

Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Digital Commons @ Disciples History

Discipliana - Archival Issues

2002

Discipliana Vol-62-Nos-1-4-2002

Newell Williams

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/discipliana>



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

DISCIPLIANA

The Quarterly Historical Journal of the
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

Mark G. Toulouse

MILLENNIAL AMERICA AND THE VISION OF PEACE IN THE THOUGHT OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL

Craig M. Watts

Kirkpatrick Historians' Seminar

April 26-27, 2002
Nashville, Tennessee

Nancy and Joe Stalcup Seminar for Local Church Historians

September 12-14, 2002
Nashville, Tennessee



Volume 62 • Number 1 • Spring, 2002

Published by DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Peter M. Morgan, President (morganpm@aol.com)

Founding Editor Claude E. Spencer

Editorial Committee D. Newell Williams, Editor (nwilliam@cts.edu)
Douglas A. Foster
Loretta Long
Henry E. Webb
Karen-Marie Yust
Richard J. CheroK

Editorial Consultants Carisse Berryhill Paul M. Blowers
James O. Duke Richard T. Hughes
David A. Jones Erma Jean Loveland
Mark G. Toulouse Daisy L. Machado

Board of Trustees Officers Chairperson James R. Reed
Vice-Chairperson Gordon B. Dalrymple
Secretary Priscilla E. Jackson
Treasurer Robert H. Edwards

DISCIPLIANA (USPS 995-060) is published quarterly for \$20.00 per year by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society which was established in 1941 "to maintain and further interest in religious heritage, backgrounds, origins, development, and general history of Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, Churches of Christ and related groups." Members of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society receive *DISCIPLIANA* quarterly, along with other benefits. Annual membership categories are: Sustaining - \$50 to \$249, Participating - \$30, Regular - \$20, Students - \$10.00, Non-U.S. - \$25. Life Memberships are: Life - \$250, Life Link - \$500, Life Patron - \$1,000.

Contributors to *DISCIPLIANA* should submit manuscripts on 3.5 floppy disk in Wordperfect 5.1 or "text" format. Electronic manuscript submission via "text only" formatted e-mail or attached file accepted at dishistsoc@aol.com. Postal mail should be addressed to: *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 Nineteenth Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196.

Phone: (615) 327-1444. Fax: (615) 327-1445. E-mail: dishistsoc@aol.com.
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society Home Page: <http://users.aol.com/dishistsoc>
Periodical postage paid at Nashville, TN.

Copyright 1997. Disciples of Christ Historical Society
Indexed by Restoration Serials Index
ISSN 0732-9881

Indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals, the Index to Book Reviews in Religion, Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975- on CD-ROM, and the ATLA Religion Database on CD-ROM, published by the American Theological Library Association, 820 Church Street, Evanston, IL 60201-5613. atla@atla.com <http://atla.library.vanderbilt.edu/atla/home.html>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 - 19th Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196. Please give both old and new addresses and attach a mailing label from an old issue. USA: Please provide nine-digit code (ZIP+4).

-From the Editor's Desk

The role of North American Christians in God's work in the world has been a concern of Disciples since the days of Alexander Campbell. In "The Kingdom of God and Disciples of Christ" Mark Toulouse traces the history of Disciples understandings of the connections between the kingdom of God and world mission, focusing primarily on the period from 1900 to 1968. Toulouse begins with a discussion of Alexander Campbell's notion of the kingdom of God. Toulouse finds in Campbell the seeds, though only occasional expressions, of a too close identification of God's kingdom with the efforts of the church and American culture that Disciples consistently embraced through the 1950s. At the same time, he identifies in Campbell's understanding of God's kingdom a corrective for that too close of an identification between Christian America and the Kingdom of God. Toulouse concludes that the Disciples' experience with world mission has taught them to distinguish gospel from culture and expanded their vision of how God is at work in the world. Toulouse's paper was delivered as the Historical Society's Kirkpatrick Lecture at Christian Theological Seminary October 25, 2000, and provoked lively discussion.

Following Richard Hughes, Craig Watts' "Millennial America and the Vision of Peace in the Thought of Alexander Campbell," argues that Campbell increasingly expressed confidence in America's role in God's work in the world from the mid-1840s until the late 1850s. Nevertheless, Watts shows that Campbell's identification of America with God's work in the world was always tempered by his pacifism. America would foster the work of God, for Campbell, only as long as it fostered the ways of peace. Thus, again following Hughes, Watts concludes that the outbreak of the Civil War caused Campbell to reassess his understanding of America's role in God's work in the world.

In the midst of The United States' War on Terrorism, North American Christians would do well to reflect on their role in God's work in the world.

-D. Newell Williams

-From the President's Desk

I cannot live without books.

Thomas Jefferson, 1815

Reading nurtures the church. One of the expanding ministries of this Society is the dissemination of historic literature. Let me detail the expansion.

In 1996 we began a home-page catalog of previously-owned books for sale, which has been used far beyond expectation. Often we have orders by e-mail within minutes of posting new entries. Check it out at

<http://users.aol.com/dishistsoc>

The church is being nurtured.

We also recently passed along a religion library intact. In the stewardship of caring for the estate of Eva Jean Wrather, Society founder, (see *Discipliana* Vol. 61, No. 4, Winter 2001) we contacted Heritage Christian University in Florence, Alabama. They were delighted to add to the college religion library and to pass along some of those books to their international students who will take them to their parts of the world. The church is once again being nurtured.

Our latest venture is the creation of a "browse and buy" room here at the Phillips Memorial building in Nashville. Members and friends of the Society will be able to relax in a carpeted, comfortably furnished room as they sample materials, including videotapes. I just finished reading Gary Holloway and Doug Foster's *Renewing God's People: A Concise History of Churches of Christ*. I will hand it to Director Sara Harwell with a card stating, "This brief historical survey and commentary on the Churches of Christ make it easily accessible to lay readers." The church is nourished.

The church continues to be nurtured by the efforts of this Society. Our founders' vision of a reasonable, make-sense faith is a rich legacy which we are committed to continue. Come by cyberspace and come in person and participate in this rich heritage. Come join us in nurturing the church.

-Peter M. Morgan

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

Mark G. Toulouse*

Introduction

Throughout American history, theological meanings associated with the phrase “kingdom of God” have changed dramatically. As H. Richard Niebuhr pointed out in broad strokes over sixty years ago, there have been at least three prominent themes associated with the kingdom of God: the sovereignty of God, the kingdom of Christ, and the coming kingdom. The three notes associated with these themes, of course, are faith in the power of God, the love of Christ, and the hope of ultimate redemption.¹ Ideally, these three themes are, at their best, inseparable ideas in a comprehensive theology of the kingdom of God. However, in reality, the content associated with them, through encounter with the every day living of the church’s life in America, has been diluted thoroughly, and the ideas themselves have often become separated one from another. As Niebuhr summarized the changes, “the sovereign God became the rule of an absentee monarch, the kingdom of Christ became a religious institution, . . . the coming kingdom, insofar as it was judgment, became a familiar and unreal crisis [and] insofar as it was promise it came to be either a fairly certain future prosperity and peace or an equally comfortable heaven to which souls were admitted by an indulgent God on recommendation of his kindly son.”²

It will likely be no surprise to any reader that the Disciples understanding of the kingdom of God has also witnessed substantial change in meaning. After all, Disciples were born in the USA, and have, throughout their history, been particularly susceptible to the shifts and leanings of American culture in general.

I intend to offer here a general accounting of ways Disciples have understood or utilized the phrase “kingdom of God” in order to further a sense of their mission as a church. For the most part, this paper will concentrate on the period between 1900 and 1968, roughly the life span of the United Christian Missionary Society. As stated in Article III of the UCMS founding documents, the object of the Society was “to engage in any . . . form of Christian service that will help to bring in the Kingdom of God, in which His will shall be done as in heaven so on earth.”³

Before moving so quickly to notions of the kingdom in the twentieth century, however, I want to say a few things about the nineteenth. Alexander Campbell’s understanding of the kingdom left a significant legacy for the movement he founded, though it is important to note the shifts in emphasis that took place in the century following his death. In order to appreciate more fully both the similarities and differences, I want to begin with some brief comments about Campbell’s notion of the kingdom of God.

*Mark G. Toulouse is Dean and Professor of American Religious History at Brite Divinity School, Fort Worth, Texas.

I. The Postmillennial Kingdom of God: The Legacy of Alexander Campbell

Alexander Campbell enthusiastically represented a postmillennial understanding of the kingdom of God. This type of understanding was prominent in Campbell's time. The name originates from the belief that Christ would return at the end of the millennium rather than at its beginning. Characterized by a profound optimism about the ultimate success of the evangelistic mission of Christianity, postmillennialism expressed the belief that God's work through the church would usher in the millennium. Most nineteenth-century scholarly postmillennialists emphasized the grace of God rather than the action of human beings. But postmillennialism also tended to emphasize the expectant success attending the efforts of human beings who evangelize on God's behalf.

Campbell's views stood in stark contrast to the premillennialism associated with William Miller and others on the frontier. Among Disciples, Walter Scott held this view for a time and Barton Stone flirted with it as well. In premillennialism, Christ inaugurates the millennium with his literal second coming. Premillennialists are usually very pessimistic about the future. They describe the unfolding of history as if it were a downward spiral. There will come a time when God will simply get fed up with all the sin and say "that's enough." At that point, Christ will return and put an end to human foolishness.

Postmillennialism, therefore, as one might expect, held a much greater stake in the efforts associated with human history than did premillennialism. Campbell believed greatly in the value of history. History, in the providence of God, revealed the "mighty acts of God" that make possible the salvation of human beings. Campbell's understanding of last things began with his understanding of first things. Creation began history; sin entered in and usurped control of God's creation, and the remainder of history is about its redemption. Eschatology completes the story of both creation and salvation.

In this view, even though the world is sinful, it should be seen through the eyes of Christian faith as God's creation. There is no escapism here - simply the faith that God is acting. Even when God is hidden, God is acting among us. This is the heart of an eschatological faith. For Campbell, Christian faith was not centered in ideas, but in God's events in history. In this way, Campbell left a legacy that valued the dynamic, rather than static, construction of human history. Human history is going somewhere. The kingdom of God is breaking in, and the world is being changed.

In this way, Campbell shared with the Reformed tradition this theological confidence that a sovereign God guided all of history toward some particular end, from the very beginning of creation to the dawn of the eschaton. God stands above history, but is not unconcerned with it. God acts through history to mold human history in the direction of the kingdom of God. In other words, there are vestiges remaining within Campbell of the prophetic strain so prevalent in the Protestant Reformation. This strain, in the words of Niebuhr, "demands rebirth rather than conservation; it announces divine judgment rather than divine protection; and it looks forward to God's salvation rather than to human victory." As Campbell put it, "Before he had laid the corner stone of the material universe, or pronounced the first fiat, the end - the development and the consummation of it, were stereotyped in his Omniscient mind."⁵

Campbell's view of the kingdom of God also reflected another characteristic associated with the Protestant Reformation. Like the reformers, Campbell was impatient with the Catholic idea of a completely deferred kingdom. In the Protestant understanding, there was no system of mediators of divine rule and grace who served some interim period awaiting later promise. Instead, salvation was to be apprehended now. Campbell drove this point home through his emphasis on the "kingdom of Christ."

When examining Campbell's thought, it is important for scholars to note the distinction between Campbell's notions of the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Christ.⁶ Campbell used the term "kingdom of God" (also "kingdom of glory") to denote the kingdom that had no beginning and no end. The kingdom of God, in his theology, referred to the transcendent kingdom. It belonged exclusively to God and all other kingdoms were beholden to it and to God. The kingdom of Christ (also "the kingdom of grace"), for Campbell, referred to the kingdom that began with Pentecost and ended with history. The kingdom of Christ has both a beginning and an ending.

This temporary nature of Christ's kingdom is an important theological point for Campbell. And those who confuse Campbell's belief in this "everlasting kingdom of God" with what Campbell writes about the kingdom of heaven will miss the point entirely.⁷ God's activity in history has pointed toward Christ and the conflict of history itself is resolved in Christ. But when history concludes, Christ will return all authority to God. (see Paul's statement of this in I. Cor. 15:24-28) The "sceptre" is handed back to God. Christ "gives up the kingdom," and only the eternal kingdom of God remains.⁸

For American Puritan theologians, particularly the heavier hitters like Jonathan Edwards, the kingdom of God was not something to be built by human hands, but rather something that came from outside the world, something that was established from eternity, something that contained the rule of God. And this rule of God "required human beings to conform and obey despite the rebellion against it which flourished in the world."⁹

By the time of Campbell, many Christians emphasized the idea of the kingdom of Christ. This placed emphasis on ways the kingdom could enter the lives of human beings through a relationship with Christ in the here and now, rather than upon concern for the sovereignty of God or God's justice. This theology shifted emphasis, subtly at first, away from the divine initiative of God's salvation toward the human action made possible due to the salvation found in Christ.

When Campbell distinguished the kingdom of Christ from the kingdom of God, he opened the door to a practical and theoretical equation between the church's actions and the kingdom's goals and ideals. For Campbell, the kingdom of Christ came close to being completely identified with the church, and, for that matter, with the particular Disciples version of the church. As Niebuhr's classic work indicated, when religious groups in America have confined the kingdom of Christ "within the walls of the church," they have tended to make the church "a self-conscious representative of God which instead of pointing men to him points them first of all to itself."¹⁰

Campbell's emphasis on the "kingdom of Christ" shared the weaknesses associated with this kind of identification. It is a small step from this

identification between church and kingdom to an identification between the kingdom and your own culture. The early signs of danger in this regard are present within Campbell. His view of the kingdom occasionally had too much faith in progress and too much confidence in the role America would play in God's plans for history. Once in a while, he mixed in a dosage of racism as well.

In our country's destiny is involved the destiny of Protestantism, and in its destiny the destiny of all the nations of the world. God has given, in awful charge, to Protestant England and Protestant America - the Anglo-Saxon race - the fortunes, not of Christendom only, but of all the world.¹¹

But Campbell's references in this regard are usually in the context of public addresses commemorating a public holiday like July 4, or orations delivered in a secular or political context. Through the countless pages of texts dealing with prophecy and millennium in thirty years of the *Millennial Harbinger*, I found no explicit references either to Anglo-Saxons or to America's role in bringing in the kingdom. But, there can be little doubt that Campbell's explicit connection between the kingdom of Christ and the church opened the door that the next generations of Disciples so boldly walked through.

II. Extending The Kingdom of God: Evangelization and Americanization, 1900-1925

We shift attention now from the time period of Campbell, who died in 1866, to the beginning of the twentieth century. Much happened in those forty years that brought new theological expressions among Disciples. After the Civil War, German scholarship reached American seminaries. Many American intellectuals accepted evolution and used it to sustain a belief in progress. Protestant theologians devised a "New Theology." They attempted a synthesis between the old faith and the new scientific thought, hoping to preserve the main lines of Christian orthodoxy in an expression more suitable for modern times.

