Th. Reichel, 1871, 23 March, MS 3343, NLA, p. 422; Hagenauer to W. E. Morris Esq., 1871, 3 April, MS 3343, NLA, p. 422.
46 Schulze, *200 Jahre Brüdermission*, p. 573.
47 See: Römer, *Die Indianer und ihr Freund David Zeisberger*; Wellenreuther and Wessels, *The Moravian Mission Diaries of David Zeisberger*.
48 Bowes, "The Gnadenhutten Effect", pp. 107–17.
49 *First Report*, p. 11. See also: Chesterman and Galligan, *Citizens without Rights*, p. 17.
50 Hagenauer does not clarify where or when this plan was implemented. Hagenauer to Hardie, 1885, 19 January, MS 3343, NLA, p. 597.
51 See for example: Wilkinson, "Fractured Families".
52 Hagenauer to Connor, 1884, 9 June, MS 3343, NLA, pp 583–9.
53 Hagenauer to Connor, 1882, 3 June, MS 3343, NLA, p. 537.
54 Hagenauer to Connor, 1884, 24 March, MS 3343, NLA, p. 581.
55 Hagenauer to Connor, 1884, 24 March, MS 3343, NLA, p. 581.
56 Schulze, *200 Jahre Brüdermission*, p. 575.
57 See PUAC, 1861, 9 April, #16, p. 38, UA; PUAC, 1862, 10 May, #17, p. 149.