This new style of evangelical liberalism represented a transformation of Calvinistic orthodoxy, even though it retained the traditional theological language. Its theologians stressed human goodness rather than original sin, emphasized an ever-present God of love without much mention of a transcendent God of wrath and punishment, focused on religious experience over correctness of doctrine and shared an optimistic belief that human actions would eventually overcome human need and culminate in the kingdom of God. Above all, these theologians made Christ the center of their theology by featuring the relevance of his life as model for the ethical life of humanity.¹²

Evangelical liberalism did not gain substantial inroads among Disciples church leadership until the next period, sometime after the mid-1920s. But some Disciples leaders, during this earlier period, were exposed to evangelical liberalism through, among other things, their involvement with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (1908). A more substantial liberal turn among a select few, more scholarly, Disciples can be tracked somewhat earlier than these experiences. These few Disciples theologians were influenced at the end of the century by the scientific modernist approach to theology developed in schools like the University of Chicago and Yale.

When Herbert Lockwood Willett examined *The Basic Truths of the*

Christian Faith in 1903, for example, he demonstrated an exegetical shift among Disciples from an emphasis on the epistles to one now placed on the gospels. He placed his stress on the “onward progress of the kingdom of God.” This shift led Disciples exegesis to a high value being placed on the activity of human beings. “It is clear,” wrote Willett, “that our Lord placed the very highest estimate upon man’s value.” This view provided new impetus on the role Christians played in bringing in the kingdom of God. As Willett put it:

That for which Jesus taught his disciples to pray, the coming of the kingdom of God and the realization of the divine will on earth, can only be brought about through the activities of his followers. He has no other way of getting the kingdom organized in the world than by the ministries of his people. . . . Seclusion and aloofness are impossible, for the kingdom is a social force and men have duties to each other.¹³

As Gene Boring put it, “Kingdom-of-God language was one means by which Willett and other Disciples liberals were able to make the transition from Campbell’s biblical theology oriented to the transcendence of God and salvation history to the more immanent God of liberalism whose revelation is not bound so closely with the Bible.”¹⁴

In addition, the theological work of Edward Scribner Ames, clearly represented in his book *The New Orthodoxy* (1918), stressed a new approach to understanding God’s kingdom.

For this new time, already begun for those who are truly at home in the twentieth century of the spiritual calendar of mankind, how shall the picture of man’s life and destiny be drawn? They have thrown off the rule of superstition and the authority of kings and priests. They do not believe in miracles. Their world is not divided by the clouds into human and divine. . . . They seek to build, to construct, to create. . . . the gigantic struggle of hundreds of millions of men over the whole earth to realize an actual and visible society of righteousness, justice, and love.

Ames evidenced a belief in human industry, intelligence, and good will. He expressed devotion to human welfare, confidence in education and in the development of a self directed toward the good of others, and a belief in experience as the norm for judging what religion has to offer. This led to an emphasis on present time rather than future time, on immanence in favor of transcendence.

[93] At last, then, religion has come to reckon with the fact that its highest quest is not for a supernatural order but just for natural goodness in largest and fullest measure. . . . [120] With all of his old reverence for life and with greater zest he is not merely seeking a city which hath foundations. He is building it.¹⁵

Ames’s theology equated Christ with the highest cultural values available. As Clark Williamson and Chuck Blaisdell noted, this blunted his ability to pay much attention to the “distinctive witness” of the church or to distinguish the interests of the kingdom from the highest endeavors of the culture or civilization.¹⁶

In the case of most Disciples, and contrary to Ames, the early versions of this new theology remained solidly connected with a concern for the eternal salvation of individuals. Evangelism defined the priority of the church in its work to extend the kingdom of God. And, as the word “extend” indicates, the

work of human beings had become absolutely essential to establishing the kingdom. The language of “extending the kingdom” is present throughout this period and collapses “kingdom” into “soul winning.”

This kind of thinking stands in the Campbellian tradition of linking the church and the kingdom of Christ together, but the transcendence Campbell kept through distinguishing between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of God has been lost entirely. As an editorial in *World Call* put it in 1919, “For over a hundred years all of us have emphasized the importance of the first Pentecost after the Savior’s resurrection, as the birthday of the Church of Christ, the day when the Kingdom of God was set up among men. No theme has had more constant attention in our victorious evangelism.”¹⁷ The only kingdom is now the kingdom in our midst represented by the work carried out by the membership of the church.

At the centennial celebration of Disciples in Pittsburgh in 1909, Stephen J. Corey preached on the “Challenge of World Conquest” on Tuesday night, October 12, for the evening session designated “for men only.” His message indicated clearly the burning passion for saving souls for the kingdom. “[E]very time my watch ticks to-night,” he told his audience, “two human souls, strangled by a cruel idolatry, and in the awful cramps of sin, go down and drown in the black waters of paganism! And we have the only life-line that will reach them.”¹⁸

Around the turn of the century, this passion for evangelism among Disciples had strong connections to an equally strong passion for a process known as Americanization. Peoples across the world were not only to be evangelized, but Americanized. Disciples, like so many other Christians of the time, definitely displayed this connection between culture and faith.

For example, Corey’s 1909 address clearly revealed his culture’s sexism when he declared that “Jesus Christ gave us a manly gospel” and the “very magnitude” of the “task of world conquest . . . marks it as a man’s job.”¹⁹ But the process of Americanization attached to evangelism went far beyond these kinds of associations.

Among Disciples, this connection was graphically portrayed in the types of pictures used in various publications. For example, around the time the nation began its work of Americanization in the Philippines, Archibald McLean, editor of *The Missionary Intelligencer*, ran a picture of compare and contrast. On one side of the page is the picture of “A Savage,” with unruly hair, ungroomed beard, and arms crossed across a bare chest, adorned only by a bone necklace. On the other side of the page is a picture marked “A Christian,” dressed in a suit, white shirt and bow tie, neatly combed hair and groomed beard, arms neatly folded in the lap. The caption underneath reads: “These pictures represent the same man. The first represents him before he heard the gospel; the second represents him after he had been justified and sanctified by the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. These pictures speak for themselves.”²⁰ These kinds of compare and contrast pictures also appeared with some regularity in *World Call*. The pictures do speak volumes, but for today’s viewer, the message is a bit different than the one originally intended.

The connection between church and country is also seen clearly in the numerous pictures in the early 1920s of Vacation Bible Schools. In all these

pictures, the American flag is prominently displayed. As one article described the importance of “saluting old glory in vacation bible school:”

The greatest force of the Disciples of Christ for producing the Kingdom of our Lord is not necessarily the three hundred consecrated missionaries in heathen lands, nor the five thousand faithful preachers of our pulpits, nor the able administrators of our societies, but the greatest force of the Disciples is that loyal army of more than 50,000 unpaid teachers in our Bible schools.²¹

The point of these pictures was that the process of “Americanization” begins at home, with our children. As H.L. Pickerill put it in 1922, “Since the majority of the young people coming into direct contact with the church, are not going into full-time Christian service, we see the necessity of a program that will guarantee that their lives will count for Kingdom building regardless of the vocation they choose to follow.”²² Education, for these Disciples, played a very important role in the process of Americanization both at home and across the world. “We are convinced,” wrote one Disciple advocate, “that education and the religion of Jesus Christ as preparations for citizenship and leadership produce Americanism.”²³

Articles of the period also articulated the connection between evangelism and Americanization. Hear the words of Bert Wilson in describing the evangelistic work of a newly converted native Disciple in Africa:

Take a peek into the “kit bag” of one of these native men as he hikes off through the forest on a three months’ preaching tour . . . Gospels, soap, several sacks of salt. . . You ask why a preacher should carry soap and salt? Because in Africa he could not preach a “full Gospel” without it. The first fruits of repentance are manifest in the use of soap. The good confession involves the use of soap. The Gospel, salt, soap, these three, but not the least of these is soap.²⁴

Associated with this confidence in cultural superiority was another form of Americanization expressed through confidence in the role America as a nation was to play in the salvation of the world. “America will not stop with the League of Nations,” argued one editorial.

That is a means, not an end. That supplies merely the favorable conditions and freedom for doing her real work in the world, perfecting brotherhood at home and establishing it abroad as the permanent rule between man and man and between nation and nation. . . . henceforth America will dare also in social and spiritual adventures – both to be safe, and to bring salvation.²⁵

The military victory in World War I had to be followed by the “moral and spiritual conquest” of the world.²⁶ The new world, to be built upon “the wreck of the war-torn old world,” had to be Christian.²⁷ This task called for the work of “Uncle Sam, Missionary.”²⁸

In these Disciples minds, God had major plans for America. After all, as Archibald McLean had put it, “God intevened [in the war] and saved the day for the Allied Nations and for humanity . . . It was not possible for the kaiser to win the battle of the Marne, on account of God and God’s gracious purposes concerning mankind.”²⁹ As a result of the war, proclaimed one editorial, America possessed “a new acquaintance with the world. . . . God pity us if we shrink within ourselves again.”³⁰ Americans must “fulfill the great destiny God has for America, Christian America, through Americanization and the Church.”³¹

Cynthia Pearl Maus, in a call for the Americanization of the Church's Youth, urged Disciples to spend time with "the seventy-five thousand Orientals on our western coast" in order that they "be Americanized and Christianized."

We must Christianize our democracy, Americanize our foreign peoples, build the church into the life of every neglected and isolated group [so that] America [can] be used of God in lighting the world to Christ's kingdom of universal Fatherhood and universal brotherhood.³²

After the war, Disciples used the war theme and called upon all Disciples to join the march.³³ *World Call* promoted the "Call to Service" issued by the Council of Women for Home Missions. The virtuous woman dressed in white, holding the Christian and American flags in one hand, with the other outstretched toward natives of the world, issuing the proclamation: "Your Country Calls You! Your Church Calls You! Christ Calls You!"³⁴

Editorials linked evangelism and democracy, but, as the poster of the Federation of Woman's Boards of Foreign Missions made clear, "Democracy is not enough. It must be Christian." "Where the gospel of Christ has free course," *World Call* explained, "autocracy wanes and democracy grows." Christianity the world over would mean democracy the world over, because "Christianity is essentially democratic."³⁵ In such ways, evangelism and Americanization were linked in the decade or so following the war.

III. Building the Kingdom: Social Reconstruction, 1926-1948

The period just considered, 1900-1925, was one dominated by the open membership controversy among Disciples. Out of the struggles that controversy occasioned, missionary leadership began to assume new directions.³⁶ The view among conservative Disciples that American churches must impose their understanding of baptism and church membership on churches in China, in the end, provided some new thought about the relationship between evangelism and Americanization. As early as 1923, Stephen Corey challenged the prevailing wisdom.

"He who studies the growth of the church in many fields," he wrote, "is convinced that Christianity will never be complete in its teaching through European and American interpretation alone."

We will not discover the full depths of the gospel until we have the contributions of all nations. Christ is at least as oriental as he is occidental. Is it not true that we interpret Christianity according to our own bent and bias and temperament? . . . we need the eastern touch and the interpretation of these oriental nations of today before we can have a full rounded religion.³⁷

In early 1926, the Disciples sent a commission to the Orient to investigate the missionary work being carried out in the fields of the Philippines, China, and Japan. Upon its return, the commission's report, besides clearing these mission stations of the charges associated with open membership, concluded that "the Church of Christ in the Orient can not accomplish its task unless it is an Oriental Church of Christ."

It must be a field product and not a factory product. It must be a church that partakes of oriental characteristics in its growth, and not a church that has stamped upon it in every detail of organization and ritual and management the trademark, "Made in America."³⁸

The Memphis International Convention of November 1926 officially received the Commission's report. Conservative attempts from the floor to discredit it failed. In his presidential address to the convention, A.D. Harmon echoed these themes:

It will not suffice for us to build our foreign mission policy as if it were an inanimate something, detached from life, built in Memphis, boxed and ready to be shipped to the world. The pattern of the church for alien Christians is to be found . . . in the Spirit of God illuminating the living world as that Spirit flows through their lives – not ours.³⁹

These stirrings are the beginning of a new understanding of support for native forms of Christianity on the mission field. Yet, even in the Commission's report, evidence is strong that these mission leaders did not believe the native church was equipped to deal with its own affairs without considerable outside guidance. The report concluded that, among both missionaries and nationals who urge autonomy for mission churches, "expectancy outweighs experience in their judgments."⁴⁰

During these years, Disciples were especially influenced by ecumenical get-togethers to discuss the nature of world missions. Three Disciples attended the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council in 1928. The meeting had an extraordinary impact upon Stephen J. Corey, who became president of the UCMS in 1930. His travel diary for that conference includes the following notation: "Indigenous, self-governing, self-operating, self-supportive, the burning topic at Jerusalem. Shift from paternalism to partnership."⁴¹ In addition, Corey and other Disciples were influenced by the international missionary conference held in Madras in 1938, especially its optimism concerning the possibility of developing a viable worldwide Christian community.⁴² Though they tried to live up to the idealism expressed in Jerusalem and Madras for world missions, Disciples were unable to accomplish this shift during the next twenty years. Instead mission, though dedicated and characterized by good intentions, continued to reflect more paternalism than meaningful partnership.

On the other hand, theological developments did affect the Disciples approach to world missions during this period. Increased ecumenical contacts with other mainline Protestant theologians brought Disciples leaders under the influence of some aspects of mainline, as distinguished from conservative, theology. Surprisingly, however, few Disciples adopted neo-orthodoxy, the new theological emphasis on sin and human limits found in the theologies of Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr. Rather, they continued to prefer the evangelical liberalism of the older generation. In fact, Disciples church leaders only fully embraced this form of liberalism at about the time it began fading from the scene.

James H. Garrison, a venerable and active Disciple who was in his mid-eighties by this time, sounded the Christological and evolutionary themes associated with evangelical liberalism very strongly in 1926. In a chapter titled "Christ's Place in the Program of World Progress," Garrison wrote,

It would be a great mistake to limit the influence of Christ to what is technically known as religion, or to the church. He has a wider program. He came into this world for the redemption of the whole world. His is to be a

universal kingdom. His plan is nothing less than that of controlling the entire machinery of the world's civilization. Governments, institutions, laws, customs, courts of justice, parliaments and legislatures, social usages and industrial systems – all are to be brought under the transforming power of Christ. . . . Jesus Christ, then, is not simply the central figure in the church, . . . but he is the central personality in the world's history . . . He has a message not only for every man, but for every institution, whether civil, religious, political, social, or industrial, that concerns its very life and its power to be useful in the world.⁴³

As Williamson and Blaisdell have pointed out, “the problem with Garrison's approach is that the line between American (especially North American) and cultural triumphalism and the demands of the gospel is blurred.”⁴⁴

Stephen J. Corey wrote two books addressing the missionary enterprise from this perspective. In the first of these, he wrote that missions needed to develop the “Christian spirit” among people “so as to create a new society of the kingdom of God on earth.”⁴⁵ He and other leaders among Disciples were convinced that Christianity offered the *only* solution to world problems. “Our task,” Corey told the trustees of the UCMS in his final presidential address in 1938, “is to make Christ known in all his fullness and as the solution of every individual and human problem.” “This,” he continued, “is to build a kingdom of God on earth.”⁴⁶ As a 1937 UCMS pamphlet put the theological sentiment, “It is dawning on Christian leaders everywhere that it is Christ or chaos.”⁴⁷ Scores of pamphlets and booklets took up the task of “building the kingdom.”⁴⁸ Corey's 1937 book, *Beyond Statistics*, spoke of how missionary work had

advised governments on peace, added inventions for human good, introduced new ideas for commerce and agriculture, overcome hurtful customs, taught industry, put value upon human life, and created an appreciation of personality. . . . This compassionate service does not get into yearbooks and statistics but it is a part of the building of the Kingdom of God on earth.⁴⁹

The earlier Disciples emphasis on individual salvation, or “soul-winning” as some called it, gave way during this period to a new and stronger concern with social reconstruction. Concern for evangelism did not disappear. It remained and, in some respects, flourished. Yet, concern for the need to construct a new society on the mission fields became prominent as an end in itself. Missions concentrated on the construction of hospitals, schools, industrial and agricultural developments, and other social projects.

If you applied to be a Disciples missionary before 1928, you would find yourself answering questions like: “Have you had any experience in personal effort in bringing others to Christ? If yes, in what form of work, and with what success?” “Do you believe that personal effort to lead people to Christ is the paramount duty of every missionary? Do you propose to make such effort the chief feature of your missionary career, no matter what other duties are assigned to you?”⁵⁰ From these questions, it is clear that the UCMS, prior to 1928, considered personal evangelism to be the primary objective of the missionary task.

In the middle years of this period, missionary applications asked different types of questions. Two of the first three questions on the revised application had to do with “educational, health and social services” rendered in the mission station. The fourth asked what the missionary should do “to

further social justice and world order.”⁵¹ Concern for evangelism remained, but social reconstruction became more prominent. Without attention to theological rationale, evangelism and social reconstruction can end up serving ends unrelated to the gospel. Disciples were lax during these years when it came to thinking about and expressing the theological rationale behind their mission. Of course, theological rationale cannot stand alone either; it must be connected to practice if it is to serve the gospel. Disciples, like many American Christian groups, had difficulty putting these two things together.

Whatever theology missionary leaders offered during these years tended to emphasize human action over divine initiative. As they did so, they grew increasingly confident that their own human actions could bring in the kingdom of God. They became convinced that if something worked, it had to be right. They became so concerned with actions to build God’s kingdom that they occasionally overlooked the fact that, after all, it is God’s kingdom and not their own. Though Disciples accomplished many great things in their mission work during this period, their efforts were tainted by some of these faults.

From 1936-1940, Disciples emphasized a “Program of Advance” carrying the general theme “Strengthen the Church to Advance the Kingdom of God.” This program once again carried on the tendency of earlier years among Disciples to collapse the kingdom of God into a total identification with the church. The Home Missions report to the UCMS Cabinet Conference in 1939 pointed out that

The church may expect to be judged increasingly on the basis of its social utility. . . . Churches exist to change lives, churches exist to make over communities, churches exist to transform the world into the Kingdom of God, so the effectiveness of any church must be measured in terms of such spiritual transformation.

The Missionary Education Report at the same meeting cited the lack of understanding found among Disciples ministers and church boards who think of the foreign enterprise as “narrowly evangelistic” as indicating the need for better programs of missionary education. “The wide-spread lack of understanding of modern trends in missions toward social reconstruction and similar services,” the report stated, “is evidence of the need for special materials interpreting this phase of mission work.”⁵²

In 1939, the third year of this five-year program, and in response to these kinds of observations, Disciples emphasized the special role of the “The Church in the State and the Nation.” As terrible as the picture representing the 1939 program is, this emphasis on the church as arbiter of the kingdom in the nation did enable some prophetic possibilities. As one interpreter wrote in 1939,

Christ founded the church to . . . live as the leaven of the Kingdom of God in the life of the nation. . . . The church, in each nation, as the interpreter of [God’s] righteous will, must act perpetually as the conscience of that nation, recalling it continually to the judgment of God.⁵³

Disciples, in these years, did begin to find their voice over against the culture and activities of the nation. James Crain and others among Disciples leaders expressed concern over racial issues, conscientious objection issues during the World War II, and other forms of social injustice. But participation in these

endeavors was not significant among Disciples. The great labor disputes of the early twentieth century brought little more than lip service from the denomination; neither did the denominational leadership provide organized support for Roosevelt's social proposals during the depression. In general, Disciples paid greater heed to social transformation abroad than at home.⁵⁴

The social reconstruction and growth of mission work during the twenty-five years since the founding of the UCMS was impressive. From 1920 to 1946, and against great problems facing both budget and staff, church membership on the mission field among Disciples grew from 23,711 to 81,653. The number of self-supporting congregations grew from three in 1923 to 635 in 1946. Schools maintained an average of 15,261 students per year during the period from 1920-1946. Missionary doctors and nurses treated nearly 12 million cases during that period. Support for indigenous workers suffered a serious drop from the high in 1933 of 2,449 indigenous workers to a low of about 1,700 in the late thirties and early forties. By 1946, the number had risen back to 2,443, but the financial support provided by the UCMS for work among indigenous workers did not rise with it. In 1932, \$223,000 supported work performed by indigenous staff; in 1946, only \$93,000 supported it. The missionary staff from the UCMS on the field reached a high of 339 workers in 1925 and had dropped off to 202 by 1946.⁵⁵

After World War II, renewed prospects of building the kingdom of God abroad gained ground and fostered renewed commitments. Disciples announced a new five-year program in 1946, entitled the "Crusade for a Christian World." The planning committee's report described the nature of the program:

Basically, what Disciples of Christ must do is to evolve a plan of action and work that is worthy of us as a people - that will cause us to develop every resource, every ounce of strength and power in Kingdom building . . .

The general objectives of the movement included these five points: 1. A resurgence of Christian life; 2. Evangelism, education and stewardship; 3. A program of Christian unity, cooperation and world fellowship; 4. World missions, relief and reconstruction - the Crusade hoped to provide better facilities for schools, churches, and hospitals in the field, as well as reconstruction for the war-torn areas of the Pacific.; and 5. A Christian world order.⁵⁶ The Crusade hoped to provide a resurgence of missionary interest among Disciples. But it did not materialize.

Notice especially the last point. In the wake of the second war, Disciples efforts expressed a strong concern for the development of a new world order that would accept all people. But Disciples tended instead toward a parochial vision of kingdom-building and social reconstruction that expressed itself in the language most familiar to them: that of American civilization, of democracy, of anti-communism, and of anti-Catholicism.⁵⁷ This language made it hard for them to preach about a God who loves all persons truly *equally*, and without any condition that any of these persons be transformed or have their nations "civilized" before they could be truly counted among the recipients of divine love. Concentrated human efforts among Disciples to build the kingdom tended to obscure their ability to see a God who is active in the midst of all people across the world.

IV. The Kingdom of God: The Mission of God, 1948-

This last phase in this brief rehearsal of a Disciples understanding of connections between the kingdom of God and world mission began with a 1948 report from the Foreign Division of the UCMS delivered to the Board of Trustees. The document addressed a crisis in foreign missions caused by forced Christian union on the mission field.⁵⁸ Within the next year, as Virgil Sly described it a few years later, “the situation became rather tense even within the administrative circles of the society when the Foreign Division insisted that something had to be done about our relationships to the United Church of Christ in Japan and in the Philippines.”⁵⁹ Disciples congregations in these areas no longer had a separate identity. Their involvement in church unity, however, had not stemmed from a conscious or theological decision to unify; instead, these churches were forced into unity by cultural and political circumstances.

After the war, this military edict uniting all churches in Japan was lifted. The Disciples churches there voted to remain in union. Many of the Filipino churches also voted to remain a part of the unified work. When these churches took this action, many at home were concerned about how their union with Protestant groups might affect their commitment to Disciples doctrines and practices. The document entitled “The Crisis in Foreign Missions” raised this question and urged the UCMS to take some action to address the critics.

As a result of this issue, Virgil Sly and Harry B. McCormick, president of the UCMS, took a 1950 fact-finding trip to Japan and the Philippines. When they returned, they reported to the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ that union in these areas was a fact. They also pointed out that the churches were participating in the union movement of their own free will. For the first time in UCMS history, Disciples leaders applied the principle of local autonomy to mission churches. The UCMS, argued Sly and McCormick, had no more right to tell these churches how they must conduct their affairs than it had the right to tell churches at home how they must act. They offered no theological justification for extending the principle of local autonomy to these churches; it just seemed to be required by the circumstances.

During this period, however, Disciples missionary leaders did engage in serious theological discussions about the meaning of world mission. The major impetus to this new theological reflection grew out of the 1952 World Meeting of the International Missionary Council at Willengen, Germany. As delegates addressed their topic, “The Missionary Obligation of the Church,” they stressed more completely the needs of the so-called “younger churches” on the mission fields. These younger churches were located in developing countries where revolutionaries struggled to overthrow Western colonialism. Indigenous peoples often viewed mission work as simply one more attribute of that colonialism. Chided by their own mission congregations at the conference, sponsoring Western churches pledged to respect the life and work of younger churches. They hoped such an action might enable Christianity, untainted by Western powers, to remain a viable alternative for people in these countries. The meeting concluded that any such changes must be accompanied by renewed theological commitments as well.⁶⁰

In response to this call, the Foreign Division of the UCMS continued more seriously a study it had begun in 1950 after Sly and McCormick had returned from their trip to Japan and the Philippines. From this study, the Foreign Division produced a pamphlet entitled "The Strategy for World Missions." After undergoing several revisions over a three-year period, the final draft was approved in early 1955 representing official Disciples strategy for missions work.⁶¹ Yet even this document did not involve a serious reconsideration of the theological nature of world missions. Rather, it represented a pick-and-choose method of theological statements that had been prepared in ecumenical circles. Though the "Strategy" spoke a needed word on the changing nature of work on the mission fields, especially in its support for "younger churches," its very approach to the topic indicated that more serious theological analysis would have to wait.⁶²

As the Foreign Division tried to implement the new strategy, it began to develop an increased awareness of its need to address more completely the theological task. As Virgil Sly put it in 1959, speaking of "Mission and Change," "The necessity of an adequate theology of missions must be faced."⁶³

As a result of these considerations, and especially emerging from Willengen, the UCMS renamed its "Division of Foreign Missions." In September of 1956, the name changed to "Division of World Mission."

Why drop the final s on the word *Missions*? And why did the revised edition of the "Strategy" document also drop the s when it was published in early 1959 under the title of "The Strategy of World Mission"? According to Virgil Sly, it was the theological recognition that "the mission...is God's mission" that led to the change. "We are participants," said Sly, "in the mission of God."⁶⁴ Willengen had emphasized these themes, and by 1956—1957, Disciples missionary leaders were taking them to heart.⁶⁵

Disciples stopped thinking in terms of exporting "missions" work to foreign areas, and began to define their role as one of Christian witness and presence in the midst of the ongoing and ever-present "mission of God." This theological approach to mission re-emphasized, in a way that had not been present for Disciples since the theological work of Alexander Campbell, the importance of the initiative of God.

In 1958, long overdue but better late than never, the UCMS and the Council on Christian Unity cosponsored a Commission on the Theology of Mission. This commission did its work for over four and a half years. Composed primarily of seminary professors, missionary administrators, and missionaries, it met several times a year to hear and discuss papers prepared by members of the commission. Its stated purpose was "to seek a clearer grasp of the essential nature of the Christian mission" and "to help stimulate the brotherhood to deep levels of theological understanding of our knowledge of God and our urgent privilege to proclaim His love to the whole world."⁶⁶

The commission fulfilled the first portion of this charge, but failed to fulfill the second. Many commission members wrote first-rate essays addressing the theology of questions related to missions. Papers dealt with such topics as non-Christian religions, ecumenical membership, the gospel's relationship to Western culture, and the nature of the church—all from theological points of view. Other papers expressed particular theologies of evangelism, mission, and

history. Yet the most theologically reflective of these working papers, along with others of course, collect dust in the archives of the Disciples Historical Society or in the mostly unread pages of journals resting on shelves. How do church leaders develop theological awareness among lay people in the churches? Though the commission expressed great hopes to do something in this area, it never quite fulfilled them. The commission's work, however, did lay the groundwork for future discussion among Disciples regarding the theology of world mission.

The influence of the commission was clearly evident in the educational campaign conducted church-wide during 1966 entitled "The Changing Church in a Changing World." The campaign used the slogan: The Church is Moving From ... Toward ...", as in *from* thinking of non-Christians as heathens *toward* belief that God is not left anywhere without witnesses.⁶⁷

Beginning in 1977, the Board of Directors of the Division of Overseas Ministries, under the leadership of President Robert Thomas, began once again to re-examine the Disciples understanding of world mission. After nearly four years of study and dialogue, including the study of earlier work done by the UCMS and the "Commission on the Theology of Mission," the DOM issued its "General Principles and Policies" statement. Disciples adopted this statement in Anaheim in 1981. With this document, Disciples, for the first time, self-consciously, and in an organized way, addressed the nature of their theological understanding of world mission.⁶⁸ Two sample statements, taken from the 1981 DOM statement, indicate the developing Disciples theological reflection about mission.

(1) "God has never, in any time or place, been without witness. One who is more fully known in Jesus Christ has been and is at work in the creation of community, the sharing of love, the seeking of freedom, the search for truth, the reactions of wonder and awe in the presence of nature's power and beauty and creativity, and the awareness of the worth of persons."

This theological claim is based upon Acts 14:17. It offers the testimony that Christians should recognize that God is active in the world even where Christians have yet to set foot. The Kingdom is God's and God will act where God sees fit.

(2) "[The church is not] to be identified either with Christ or the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom in its fullness is solely the gift of God; any human achievement in history can only be approximate and relative to the ultimate goal—the promised new heaven and new earth. Yet this kingdom is the inspiration and constant challenge in all our struggles."

Here Disciples affirm that, even though the church is called to its task by God, it, nevertheless, must recognize its humanity. Though the church belongs to God, it is not a fully divine institution. Neither it nor its members constitute the kingdom of God. This theological affirmation hearkens back to the theological distinction Alexander Campbell made between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of God. In this return to Campbell, the kingdom remains the proper inspiration of the church's activities only so long as the church recognizes it as fully a divine gift dependent entirely upon the initiative and action of God.

This 1981 document guided Disciples efforts in mission until 1996,

when the DOM joined its efforts with the common policy-making body known as the “Common Global Ministries Board,” made up of a partnership between the United Church of Christ and Disciples. The CGMB operates consistently with the theological principles expressed in these early statements. As stated in the DOM’s most recent report, “By God’s grace, Disciples are part of a global family of faith, serving as one in a mission that belongs to God.” The strategic plan of the CGMB identifies three specific program directions consistent with the theological recognition of the primacy of the divine action: Nurturing Human Community, Restoring the Environment and Economics to the Service of God, and Faith Development. Throughout these programs, there is a strong emphasis on the importance of interfaith as well as ecumenical relationships in performing ministry in this area of global mission.⁶⁹

Conclusion

Disciples began their endeavor in world mission without much theological reflection. Yet they knew instinctively that they could not ignore the Christian call to ministry in the midst of the world’s neediest people. They went to work, offered selfless service, and preached the only gospel they knew. The message of the good news came through, in spite of the fact that it was often unsophisticated, tainted with American culture, and usually expressed in paternalistic ways. People the world over were moved to respond to God and to understand their lives in relationship to the message of Christ. Their lives and the lives of those around them were transformed by this experience.

Yet the lives of the missionaries and the congregations supporting them were also transformed. The mission field taught its own lessons. Some congregations listened to those lessons earlier than others, but most mainline Protestant denominations eventually heard them. The missionary endeavor of the last two centuries has encouraged American Protestantism to reexamine the theological foundations of the gospel. This rebirth of critical theological awareness has enabled the church to recognize the need to distinguish gospel from culture. It has helped it to find a new prophetic voice that has been heard the world over. Most importantly, perhaps, the church’s work in world mission has expanded the church’s vision of how God is at work in the world. The church has an enlarged appreciation for both the wideness of God’s mercy and the inclusive nature of God’s family.

All these changes have affected the Disciples of Christ. In a relatively short time, the Disciples have come a long way. They have learned that instead of emphasizing their own human action to “extend” or “build” the kingdom of God, they should see their activity as a “response” to God’s initiative to establish the kingdom of God in their midst. Their work in missions has led them to a more active engagement in church unity, one of their most important founding principles. Missionary work and accompanying ecumenical involvements have also strengthened commitment to the theological task. The Disciples expression of gospel is far more responsible today than it would have been had their nineteenth-century predecessors not dedicated themselves to the missionary task.

NOTES

¹ H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Kingdom of God in America* (Middletown, Ct.: Wesleyan University Press, 1988, originally published by Harper & Row, 1937), p. 127.

² *Ibid.*, p. 135.

³ Article III, included in Minutes of the Joint Convention meeting at Music Hall, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 20, 1919, UCMS papers, Box 63.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁵ Campbell, "The Millennium, no. 3," *Millennial Harbinger* (April 1856): 187. See also Campbell, "Millennium, no. 4," (May 1856): 270: "There is one oracle of our Apostle Paul that commands much thought, and which furnishes a very safe sign-post . . . in our pathway along the lines of the prophetic chart. . . . It reads thus: 'The gifts and callings of God are without change of purpose' or 'repentance,' on his part [Romans 11:29]. He has a scheme, a purpose, a plan in creation, providence, moral government, and in redemption, from which he never departs. . . . Now such being the fact through the entire domain of animated nature, ought we not to realize the Divine power and wisdom as acting wholly under the promptings of Divine goodness, and as directed and controlled by it? . . . In tracing all the meanderings of the stream of prophecy, from the first prophetic promise or covenant vouchsafed to fallen man, however it may appear to us to change its course, we shall find that it is moving forward in the most direct and consistent line, and in perfect good keeping with every Divine attribute, developing the moral and spiritual grandeur of the absolute monarch of universal being."

⁶ On Campbell's division of his understanding of the kingdom into at least four different types of kingdoms, see Toulouse, Chapter 5, "The Eschatological Principle: God With Us," in *Joined in Discipleship* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1997), pp. 101-135.

⁷ For Campbell's use of this term, "everlasting kingdom of God," see, for example, *Christian System*, p. 161; and "Query," p. 12.

⁸ *Christian System*, p. 147. See also p. 154.

⁹ See Niebuhr, p. 56.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

¹¹ Quoted in Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, p. 53. The quote is from the *Millennial Harbinger* (August 1852): 462. Harrell details the combination of national destiny, racism, and millennialism in this chapter; see especially pp. 44-53. Hughes, *Illusions of Innocence*, chapter 8, pp. 170-187, argues that there was a shift in Campbell toward a consistent national form of millennialism in his later years. I do not see it any more evident there than it is in his earlier years, and it is never the dominant characteristic of his millennialism, but rather resides as an occasional and limited, but nonetheless real, part of it throughout his life. For Campbell's references to Anglo-Saxon triumph, see Harrell, p. 47. Though I was influenced by Hughes' arguments before reading the material in the *Millennial Harbinger* for myself, I have since concluded that Campbell did not offer any consistent or direct associations between the millennium and the "religion of the republic" in his later years. In general, I found consistent emphases connecting the hopes of restoration and

the hopes of millennialism throughout Campbell's writings on the topic; his writings on the millennium and the second coming contain vastly more regular mention of the "ancient gospel" than mention of the "progress of civilization." Besides the reference I have already mentioned, see "Millennium," (December 1956): 699 for another later reference. In this essay, Campbell also affirms the Apostles Creed, and adds to it, as setting forth the "facts" of the ancient gospel that need to be believed (see pp. 701-702). I do believe Hughes has contributed greatly to our historical understanding of Campbell by demonstrating that Campbell came to a greater appreciation of his association with Protestantism as he became older.

¹² The movement's most popular representatives were preachers like Henry Ward Beecher, Phillips Brooks, Lyman Abbott and Washington Gladden. Some of the more well-known theologians were William Newton Clarke, William Adams Brown, and Walter Rauschenbusch. For an accounting of the development of evangelical liberalism, see Kenneth Cauthen, *The Impact of American Religious Liberalism* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962); and Daniel Day Williams, *The Andover Liberals: A Study in American Theology* (New York: Octagon Books, 1970).

¹³ Herbert L. Willett, *Basic Truths of the Christian Faith* (Chicago: Christian Century Company, 1903), pp. 124-125. The earlier quotes from Willett are from pp. 39-40 and p. 45 respectively.

¹⁴ M. Eugene Boring, "The Disciples and Higher Criticism: The Crucial Third Generation," in D. Newell Williams, ed., *A Case Study of Mainstream Protestantism: The Disciples' Relation to American Culture, 1880-1989* (Grand Rapids and St. Louis: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, and Chalice Press, 1991), p. 63.

¹⁵ Edward Scribner Ames, *The New Orthodoxy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1918). The first block quotation is taken from p. 3; the second block quote lists the pages in brackets found within the quote.

¹⁶ Clark M. Williamson and Charles R. Blaisdell, "Disciples and Mainstream Protestant Theology, 1880-1953," in D. Newell Williams, ed., *A Case Study of Mainstream Protestantism: The Disciples' Relation to American Culture, 1880-1989* (Grand Rapids and St. Louis: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, and Chalice Press, 1991), pp. 125.

¹⁷ See "Pentecost 1919, *World Call* (June 1919): 7.

¹⁸ Corey, *The Challenge of World Conquest to Christian Men* (Cincinnati: Foreign Christian Missionary Society, 1909), pp. 6, 19.

¹⁹ Corey, *The Challenge of World Conquest to Christian Men*, pp. 14-17.

²⁰ "Portraits," *The Missionary Intelligencer* (February 1898): 33.

²¹ C.E. Lemmon, "Our Obligation to the Teachers and the Taught," *World Call* (November 1921): 24-27.

²² H.L. Pickerill, "Training Camps of the Kingdom," *World Call* (November 1922): 23-25.

²³ Joseph C. Todd, "The Christian College and Patriotism," *World Call* (July 1919): 26-27.

²⁴ Bert Wilson, "The Adventures of Yoka, of the Tribe of Smith," *World Call* (March 1919): 12-16.

²⁵ Editorial, "America Dares," *World Call* (July 1919): 3.

²⁶ "The World Call," *World Call* (January 1919): 3.

²⁷ Carl Van Wrinkle, "Importance of the Church College," *World Call* (January 1919): 4.

²⁸ Edward B. Bagby, "Uncle Sam, Missionary," *World Call* (July 1919): 4-8.

²⁹ McLean, "Have Faith in God," *World Call* (January 1919): 5.

³⁰ "Why Foreign Missionary Service Should Appeal to Students in this Hour," *World Call* (February 1919): 12.

³¹ Jessie L.P. Brown, "Americanization and the Church," *World Call* (July 1919): 36-38.

³² Cynthia Pearl Maus, "Americanization Calls to the Youth of the Church," *World Call* (November 1919): 26.

³³ See George W. Knepper, "The Ideal Patriot," *World Call* (May 1920): 26-29, where he writes: "This is the day supreme for fellowship with man and God in the great task of establishing the Kingdom of our God. . . . God is on the march! We march with Him or we will be trampled by His cohorts as they move;" see also the pictures accompanying the article on "Answering the Call," *World Call* (January 1920): 2-3. Those pictures depict missionary recruits lined up to join the march of battle; see also the pictures on p. 9, 18, 34-35.

³⁴ "A Call to Service," *World Call* (October 1919): 35.

³⁵ "The Application of Democracy to the Administration of Religion," *World Call* (May 1919): 6-7.

³⁶ Throughout this time period, the United Christian Missionary Society essentially ran its affairs in a democratic fashion. In a telling acknowledgement in 1928, Frederick Burnham, president of the Society, admitted "the United Christian Missionary Society does not attempt to deal in theological matters. It is a missionary society and carries on the enterprises which the brotherhood commits to its charge." This is one reason why this period was so dominated by the open membership controversy. The majority of members in the democracy of Discipleship opposed it. Theological understanding to the contrary had to submit. See letter from Frederick Burnham to E.L. Thornberry of Kentucky, April 9, 1928, UCMS papers, Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Box 62. See also the "Report of the Peace Conference Committee," approved by the International Convention held at Oklahoma City, October 9, 1925, UCMS papers, Box 54. That report indicated that "it is in keeping with our policy and in harmony with our democracy, that such persons only be employed as representatives of the Society whose views are in harmony with the views of the majority of those who employ them and whom they represent." A few years earlier, in an address to the Board of Managers of the UCMS, Burnham described the problems associated with operating the missionary enterprises of the Disciples of Christ as a democracy: "Can an association of free churches, such as ours, retain its democracy and yet be efficient, through duly constituted and controlled organizations, in effectively promoting and administering the work of the Kingdom of God on earth, or, is such a democracy foredoomed to chaotic inefficiency, to constant disorder, and to ever-imminent peril of disruption by the selfish intents which thrive upon

the disorder they themselves create? Can such a democracy of free Churches of Christ really build a Brotherhood of the disciples of Jesus, or is it inherently weak, necessarily chaotic, hopelessly a rope of sand?" See "Address to the Board of Managers of the United Christian Missionary Society," St. Louis, MO, January 18-19, 1922, UCMS papers, Box 60. For a full description of the open membership controversy, see Mark G. Toulouse, "Practical Concern and Theological Neglect: The UCMS and the Open Membership Controversy," in D. Newell Williams, ed., *A Case Study of Mainstream Protestantism: The Disciples' Relation to American Culture, 1880-1989* (Grand Rapids and St. Louis: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, and Chalice Press, 1991), pp. 194-235.

³⁷ Stephen J. Corey, "New Visions of Truth from the Mission Field," *World Call* (March 1923): 9-12.

³⁸ "Report of the Commission to the Orient," *World Call* (August 1926): 41.

³⁹ *Christian Evangelist* (November 18, 1926): 1449-1451, 1463-1464.

⁴⁰ "Report of the Commission to the Orient," p. 42.

⁴¹ Stephen Corey's Travel Diary for 1928, UCMS papers. The "Laymen's Inquiry" into foreign missions took place in the years just following the Jerusalem Council. It was published as *Re-Thinking Missions: A Laymen's Inquiry After One Hundred Years*, William E. Hocking, ed. (New York: Harpers, 1932). This study, conducted by William E. Hocking and others, also influenced Disciples as it sought a more careful, critical selection of missionary candidates, a gradual transfer of responsibilities to Christian nationals, and the organization of administrative unity across ecumenical lines for missions at home.

⁴² On Madras, See Stephen Corey, "From Jerusalem to Madras," UCMS papers, Box 60.

⁴³ J.H. Garrison, *Christ the Way* (St. Louis: Bethany, 1926), pp. 97-98.

⁴⁴ Clark M. Williamson and Charles R. Blaisdell, "Disciples and Mainstream Protestant Theology, 1880-1953," pp. 117-118.

⁴⁵ Corey, *Missions Matching the Hour* (Nashville: Cokesbury, 1931), p. 107

⁴⁶ Corey, "Executive Statement," 1938, p. 11 (UCMS papers). The 1940 UCMS handbook put it this way: "Thus the world missionary effort lives and gives life. It is building the kingdom of God even in this hour of world distress and hate." See *Handbook of the United Christian Missionary Society* (Indianapolis: UCMS, 1940).

⁴⁷ "Foreign Missions Day, March 7, 1937: Through Loyalty to Victory," p. 17

⁴⁸ See, for example, Jessie M. Trout, *Forward in Missions and Education: Disciples of Christ Help Build the Kingdom* (Indianapolis: UCMS, 1941); the pamphlet: *Twenty-Five Years of Kingdom Building Through the United Christian Missionary Society: 1919-1944* (Indianapolis: UCMS, 1944); Clement Manly Morton, *Kingdom Building in Puerto Rico: A Story of Fifty Years of Christian Service* (Indianapolis: UCMS, 1949).

⁴⁹ Corey, *Beyond Statistics* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1937), p. 36.

⁵⁰ "Application for Appointment as Missionary," United Christian Missionary Society. The forms I looked at had been filled out by Nancy Adeline Fry in June 1920, Oswald Goulter in September 1921, and Grace Stevens Corpron in October 1922, UCMS papers.

⁵¹ "Application for Missionary Service." The one I looked at had been filled in by Margaret Cherryhomes, June 17, 1946. Mrs. Cherryhomes was a graduate of Phillips University and a former secretary to G. Edwin Osborn, pastor of the University Place Christian Church in Enid, Oklahoma. She trained at Yale and was married in Marquand Chapel at Yale by Dr. Kenneth Scott Latourette, the great mission historian. (UCMS papers).

⁵² See Home Missions Report and Missionary Education Report, Cabinet Conference, October 31-November 4, 1939, held at Spring Mill Park Hotel, Mitchell, Indiana, UCMS papers, Box 62.

⁵³ C.O. Hawley, "The Church in America," *World Call* (September 1939): 20.

⁵⁴ See James A. Crain, *The Development of Social Ideas Among the Disciples of Christ* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1969); see also Crain's comments before the Executive Conference of the UCMS, meeting at Turkey Run State Park, June 27-July 3, 1937, UCMS papers; see also Toulouse, "Disciples and Social Transformation, Past," *Midstream* (July 1987): 459-472.

⁵⁵ See Virgil A. Sly, *World Missions: A Crusade for A Christian World* (Indianapolis: UCMS, n.d., but most likely around 1946).

⁵⁶ "Disciples Are Preparing to Launch 'Crusade for a Christian World,' *World Call* (May 1946): 18-19.

⁵⁷ Examples of some of these expressions are found in Toulouse, "Pragmatic Concern and Theological Neglect."

⁵⁸ See "The Crisis in Foreign Missions: The Foreign Division Faces a Decision," 1948, UCMS papers.

⁵⁹ See Virgil Sly, "Christian Unity and World Missions," August 8, 1954, p. 24, UCMS papers.

⁶⁰ Virgil Sly attended the International Missionary Council, July 5-19, 1952 at Willingen, Germany. There were over two hundred participants from fifty countries.

⁶¹ "Strategy of World Missions," (Indianapolis: Foreign Division of the United Christian Missionary Society, 1955).

⁶² See Joseph Smith's analysis of the document in his dissertation, "A Strategy of World Mission: The Theory and Practice of Mission as Seen in the Present World Mission Enterprise of the Disciples of Christ," (Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1961), pp. 155-233.

⁶³ Sly, "Mission and Change," December 2, 1959, p. 7, UCMS papers.

⁶⁴ See Virgil Sly, "From Missions to Mission," in *The Christian Mission for Today: Five Addresses Presented to the Ninth Annual Assembly of the Division of Foreign Missions, NCC*, December 7-10, 1958 (New York: Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, 1958), p. 8. Sly carried this theme admirably through the period of restructure in most of his major addresses; see, for example, Sly, "The Leaven," October 16, 1964, UCMS papers, Box 60; Sly, "The Structure and Organization of the United Christian Missionary Society," president's report

to the Board of Managers of the UCMS at the St. Louis International Convention, October 11-18, 1967, UCMS papers, Box 62; and Sly, "The Issue of Representative Responsibility and Integrity of Administration," August 1, 1968, Chapman College, Council of Agencies of the Disciples of Christ, UCMS papers, Box 60.

⁶⁵ In 1959, using the slogan, "From Missions to Mission," the first joint assembly of the Divisions of Home and Foreign Missions of the National Council of Churches encouraged denominational mission boards to consider dropping traditional approaches to mission in favor of more ecumenical endeavors connected with the World Council of Churches.

⁶⁶ These original purposes were first stated in "Working Paper for a Study on the Theology of Missions," originally dated July 16, 1958, and attached as "Appendix II" to the "Minutes of Meeting, Commission on the Theology of Missions, October 18, 1958, Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo." UCMS papers.

⁶⁷ See, for example, "The Church is Moving From: . . . Toward . . . , #6 - World Mission," *World Call* (March 1966): 20.

⁶⁸ The following quotations are from the *General Principles & Policies*, published by the Division of Overseas Ministries in the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

⁶⁹ For an expression of the work of the Common Global Ministries Board, see "No. 9809, Division of Overseas Ministries," in *Year Book & Directory, 1999, of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)* (Indianapolis: Office of the General Minister and President, 1999), pp. 221-243.

QUILTING DEMONSTRATION AND FABRIC EXHIBIT

An exhibit of women's handiwork will tell the Stone-Campbell story in textiles. On Monday, June 17, 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. and Tuesday, June 18, 9:00 to noon, a special demonstration of quilting, handiwork and story telling is being offered by Linda Chenoweth, Historical Society Trustee and CWF member for more than 35 years. Linda will travel on to Louisville to the Disciples Quadrennial to be a "walking booth." She plans to draw from her satchel items of historic interest as she engages women in conversation.

The Historical Society also had two long-standing exhibits in addition to the special exhibit created for Quadrennial guests. One exhibit displays artifacts related to our founders' vision. The second exhibit displays artifacts portraying our history of mission. Tours are available on request.

Quadrennial guests are invited by busload, vanload, or in individual cars. All are encouraged to register at Disciples of Christ Historical Society

1101 19th Ave. S.

Nashville, TN 37212

615-327-1444

e-mail: dishistsoc@aol.com

**MILLENNIAL AMERICA AND THE VISION OF PEACE
IN THE THOUGHT OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL**

by Craig M. Watts*

Up until the mid-1840s, Alexander Campbell had little to say about a role for America in relation to the millennium, that perfectly harmonious, just and joyful reign of the Lord prophesied in scripture. However, this changed during his later years. The first indication of this change was seen in 1841. In an address, "On Common Schools" Campbell stressed the importance of public education for the good of the entire community. But he argued that a dissemination of information was not sufficient; moral education was imperative and the Bible must be central to any moral education. He claimed that clergy of all denominations agreed with him. Campbell continued,

It is also becoming more and more evident that, notwithstanding our sectarian differences, we yet have something called a common Christianity; - that there are certain great fundamental matters - indeed, every thing elementary in what is properly called piety and morality - in which all good men of all denominations are agreed; and that these great common principles and views form a common ground on which all Christian people can unite, harmonize and co-operate in one great system of moral and Christian education.¹

Thirteen years later Campbell went further still and claimed that the United States had "a by law established religion." This religion was not denominational, he asserted, and did not have a specific form of worship. Nevertheless, it was evident in the administration of oaths, the conscience of the population and appeals to God made at every level of the government. "In these we have a solemn recognition of the being and perfection of God, of a day of judgment, or future and eternal rewards and punishments."² This common religion, Campbell recognized, was a nonsectarian Protestantism.

The Role of America

While Campbell never repudiated his belief in the centrality of the restored church in preparing the world for the millennium, the United States came to have an increasingly larger role in his thinking. In fact, Ernest Lee Tuveson wrote of Campbell, "No other preacher more completely fused the religious and secular elements of the millennial utopia; none more strongly emphasized the need for social reform as preparation for the great age."³ Campbell held that the American situation was ideal because it "conforms to the genius of human nature and human society, as developed in the Christian Scriptures."⁴

Campbell refused to acknowledge that the Deist views of the founders of the nation played a significant role shaping any characteristic of American life that could help inaugurate the millennium.⁵ "We are indebted for all the great improvements in society for the philosophy of Christians," declared Campbell, "and not to the philosophy of skeptics ... The labors of the

*Craig M. Watts is minister of Royal Palm Christian Church, Coral Springs, Florida.

Reformers, and the more recent labors of Milton, the poet, and Locke, the philosopher, have done more to create the free institutions of Europe and America than the labors of all the skeptics."⁶ There was no intrinsic quality that set America apart from other nations. The greatness Campbell found in the United States - and in England - was not a matter of climate, geography or race but due to the influence of the Bible and Protestantism.⁷ Campbell began to teach that the liberation of the world from spiritual darkness and oppression was the destiny of "Protestant America and Protestant England."⁸ In the country's destiny is involved the destiny of Protestantism, and in Protestantism's destiny that of all the nations of the world. "God has given, in awful charge, to Protestant England and Protestant America - the Anglo-Saxon race - the fortunes, not of Christendom only, but of all the world."⁹

In earlier years Campbell held that there was no "common religion" that might lead to the unity of the church, and through the church, to the unity and peace of the world, except in the restored gospel which he proclaimed. Richard T. Hughes suggested that the results of Campbell's restoration movement were not up to his expectations. Consequently, he shifted his millennial hopes from the church to the nation that he saw successfully embodying the unity in diversity he hoped to achieve in the church.¹⁰

It came to be Campbell's conviction that America would be able to drive out ignorance, superstition and injustice by being an example of freedom, education, progress and faith. All that needed to be done in order to benefit the nations and peoples of the world would be for Americans to "show them our religion by pointing to our common schools, our common churches, our common colleges and our common respect for the Bible, the Christian religion and its divine and glorious Founder - the Supreme Philanthropist"¹¹ Campbell was confident that the influence of Britain and the United States would continue to spread to every nation throughout the world. He looked forward with assurance to the day when the nations "Hang their trumpet in the hall, and study war no more. Peace and universal amity will reign triumphant. For over all the earth there will be but one Lord, one faith, one hope and one language" - English!¹²

America in the Peace Movement

Campbell certainly was not the only antebellum pacifist who believed America was to have a central role in the inauguration of the millennium. One of the more interesting developments in the arguments against war was the emphasis placed on "the special mission of the United States" as a vanguard for peace.¹³ Speaking before the Hartford Peace Society, the Rev. N.S. Wheaton said, "The free and enlightened citizens of America have given proof that they are breaking through the trammels of an accursed delusion [of war], under which the world has lain spellbound for ages."¹⁴ Not only had monarchist tyranny and oppressive superstition been dealt a blow by freedom-filled America but God was using America to lead the world to turn from the ways of war.

American Peace Society President, William Ladd, repeatedly claimed that the United States had a distinctive responsibility to cast war as a benighted practice of the Old World in order to lead the nations to harmony

and peace. Likewise, Samuel E. Coves, Ladd's immediate successor as president of the Society wrote, "It is in this country that the martial spirit has received its greatest check. It is here that the pacific principles will first be adopted."¹⁵ Coves argued that war was contrary to the democratic spirit that was the life blood of America. The practice of war, he believed, could not long endure in a nation populated by citizens with equal rights.

This opinion was shared by Elihur Burritt. Burritt sometimes referred to as the "learned blacksmith" was a brilliant, largely self-taught energetic peace activist. He founded the League of Universal Brotherhood in 1846 after conservatives took control of the American Peace Society. He wrote in the pages of his journal on New Year's Day 1845, "I find my mind is setting with all its sympathies toward the subject of Peace. I am persuaded that it is reserved to crown the destiny of America, that she shall be the great peacemaker in the brotherhood of nations."¹⁶

Pacifists in other countries occasionally asserted that their particular nations were destined to usher in worldwide peace. But such claims were much more common from advocates of peace in America. Nowhere else did millennial hopes run so high.

Nonviolent Americanism

Like other nineteenth century pacifists, Campbell saw no contradiction between his millennial hope in America and his commitment to peace. In fact it was to the pacifist leader Thomas Grimké that Campbell is indebted for the idea that Anglo-Saxon superiority arises from Protestantism.¹⁷ He imagined a world eager to be Americanized and by being Americanized, Christianized. Resistance to the destiny of America was virtually unthinkable. Campbell seemed unwilling to entertain the possibility that the United States, God's instrument for liberation, might be required to use deadly force to achieve the noble ends he envisioned. In his optimism, he failed to recognize that "America's national origin, and the first expressions of national character were largely military in form."¹⁸ Only with a self-imposed amnesia could Campbell forget that the expansion of the nation had already displaced and killed hundreds of thousands of native Americans and Mexicans.

Campbell apparently was convinced that the power of reason, persuasion, and truth would nonviolently overcome any pockets of resistance to the mission of America. He even called upon his readers, not to just cherish "but prosecute, the duties which we owe to ourselves, our country and the human race." For only in so doing, "will our career be glorious, our end victorious, and our destiny, and that of our country, 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun,' and to our enemies "terrible as an army with banners."¹⁹

Still never would Campbell condone any literal "army with banners." Despite the bloated claims he sometimes made regarding the destiny of America, his pacifism tempered his views. As much as Campbell exalted America and gloried in its millennial role, he recognized that the nation's civilization would not be sufficiently developed until there would be no room for selfishness, hatred, revenge, terror and cruelty. Civilization cannot be complete until society reaches "that intellectual, benevolent, pacific, moral and blissful goal."²⁰ Never did he advocate holy wars of liberation as a possible

means of spreading the good he believed America had to offer to the world. For Campbell that would be fratricide. In his essay on "The Destiny of our Country," he reminded his audience, "Nations and empires stand to each other as members of an individual family stand to one another."²¹

The universalism of Campbell's pacifism helped to thwart any tendency to promote the national good at the expense of other nations and peoples. In an essay in which he asserted that the civilizations of Europe and America have a "present superiority over their more remote ancestors, and over all other portions of the human race,"²² he made no attempt to use this claim to justify the subjugation of others. Rather, Campbell insisted that "the amelioration of the social state" could never be in reference only "to that little community of which we may happen to be a component part; but to that great community of communities which fills up the whole circle of our national intercourse" and which grows "from nation to nation."²³

Amazingly, even after making the most extravagant claims for the millennial role of America, Campbell would check himself. Citing the pacifist Soame Jenyns, Campbell stated, "Patriotism, it is conceded, has no special place in the Christian religion. Its founder never pronounced a single sentence in commendation of it." As Campbell knew, Jesus Christ had a love that recognized no borders, "and as patriotism is only an extension of the principle of selfishness," patriotism being a love of what is one's own, "he deigned it no regard, because selfishness is the great damning sin of mankind."²⁴

A quarter century earlier, in his debate with Robert Owens, Campbell approvingly referred to Jenyns' claim that patriotism is a pagan virtue. Campbell never backed away from that view. He conceded that "our neighbor is every man in the world," but inasmuch as no one can directly love everyone in the world, Campbell argued, "Our country, then, for the most part engages our attention, and exhausts all our means of doing good." Consequently, by increasing the morality, prosperity and character of the nation, Christians "extend its means of communicating blessing which, without it, no Christian man could bestow upon his species."²⁵

This approach sounds like a "trickle-down" blessedness. However, it is not significantly different from his teachings about patriotism prior to the development of his understanding of the millennial role of America. In 1832, he distinguished "Christian philanthropy" from the "love of country" exhibited by the patriot. Campbell's objection to patriotism implied nothing critical of the natural affection for one's own country. Rather he opposed that patriotism which promotes the love for and promotion of the interests of one's country at the expense of other peoples and nations or to the neglect of the needs of those beyond the boundaries of one's own country.²⁶ For Campbell, the universality of Christian love must always challenge the parochial impulses of patriotism.

Peaceful Reign Delayed

A few years prior to the beginning of the Civil War Campbell began to express doubts about an imminent beginning of the millennium and he fell silent about any millennial role for America. In 1858, Campbell mentioned hearing from a Washington correspondent who stated that a spiritual awakening had been detected throughout the land. The writer suggested that perhaps this

"may be the herald of the millennium." Campbell did not agree. He declared that other events which had not yet occurred must precede the millennium. Among these, he wrote, "The sword is to be beat into the pruning hook, the lion and the lamb lie down together, and the nations of the earth are to learn war no more." But as Campbell looked across the United States and beyond he found the opposite. Preparations for war were more prominent than efforts toward peace. "The sheen of the sword, the bayonet, and the deep mouthed cannon are preserved among all nations, by the constant threat of invasion from abroad, or eruption within."²⁷

Again in 1859 there was indication that Campbell's optimism about a imminent inception of the millennium had diminished. He quoted at length a report on the battle at Castiglione between the French and Austrian armies. The report described the horror of the conflict, the agony of the wounded and the grief of the civilians who remained in the town during the battle. At the conclusion of the report, a disheartened Campbell wrote, "The signs of these times are not indicative of the speedy commencement of that long wished for and prayed for era - when the knowledge of the true and only Potentate - 'the King of kings' and the 'Lord of lords' - shall cover the earth as the waters spread themselves over its lakes and seas and oceans."²⁸ The hope Campbell once had for a prompt inception of the millennium was greatly diminished by the lack of progress toward peace in both the divided church and the divisive nation.

This new train of thought continued into the next few years. Early in 1861 he wrote that the future destiny of the universe is known to God alone. Referring to the millennial reign, he wrote, "And one day being with the Lord of the universe as a thousand years, and a thousand years being as one day, we may on all our premises anticipate a glorious consummation of the present campaign in some one hundred and forty years hence..."²⁹ Later the same year, shortly after the Civil War began, Campbell pushed the millennium into a more distant future by saying before "the actual reign of the Messiah over all the nations, kindreds, tongues, and people, can culminate in all its glory and grandeur, the gospel must be announced to all the nations and peoples on this earth."³⁰

When the Civil War began, members of the church Campbell helped found traded the "Sword of the Spirit" which is the Word of God for the sword of the battlefield. While many pacifists remained in the ranks of Disciples - particularly in the South - many others disregarded Campbell's cries for nonviolence and threw themselves into the conflict.³¹ David Harrell has written, "As the cries of prophets of peace were slowly overwhelmed by the crescendo of galloping hoofs, clattering caissons, and bellowing demagogues - the sounds of a nation converging on Bull Run - most young Disciples packed their Bibles into saddlebags and rode off to do homage before the altar of Mars."³²

Hopes Deferred

For some even the approach of the horrible conflict was a hopeful sign. One writes, commenting on the ever-present sense of "cosmic optimism" in the years immediately prior to the civil war, that there was "a feeling that the millennium, if not at hand, was fast approaching" and that there was a

"pervasive millennialism which looked hopefully on the American future as the fulfillment of divine promise."³³ But for all the optimism that was evident in Campbell in earlier years, a dark mood had by this time settled over him. Others may have felt that the war was a stage in America's preparation for a millennial mission. Campbell thought otherwise. He apparently was not convinced that the war was in any way ennobling or purifying. To him, the bloody conflict was not a divinely willed battle for liberation and righteousness but rebellion against the will of God.

Campbell's hopes of seeing the millennial reign of Christ begin during his lifetime were dashed as national bloodletting began. Neither the restored church that he worked to develop nor what he had called "the most Protestant" of nations he loved brought in the millennium Campbell anticipated.³⁴ As it became apparent to him that the millennial hope he at least in part invested in America was misplaced he began to speak of the millennium as being far less imminent.

At the outbreak of the Civil War, Campbell lifted his pen to call for peace and to dissuade Christians from participating in the conflict. As he had in the past, Campbell again reminded his readers that "no Christian man who fears God and desires to be loyal to the Messiah, the Prince of Peace, shall be found in the ranks of so unholy a warfare." As he frequently did, Campbell cited Jesus' declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world." He continued, "For the reason that kingdom is established upon the principles of equity, peace and love, it shall endure forever."³⁵ He knew that the same thing could not be said of America.

It was that kingdom of equity, peace and love that Campbell wanted to promote, rather than ever support or condone killing for kingdoms and governments that depend upon the sword and are destined for demise. Campbell called upon his readers to live in a confident and peaceful manner appropriate for the kingdom of God. "Let the Christian therefore rejoice that his citizenship belongs to a kingdom that cannot be shaken or disturbed."³⁶

In 1864, Campbell wrote again of the millennium, but the Republic was given no central role in the divine drama. The church regained the prominence it had in Campbell's earlier eschatological thought, but no longer did he see its triumph near at hand. With a mixture of judgement, heartbreak and hope, he wrote,

We would rather see only the rosy dawn of a peaceful and triumphant procession of a golden age for the church - to imagine her going forth in her bridal adornments to meet the coming of her Espoused in the garments of joy. But it may not be. Darkness and tempest are round about the habitation of his Throne, and the aspects of the future for the church are darkly militant... The times are full of corruption, and the church is contaminated with the times. We need to be reminded, in tones of tenderness, coming as from the world-renouncing agonies of the cross, that we, the people of the living God, are not of the world... Let us not forget the weapons of our warfare, nor distrust the wisdom and power of our Leader.³⁷

NOTES

¹Alexander Campbell, *Popular Lectures and Addresses* (James Challen & Son: Philadelphia, 1864), 259.

²*Millennial Harbinger*, 1854, 67.

³Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Redeemer Nation: The Idea of America's Millennial Role* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 217.

⁴*Ibid.*, 1853, 487.

⁵*Popular Lectures and Addresses*, 373.

⁶Alexander Campbell and Robert Owen, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate* (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, n.d.), 395.

⁷*Popular Lectures and Addresses*, 373.

⁸*Ibid.*, 174.

⁹*Ibid.*, 178.

¹⁰Richard T. Hughes, "From Primitive Church to Protestant Nation: The Millennial Odyssey of Alexander Campbell," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XLIV/1 (March 1976), 96ff.

¹¹*Popular Lectures and Addresses*, 181.

¹²*Ibid.*, 44.

¹³Curti, *The American Peace Crusade 1815 - 1860* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1929), 53.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 44.

¹⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁶quoted in Peter Brock, *Pacifism in the United States from the Colonial Era to the First World War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968), 643.

¹⁷Lunger, *The Political Ethics of Alexander Campbell* (St. Louis: Belhany Press, 1854), 254.

¹⁸Marcus Cunliffe, *Soldiers and Civilians: The Martial Experience in America, 1775-1865* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968), 68.

¹⁹*Popular Lectures and Addresses*, 179.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 55.

²¹*Ibid.*, 166.

²²*Ibid.*, 49.

²³*Ibid.*, 48.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 184.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 185.

²⁶*The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate*, 409.

²⁷*Millennial Harbinger*, 1858, 335.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 1859, 519.

²⁹*Millennial Harbinger*, 1861, 20.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 1861, 426.

³¹David Edwin Harrell, Jr., op. cit., 139-173.

³²David Edwin Harrell, Jr., "Disciples of Christ Pacifism in Nineteenth Century Tennessee," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, 21/3 (Sept. 1962), 266.

³³George M. Frederickson, *The Inner Civil War* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 7.

³⁴*Millennial Harbinger*, 1853, 488.

³⁵*Ibid.*, 1861, 339.

³⁶*Ibid.*

³⁷*Ibid.*, 1864, 3f.

Kirkpatrick Historians' Seminar

April 26, 7:00 p.m., 2002

Through

April 27, 4:00 p.m.

At

The Historical Society

1101 19th Avenue South

Nashville, TN 37212

Exercised by the Spirit:

Ecstatic experiences and the Stone-Campbell Movement

- *The Background and Character
of the "Exercises" of the Great Revival*
Richard C. Goode, Faculty, Lipscomb University
- *The Encounter of North American Stone-Campbell Christians
with the Pentecostal/Charismatic Movement*
Amy Collier Artman, Ph.D. candidate, University of Chicago
- *Pentecostal Movements among Stone-Campbell Christians in the
Caribbean and South America*
Carmelo Alvarez, Faculty, Christian Theological Seminary

A formal response and open dialogue will follow each presentation.

An opportunity to meet Ketcherside Scholars.
These Ph.D. candidates and recent degree recipients
will introduce their work.

Send \$15 registration fee to the Historical Society.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY



Order of the Stone-Campbell Fellowship

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society has been blessed through the years with gifts from estates. Some have come unsolicited; others have been planned in advance with leadership of the Society. These gifts have measurably strengthened the ministry of the Society. Through the Order of the Stone-Campbell Fellowship the Society can recognize these intended gifts and express appreciation to those planning the gifts.

*Such a fellowship
expresses confidence in
the future of the Society*

Members of the Fellowship are persons who have a hope and a dream for the future of the Society as it continues to serve individuals and the church. They have named the Historical Society in their Will, established a charitable gift Annuity or Trust, made a gift of life insurance, or given their home or personal property while retaining lifetime use of the property. Some of these provisions were made early in the days of the Society's 50 year history while others were made in recent months. Each is a testimony to a life of stewardship and an expression of faith in the purpose and mission of the Historical Society.

*The fellowship is named
for two of the earliest
Church leaders*

Barton Warren Stone was the first of the major leaders to appear on the scene in 19th century America. Soon thereafter Alexander Campbell's voice was heard. From the followers of these men a church was born which continues to spread the gospel. The history of that movement housed in the Thomas W. Phillips Memorial is a legacy of their early faith and witness. Their gifts live on in the life of the church and the Disciples of Christ Historical Society.

DISCIPLIANA

The Quarterly Historical Journal of the
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

A DISCIPLES SEMINARY AT BERKELEY

Lester G. McAllister

**The Joe and Nancy Stalcup
Seminar for Local Church Historians**

**September 12-14, 2002
Nashville, Tennessee**

Details Inside

Make plans now to attend

**The Historical Society Banquet
at
General Assembly 2003**

Fred B. Craddock, speaker
(Seating limited to 300--Historical
Society members given first
choice of tickets)



Volume 62 • Number 2 • Summer, 2002

Published by	DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY Peter M. Morgan, President (morganpm@aol.com)	
Founding Editor	Claude E. Spencer	
Editorial Committee	D. Newell Williams, Editor (newell.williams@cts.edu) Douglas A. Foster Loretta Long Henry E. Webb Karen-Marie Yust Richard Cherok	
Editorial Consultants	Carisse Berryhill James O. Duke David A. Jones Mark G. Toulouse	Paul M. Blowers Richard T. Hughes Erma Jean Loveland Daisy L. Machado

Board of Trustees Officers	Chairperson	James R. Reed
	Vice-Chairperson	Gordon B. Dalrymple
	Secretary	Zola Walker
	Treasurer	Robert H. Edwards

DISCIPLIANA (USPS 995-060) is published quarterly for \$20.00 per year by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society which was established in 1941 "to maintain and further interest in religious heritage, backgrounds, origins, development, and general history of Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, Churches of Christ and related groups." Members of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society receive *DISCIPLIANA* quarterly, along with other benefits. Annual membership categories are: Sustaining - \$50 to \$249, Participating - \$30, Regular - \$20, Students - \$10.00, Non-U.S. - \$25. Life Memberships are: Life - \$250, Life Link - \$500, Life Patron - \$1,000.

Contributors to *DISCIPLIANA* should submit manuscripts on 3.5 floppy disk in Wordperfect 5.1 or "text" format. Electronic manuscript submission via "text only" formatted e-mail or attached file accepted at dishistsoc@aol.com. Postal mail should be addressed to: *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 Nineteenth Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196.

Phone: (615) 327-1444. Fax: (615) 327-1445. E-mail: mail@dishistsoc.org
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society Home Page: www.dishistsoc.org
Periodical postage paid at Nashville, TN.

Copyright 1997. Disciples of Christ Historical Society
Indexed by Restoration Serials Index
ISSN 0732-9881

Indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals, the Index to Book Reviews in Religion, Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975- on CD-ROM, and the *ATLA Religion Database*, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606, E-mail: atla@atla.com, WWW: http://www.atla.com/

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 - 19th Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196. Please give both old and new addresses and attach a mailing label from an old issue. USA: Please provide nine-digit code (ZIP+4).

— From the Editor's Desk

One would not necessarily expect the twenty-four year history of a long defunct Disciples of Christ school to be a real page-turner. Nevertheless, Lester McAllister tells a fascinating story of the origin, growth and decline of such an institution--a Disciples of Christ seminary at Berkeley, California. Established in 1896 to prepare ministers and laity for the leadership of the church, the Berkeley Bible Seminary was an innovative turn-of-the-century response to the educational needs of the Stone-Campbell movement in California. Seeking from the start cooperative relations with other California educational institutions, the early success of the seminary could not be sustained. Emerging at a time of growing controversy among Disciples over the issues of the Higher Criticism of the Bible and Open Membership, the fledgling institution was soon caught in the crossfire. Facing decline, the school contributed its legacy--books, funds, and personnel--to the formation of a Disciples educational institution that continues to this day with increasing strength.

How might the story have been different? Should it have been different? What is the appropriate relation of churches to educational institutions? Christians committed to the church's educational ministry in the twenty-first century will find much on which to reflect in McAllister's well-written narrative of the Berkeley Bible Seminary.

-D. Newell Williams

— From the President's Desk

David and Donna McWhirter are now a part of the history of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society. David served as Director of Library and Archives for twenty-six years; Donna assisted him in a variety of responsibilities. They retired in June of this year.

One of David and Donna's mentors is Lester McAllister, the featured author of this issue of *Discipliana*. Lester and David's friendship goes back to the 1960s when both served at Christian Theological Seminary. Both tell of family picnics when the McWhirter children were young. Dr. McAllister was instrumental in calling David to the Historical Society.

Lester helped send the McWhirters off in style. A bagpiper escorted them into a dinner in their honor on May 17. Lester's citation acknowledged David for cataloging over half of our 37,000 volume library and for the six indices he compiled, and for introducing the Society to the computer age including listing a large percentage of our collection on the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC). Donna was recognized for her years as photographer, research assistant and periodicals manager for the Society.

The festivities for David continued the next weekend. Emmanuel School of Religion honored David at their commencement. He was awarded the James A. Gardfield prize, the seminary's highest honor.

David and Donna will make their new home in Colorado Springs, Colorado--Donna's native state. They leave behind many friends and accomplishments in a ministry of twenty-six years.

David and Donna, part now of the Historical Society's history, are examples of living history: what was is present now to form what will be. Whenever a student checks out one of the 20,000 volumes David cataloged--whenever a scholar scrolls down OCLC listings and discovers one of the Society's one-of-a-kind holdings--whenever a learner opens the index to the *Millennial Harbinger* or *World Call*--whenever an author finds just the right photograph to be published in a new book or article--their work will go on.

-Peter M. Morgan

A DISCIPLES SEMINARY AT BERKELEY

Lester G. McAllister*

Prologue

Between 1896 and 1920 there was an institution located in Berkeley, California whose purpose was to prepare ministers and laity for the leadership of the church. The origin, growth and decline of that institution, the Berkeley Bible Seminary, is a little known facet of Disciples history. Almost from the first appearance of the Stone-Campbell movement in California there was an interest in education.

With the signing of the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo on February 2, 1848 the Mexican War was ended and California, along with other territories, was ceded to the United States. Within a matter of months a state constitution was written and adopted in a general election held in November of 1849; by September of 1850 California had become the 31st state.

The discovery of gold brought hundreds of new people to California. It was not long until an increasing number of ranchers and settlers, among whom were members of the Stone-Campbell movement, began to appear. Soon Disciples congregations were organized in many of the new towns of northern California, primarily in the area between Sacramento and San Francisco. Peter H. Burnett, a Roman Catholic who earlier had been a Disciple, was elected the first governor of the state. His brother, Glenn D. Burnett, remained a Disciple and was a pioneer preacher in California. (Ware, 13f.)

By 1860 an annual meeting or convention of the congregations had come into being. Rotating among the larger communities, these conventions were structured more formally than earlier evangelistic encampments; business was transacted along with inspirational preaching. (Ware, 130f)

One matter of concern which came before the gathering in 1860 was the lack of schools for their young. Disciples observed that several denominations were founding schools for children and for older students. A proposal was made to found such a school under Disciples auspices which resulted in an institution named Hesperian College located at Woodland. Opened for classes on March 1, 1861, the day Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated president, the school was incorporated under the laws of the state in 1869. (Ware, 161.)

Early in the year 1871 Disciples in the Santa Rosa area began planning for a school in their community. On September 23, 1872 the doors of Christian College were opened. Its most outstanding enrollee was Edwin Markham (1852-1940), a member of the Disciples and later a well-known poet. (Ware, 168f.) College City, thirty-five miles north of Woodland, became the location of Pierce Christian College which opened September 14, 1874. (Ware, 164-165) Washington College in Irvington (in Alameda County, not far from Berkeley) while organized by others, came under the

*Lester G. McAllister is Professor Emeritus of Modern Church History, Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis. Dr. McAllister is a Life Member of the Society, now living in Claremont, California.

patronage of the Disciples in 1883. (Ware, 218f.)

Those who led and taught in these schools had attended or had graduated from Disciples colleges in the east. One man teaching in Hesperian College had attended Hiram College while another teacher had graduated from Kentucky University (now Transylvania) at Lexington. Leaders of Christian College at Santa Rosa had graduated from Bethany College in West Virginia and Eureka College in Illinois. Pierce Christian College had as principal a graduate of Abingdon College (later merged with Eureka) and a faculty member who graduated from Kentucky University. They brought with them to California educational principles and ideals learned from either Campbell himself or from those who had studied under him. (See Ware, Chapter IX)

Those who gave leadership in these California educational enterprises were seeking to be true to the educational vision of Alexander Campbell (1788-1866) which he expressed in the program of Bethany College. His purpose was to encourage young men to prepare for the ministry and, at the same time, to prepare lay leaders and workers for the local congregations. The demand for such leaders was especially great in California as the Disciples were experiencing rapid growth.

Little more than high schools, these institutions provided their communities with at least some advanced education. Their influence was felt and appreciated not only in each community but also among Disciples throughout the area. However, maintaining enrollment and financial support for four separate schools proved difficult. (Raab, 88)

As early as the 1882 San Jose convention, several interested educators and lay leaders, feeling financial pressure on the schools, called an educational conference to meet outside the convention's regular sessions. Later, the full convention voted to form an Educational Committee to consider the question of establishing "a single Bible college or a Christian university in the state of California." After the state legislature voted funds for a free educational system in 1887 the situation became ever more critical. Tax supported schools meant a loss of students and income for the church schools. (Burgh and Parker, 3)

In the decade between 1882 and 1893 the energy of Disciples leaders was dedicated to organizing congregations, a state organization, a missionary society and a regional church paper. Only after these projects were underway could Disciples again turn their attention to educational efforts.

At the 1893 state convention, now meeting annually at Santa Cruz, a Committee on Education was appointed to consider a consolidation of Disciples educational interests. After the convention, representatives from congregations in the northern part of the state joined with representatives of the growing number of southern California churches to consider making Washington College, located not far from Berkeley, the center of Disciples efforts. (Cole, 70) The supporters of the earlier established schools naturally were opposed; it was obvious there could be no concentration on any one of the schools then existing. (Ware, 249f.)

A small and struggling school of the Congregational Churches, the College of California at Berkeley, had been founded in 1855 for the same reason the Disciples organized their schools. Taken over by the state in 1869 and fully funded by tax dollars, it became clear that the future of higher education in California would be tied to this institution now named

the University of California. Small church supported schools would have an ever more difficult struggle.

The growth of a young people's movement called Christian Endeavor, first organized in 1881 by a Congregational minister in New England, would greatly influence the Disciples efforts in higher education in California. The state Christian Endeavor Union of the Disciples, meeting in the 1893 convention, resolved to "take up the work in Berkeley as its special work and devote its energies to planting a church of the Disciples in that cultural center." (Ware, 249f.)

Early in 1893 Harold E. Monser (1868-1918) and his young wife moved to California from Kansas City to serve the Willows congregation. By the time of the 1893 state convention Monser, a graduate of the University of Missouri, had decided to continue his education at the university in Berkeley. The Christian Endeavor committee, along with the state board, availed themselves of the opportunity to appoint Monser to the new work there. (Raab, 17)

Selected as the pastor-evangelist of the recently established congregation, Monser and his wife moved to Berkeley in late September of 1893. He was to be supported by gifts from congregations and by contributions from Christian Endeavor societies specifically designated for the Berkeley congregation. (Raab, 19) Later that fall, in a letter published in the state paper, Monser said "When I came to Berkeley and entered the state university and saw the work of the students, the thought came to me that here was the true solution of the educational question of the Disciples on the Coast." (Ware. 251)

In their experience Disciples had known only two forms of education for ministers and lay leaders. The best known means of ministerial preparation in the Stone-Campbell movement was that of Alexander Campbell as conducted at Bethany College. In Campbell's educational understanding courses in classical languages, literature, science, mathematics, and the Bible, were to be offered as of value equally to preachers and to lay people.

A newer form of ministerial preparation for Disciples came into being at Lexington, Kentucky in 1865. John W. McGarvey (1829-1911), a graduate of Bethany College, established a College of the Bible as one of the colleges in Kentucky University. While McGarvey believed he had received a good education at Bethany, he also believed he had not been prepared adequately for ministry. The College of the Bible was to be specifically for ministerial preparation.

A third means of religious instruction in higher education was introduced in 1893 just as Monser was beginning his work at Berkeley. The first "Bible chair" opened in October at the University of Michigan. Its purpose was to sponsor and undergird the teaching of religion in state universities. With class meetings off-campus, such "chairs" were staffed by Biblical scholars and financed by the church. This imaginative experiment in higher education encouraged Disciples elsewhere to consider launching similar programs. (McAllister-Tucker, 333f.)

The Bible chair program at Ann Arbor attracted the attention of Harold Monser. In March of 1894 Monser laid before the "Ministerial Union of the Christian Churches Around the Bay" a Bible seminary in connection with the University of California similar to the institution at the University of Michigan. It appears that Monser did not fully understand the Bible

chair concept and equated it to a Bible college whose purpose was to prepare students for ministry. (Raab, 89)

Monser's proposal was favorably received by the ministerial union and a committee was appointed consisting of Harold E. Monser, president of the union, and two others to look into the matter. The Committee on Education appointed at the 1893 convention declined to take action though they expressed themselves favorably inclined toward such a project. A letter sent to every congregation in northern California resulted in over 60 congregations giving approval to the plan. (Ware, 251 f.)

The special committee of the Bay area churches' Ministerial Union met regularly between April and July of 1894 to make concrete plans for an institution to be located in Berkeley. At the state convention of the churches in August a resolution proposing a school was presented. In the discussion which followed several important issues were raised.

There was a concern as to the leadership of the new institution and a difference of opinion as to what kind of institution should be established. Some delegates were not entirely sold on the Bible chair idea; they could not see spending good money on university students. Other delegates had uppermost in their minds the need for an institution designed to prepare evangelists, pastors and other leaders for Disciples congregations. (Raab, 91 f.)

At the end of the 1890s the Stone-Campbell movement had not yet divided over such issues as the use of instrumental music in worship, a paid ministry and the support of missionary societies. While these questions had become settled in the minds of many in California, tensions were growing between those who in time would be known as "Churches of Christ" and those who took the name "Christian Churches." Those leaders of a more conservative nature such as James C. Keith, former president of Pierce Christian College, and Lanceford B. Wilkes, former president of Christian College at Santa Rosa, opposed the idea of a new institution.

Apparently a compromise was reached. An amended proposal was presented to the convention to consolidate the Disciples educational interests in California in an institution located adjacent to the University of California to have the name Berkeley Bible Seminary. The discussion for and against a seminary was lively, but when the vote was taken the resolution to establish the school carried by a slight majority.

During the debate young Monser and others pictured in glowing terms the many benefits for Disciples which would be created by having a school at Berkeley. The conservative Wilkes, known for his opposition to "innovations," said "Perhaps ten or fifteen years hence we will be better prepared to judge the effect of this enterprise upon our movement than we are now." His statement proved prophetic. (Ware, 251 f.)

Berkeley Bible Seminary

The 1894 convention, having voted to establish a Berkeley Bible Seminary, appointed a Seminary Committee to oversee the project. It was assumed Disciples congregations of California, north and south, (and their members) would support the new institution.

The committee was composed of W. A. Gardner, as state secretary-evangelist; Elias Benton Ware, Healdsburg, pastor and editor; Henry D.

McAneney (1858-C.1919), president of Hesperian College; Allen M. Elston (1845-1946), professor at Hesperian; James Madison Monroe, pastor at Modesto; Alexander Campbell Smither (d.1928), Los Angeles, minister of the influential First Christian Church; Judge A. M. McCoy (b. 1852), Red Bluff, lawyer and president of the state convention; Harold E. Monser, Berkeley; and J. B. Johnson. (Ware, 252)

In one of its first actions the committee decided that the new institution would not open until an endowment of \$100,000 had been secured. In a second action the committee unanimously selected Henry McAneney to be the "financial agent," that is, the person to solicit the churches and individuals for money. McAneney had supported the idea of a school at Berkeley from the beginning.

Henry Dalton McAneney was born in Ohio in 1858 and graduated from Drake University about 1876. After graduation he taught public school in Iowa until called in 1882 to be a professor at his alma mater. Through his friendship with a fellow professor, Dr. David R. Dungan, McAneney left the Roman Catholic Church and joined the Disciples. He married in 1882. In 1892 he resigned his position at Drake and he, his wife and children moved to Woodland, California where he had accepted a call to be president of Hesperian College. (Ware, 315)

J. M. Monoe was appointed by the committee to be "Trustee for the Berkeley Bible Seminary." In that position he was authorized to receive and to hold in trust all gifts to the seminary, either money, stocks or other property until the incorporation of the school. (Ware, 253)

During the remaining months of 1894 and all of 1895, McAneney traveled extensively in behalf of the committee seeking the necessary funds to permit the opening of the school. (Ware, 253) Harold Monser, at the same time, visited bay area congregations seeking funds for a Bible chair at the university, funds later turned over to the trustee of the proposed seminary. Monser continued to serve as pastor of First Christian Church, Berkeley, until his graduation from the university in late spring 1895 at which time he and his wife returned to the mid-west. (Raab, 22)

By the spring of 1896 McAneney had managed to raise a total of \$70,000 of the necessary \$100,000. Not all of the \$70,000 was in cash; some of it was in pledges, notes, and wills along with real estate to be sold. (Ware, 253)

At the 1894 convention the two remaining schools, Hesperian at Woodland and Pierce College at College City, had agreed to give their relatively small endowments to the seminary fund. Christian College at Santa Rosa and Washington College at Irvington were closed earlier. Sometime early in 1896 the properties of Hesperian and Pierce Colleges were turned over to their respective communities as high schools and their endowments, totaling \$10,000 to \$12,000, were added to the Berkeley Seminary fund; the committee was still short of the needed \$100,000. (Ware, 253f.)

When Mr. and Mrs. E. B. Beard, members of the Modesto Christian Church, and wealthy landowners, realized how close McAneney was to his goal they agreed to give to the seminary committee 800 acres of land valued at \$20,000. The Beard's gift brought the endowment to the required \$100,000; a way to open the seminary was assured. (Ware, 254)

The seminary was incorporated on July 20, 1896. The first board of trustees was composed of the members of the Seminary Committee

elected by the 1895 convention. They were: W. A. Gardner, Henry D. McAnaney, Allen M. Elston, Alexander Campbell Smither, A. M. McCoy, E. B. Ware, E. B. Beard and C. P. Hodges. With Judge A. M. McCoy presiding, the board met for the first time at the 1896 state convention at Santa Cruz to select a dean for the new school.

After a review of possible candidates and considerable discussion, E. B. Ware proposed the name of S. M. Jefferson, a professor at Bethany College who was widely known as an outstanding Biblical scholar. W. A. Gardner seconded the motion and the trustees voted unanimously in favor of electing Dr. Jefferson the first dean of Berkeley Bible Seminary. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, March 12, 1914: 338 and Ware, 255)

Samuel Mitchell Jefferson (1849-1914), A. M., LL D., a native of Delaware, grew up in Indiana and graduated from Indiana University in 1874. Between 1874 and 1893 he served as pastor of congregations in Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio and Georgia. Jefferson was professor of Biblical Literature at Bethany College between 1893 and his call to be dean at Berkeley. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, March 12, 1914: 338)

On Monday, August 17, 1896 an article appeared in the *Berkeley Daily Gazette* concerning the opening of the school:

The Berkeley Bible Seminary, Dr. Jefferson in charge, opened this morning under the most favorable circumstances.... it is expected that between 15 and 25 will be enrolled before the end of the week... in the meantime, all arrangements are being completed whereby the seminary and university studies will not conflict.

The upper portion of Stiles Hall has been leased by Berkeley Bible Seminary and the lectures for the ensuing year will be held in that building.... [Stiles Hall was the University Y. M. C. A. building and convenient to the university campus.] A course of lectures will be delivered by Dr. Jefferson during this term on "The Importance, Principles and Methods of Biblical Study." They will be delivered on Wednesday afternoons at four o'clock." (As quoted in Raab, 91)

Some of the university students who enrolled in the seminary were planning to be preachers while others were attracted by the subject matter. The Bible chair aspect of the seminary's purpose was clear. President Kellogg of the university agreed that university students enrolled in the seminary might count their course with "the Seminary's Professor of Philosophy in their regular work for the degree - provided that said Professor of Philosophy be satisfactory to the Regents." (Raab, 92)

It is appropriate at this point to say a word about the relationship which developed between the seminary and the congregation of Disciples in Berkeley. From the time when Harold Monser arrived in Berkeley to serve as pastor of what was now called First Christian Church the history of the two institutions was closely intertwined. Faculty and students of the university and seminary provided leadership in the congregation and, from time to time, pastors of the congregation served on the faculty of the seminary. (Raab, 88)

That this was the general impression is to be seen in the statement of William A. Ferrier in his book *Ninety Years of Education in California*. He states:

The movement for this seminary grew out of the desire of a few members of the Christian Church to remedy what was held to be a lack of religious influences on and adjacent to the University campus. The aim was to establish at Berkeley a religious center which should consist of a church organization and a school for Bible study not only for the training of young men for the ministry, but for all those persons who might wish to avail themselves of the advantages thus afforded

in order to lay better and more enduring foundations for right living. (Ferrier, 305)

There were approximately 2,000 students enrolled in the University of California in 1897, a number of whom came from Disciples families. Berkeley Bible Seminary announced itself as “not denominational,” and university students were encouraged to take seminary courses.

The seminary, in anticipation of the 1897-1898 academic year, issued its first catalog. The faculty and administration consisted of Henry D. McAneney, president; Samuel M. Jefferson, dean; and Allen M. Elston, associate professor. At the time Hesperian College closed Elston had served that institution eighteen years as professor and president. In semi-retirement he moved to Berkeley with his family. When Harold E. Monser resigned in 1895 as pastor of the small congregation which was “houseless and little-known,” Elston was called to succeed him and to teach in the seminary. (Ware, 162)

The catalog announced a three-year course consisting of a junior, middle and senior year. There were four departments of study: Biblical Theology, Historical Theology, Systematic Theology and Practical Theology. It was stated that the seminary was designed primarily for the training of preachers of the gospel. Stated more specifically, the purposes of the seminary were:

1. To furnish, in connection with the course of instruction in the University of California, a thorough and comprehensive course of instruction and training in Christian theology as an adequate preparation for Christian ministry.
2. To provide instruction and training for persons who wish to work in Sunday School, Christian Endeavor, missions, evangelism or other church work.
3. To afford students of the university an opportunity for acquiring a systematic and practical knowledge of the Bible as an important part of a liberal education.

The seminary further stated that the classes in all departments were open to both men and women who were properly qualified. This openness to both sexes was unusual in 1897. (Berkeley Bible Seminary *Catalog* - 1897)

In publishing the overall design for the seminary, it is clear that the state convention of the churches and the board of trustees were giving priority to ministerial preparation. Only in third place is the opportunity for university students to take seminary classes listed as a purpose of the school.

One of the trustees, A. C. Smither of Los Angeles, in an article published in March, 1898 reported on the development of the seminary to that point. Smither stated that 15 students had been enrolled in the 1896-1897 year and that Dr. Jefferson was well received. (*Christian Standard*, March 5, 1898:307)

By the fall of 1898 things seemed to be going so well that Mr. and Mrs. E. B. Beard, the Modesto couple who had made possible the opening of the seminary in 1896, purchased and deeded to the trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary a piece of property so that the institution might have a campus. The property was located at the corner of Dana and Bancroft Way on the south side of the University of California. (Raab, 93)

Samuel M. Jefferson resigned in December of 1899 as dean of the seminary to accept a position at Kentucky University, Lexington, as professor of philosophy in the College of the Bible (now Lexington Theological Seminary). We can only speculate as to the reason for his leaving. As he had been a pastor for 20 years before entering higher education it may be assumed his main interest was in preparing preachers.

(*The Christian-Evangelist*, March 12, 1914: 338)

The first graduate of Berkeley Bible Seminary and the only graduate under Dean Jefferson was George W. Brewster, Jr., a native Californian born in Sacramento County. He was later secretary of the northern California churches. (Ware, 321)

The trustees chose as the second dean Hiram Van Kirk (1868-1920). Van Kirk was born in Ohio and received the A. B. degree from Hiram College in 1892. In 1895 he graduated from Yale Divinity School with a Bachelor of Divinity. In June of 1900 Van Kirk received the Ph. D. from the University of Chicago and came directly to Berkeley to assume his duties as professor and dean of the seminary. One can imagine the challenge the 32-year old Van Kirk felt on coming to an exciting university campus where he would be able to try new ideas and put his learning to good use.

During this time, according to seminary student J. J. White, "The congregation [of First Christian Church] was made up entirely of students (and some professors) of the University and at the end of the semester the students all went home and the church dissolved." (Raab, 30)

In October of 1900 the congregation began meeting at Stiles Hall, where seminary classes were held. One member is reported as saying, "It is a pleasant place and in a nice location but it has inconveniences and it is not our home." (Raab, 31) The congregation looked forward to having a building of its own. To this end they made arrangements with the Berkeley Bible Seminary trustees to lease part of their lot at Dana and Bancroft Way on which to place a building at some time in the future. (Raab, 31)

During the summer of 1901 Pacific Theological Seminary, founded in 1866 by the Congregational Church, moved from Oakland to Berkeley to be near the university campus. New opportunity for cooperation between the seminaries was made possible. Not only could Berkeley Bible Seminary and Pacific Theological Seminary interact with the courses of the university but also courses in the seminaries could be interchanged. Beginning in the spring of 1902 Dean Van Kirk was invited to give courses at Pacific Theological Seminary. (Hogue, 77)

In July of 1902 Van Kirk reported a successful academic year. Over 400 books had been added to the seminary library. Course work had been of two kinds: classes for training ministerial students (with an enrollment of 20) and a popular class "of the character of work done by Bible chairs" (with an enrollment of 30). For pastors and laity attending the state convention held at Santa Cruz, Van Kirk organized a summer school. Ninety-seven delegates enrolled.

The dean concluded his report by listing the needs of the seminary. He believed the most urgent need to be a building so that students would feel a sense of belonging to a stable institution. More students for the ministry were of prime concern. A full-time second faculty member would be helpful. The year's cooperation with the University of California and with Pacific Theological Seminary had been most pleasant. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, July 3, 1902:464)

Along with his teaching at Pacific Theological Seminary, Van Kirk had been appointed a lecturer in history on the faculty of the university. The dean had taught 150 students in an Old Testament class and 50 students in a New Testament class in his first year of university teaching. (Raab,

92f.)

Dean Hiram Van Kirk did not know it but his report in July of 1902 was to be his last positive experience as dean for nearly a year and a half. Van Kirk's graduate education at Yale Divinity School and the University of Chicago had encompassed higher criticism of the Bible derived mainly from German Bible scholars of the 19th century. Such study entails examining the books of the Bible seeking to discover their history, purpose and meaning as well as questions of authorship.

In the first decade of the 20th century the Christian community was seriously disturbed by the introduction of higher criticism and a new interpretation of the Bible into the seminaries. Because the Disciples had sought to base their hopes for Christian unity upon a simple reading of scripture, these new teachings were particularly upsetting to some church members.

Disciples became aware of these issues through the pages of two journals: the *Christian Standard*, Cincinnati, Ohio and *The Christian-Evangelist*, St. Louis, Missouri. These widely read magazines were published by privately held, exceedingly competitive, companies. Usually, that which one magazine approved the other disapproved.

With a vitriolic weekly column written by John W. McGarvey (1829-1911), professor of Bible in the College of the Bible in Kentucky and a staunch conservative, the *Christian Standard* in general opposed higher criticism. Calling such studies "destructive" and "detrimental to orthodoxy," McGarvey and the *Christian Standard* sought to expose and destroy any persons propagating the new studies.

The Christian-Evangelist, by and large, accepted the new interpretations. The editor published a weekly column by Herbert L. Willett (1864-1944), a Disciples scholar who taught Bible at the University of Chicago and who sought to answer McGarvey by upholding higher criticism.

McGarvey titled his column in the *Christian Standard* for December 13, 1902 "Wolves in Sheep's Clothing." It was an account he had been given about a young preacher in Oakland, California who was using biblical criticism. The young man had continued getting his salary from the congregation for six months after saying he was "practically a Unitarian." McGarvey continued. "I have private information others are playing the same game," a veiled reference to Hiram Van Kirk of Berkeley Bible Seminary. (*Christian Standard*, December 13, 1902:1726)

Whether the *Christian Standard* and its editor were aware of it or not, Hiram Van Kirk, while a student at the University of Chicago, had been behind an effort the journal later was to oppose as vigorously as it did higher criticism. At the General Convention of the Christian Churches which met at Springfield, Illinois in October of 1896 it was Hiram Van Kirk who called together all of the "university men" in attendance to found the Campbell Institute. (Becker, 2)

The Campbell Institute restricted its membership to college graduates and adopted a threefold purpose: "to encourage a scholarly spirit, to inspire contributions to the literature and thought of Disciples and to promote spiritual maturity." Beginning with fourteen members in 1896, within five years it claimed a membership approaching 100. As a means of liberalizing the Disciples the organization's influence was considerable. Conservatives thought of the Campbell Institute as a nest of modernists.

(McAllister and Tucker, 374f.)

The attack on Van Kirk began in the same December 13 issue of the *Christian Standard* containing McGarvey's column telling of the Oakland pastor. The editor, James A. Lord, published an editorial titled "Criticism in California." He reported that "destructive criticism" had been disturbing California congregations. He said, "There have been rumors for some time but now events have so shaped themselves ... that publication in the interest of the cause of Christ seems necessary." Lord continued, "Students at the seminary allege that Van Kirk is devoted to what is generally known as higher criticism and teaches it in the classroom." (*Christian Standard*, December 13, 1902: 1728)

James Alexander Lord (1849-1922) was editor of the *Christian Standard* from 1895-1911 and was zealous to uphold orthodoxy. Originally from New Brunswick, Canada, he had been a student of McGarvey at the College the Bible after which he was a popular preacher in Missouri for fifteen years before becoming an editor. (*Christian Standard*, June 24, 1922: 3676)

On December 19, 1902 Hiram Van Kirk addressed a letter to the readers of the *Christian Standard* saying "I see I am marked by the editor of the *Standard* as the next victim of his inquisition." Van Kirk denied teaching destructive criticism. (*Christian Standard*, January 3, 1903:10)

The *Standard* published the seminary's reply in the February 21, 1903 issue. James H. McCullough (1829-1920), a member of the board of trustees and a highly respected northern California leader, on behalf of the board wrote a defense of Van Kirk. He indicated that the statements in the editorial were not new; they were known at the state convention in July, 1902. At that time the seminary board appointed a committee consisting of himself, A. C. Smither and A. M. McCoy to interview Van Kirk.

The committee reported unanimously that it was satisfied with the theological views of the dean. Van Kirk was re-elected dean for another year at an increased salary. The board in July had felt that the matter was closed until the December 13 editorial.

In the same issue of the *Standard* in which the seminary's reply was published, the editor had a second editorial titled "Criticism in California, Again." It was suggested that because of their views at least two members of the seminary board, McAneney and Martin, should have disqualified themselves. It was Lord's view that McAneney was on trial as well as Van Kirk. The editorial of December 13 had stated that the dean taught higher criticism at the Berkeley seminary. The editor now wished to present proof.

I. J. Luce, a graduate of Pacific Theological Seminary and a Congregational minister, was a friend of a student studying under Van Kirk. The two men had compared notes and they believed the course content Van Kirk was teaching was essentially that being taught by a Prof. Lloyd of Pacific Theological Seminary.

By chance the guest speaker at the 1902 state convention had been none other than J. W. McGarvey. The editor declared that McGarvey had been shocked to see A. Cushman McGiffert's controversial book *Apostolic Age* being sold in the bookstore and, upon checking, found that it had been placed there by Van Kirk. The editorial closed by stating "Our

schools should teach only revealed truth.” (*Christian Standard*, February 21, 1903:254)

After one or two additional editorials the rather lengthy exchange between the several parties seemed to be drawing to a close. Van Kirk made a protest in an article for the July 11, 1903 issue of the *Standard*. He reviewed the major charges in what he called “inflammatory” articles. The dean reminded the readers of Alexander Campbell’s well-known principles of biblical interpretation which were widely accepted and were similar to the principles he used in his classes and lectures. (*Christian Standard*, July 11, 1903:1004)

Eleven months later, August 13, 1904 the *Christian Standard* published its regrets for the attack on Dean Van Kirk and the Berkeley Bible Seminary. A statement was made that R. H. Waggoner, representing the Standard Publishing Company, had made a tour among the California churches, interviewing leading members. His conclusion, “We have become satisfied that the principal witnesses, upon whose statements we made certain charges against Dean Van Kirk and the Berkeley Bible Seminary are untrustworthy; we therefore regret the unfortunate controversy arising there from, and, so far as we are concerned, this matter is forever closed.” (*Christian Standard*, August 13, 1904:1121) There the matter rested except for the harm done to the reputation and continuing positive influence of Dean Hiram Van Kirk.

Berkeley Bible Seminary trustees were required to report to the state convention annually. The report for 1902-1903 made at the convention on July 27, 1903, came during the main attack by the *Christian Standard*. Presented by the president of the seminary, Henry D. McAneney, the board sought to be as positive as possible.

On the whole the seminary year had been a successful one. In addition to the regular program, Dean Van Kirk had taught 143 different students of the university. McAneney said, “No fairer opportunity has ever opened to any of the Bible chairs at our state universities than that which lies at Berkeley.”

In addition to Van Kirk’s university courses, the courses given in the seminary were listed. They included “The Life of Christ,” “Harmony of the Gospels,” “The Teachings of Jesus,” “The Teachings of the Disciples of Christ,” “Survey of Old Testament Literature and History,” and “New Testament Greek.” There had been 35 students in the seminary proper.

The trustees had met in San Francisco on January 6, 1903 to investigate the charges against Van Kirk. The board heard testimony from students who were unanimous in agreeing that the dean’s teaching was “not destructive but constructive.” On the financial side the seminary had lost income due to the attacks by the *Christian Standard* begun the previous December containing unsubstantiated charges against Dean Van Kirk.

The trustees made two recommendations to the convention: an adequate building should be provided the seminary and a goal of a quarter of a million dollars additional endowment for the seminary in relation to the Centennial Convention of the Disciples planned for Pittsburgh in October of 1909.

The board’s report was submitted to the convention expressing full support of Dean Van Kirk and of Berkeley Bible Seminary. The trustees especially wished to recognize Henry McAneney as a man of Christian character and distinguished ability. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, September

3, 1903: 308)

From its opening in 1896 the Berkeley Bible Seminary held its classes in rented quarters on the second floor of Stiles Hall, the university Y. M. C. A. After seven years it was recognized that other arrangements should be made for housing the institution. Acting on a resolution passed by the convention in July of 1903 the seminary administration had plans drawn for an adequate building to be erected on the corner of the property at Dana and Bancroft Way.

Because of the attacks made on Hiram Van Kirk and Henry D. McAneney, and with all the questions raised by such attacks, the problem of how to finance a building became acute. Income had been decreasing and major gifts were not to be had.

It was decided that a building to house the congregation would be constructed first. The seminary trustees gave approval for First Christian Church of Berkeley to erect a building on the south part of the seminary's property facing Dana Street. By December of 1904 the building to house the congregation was finished and dedicated. Beginning with the spring semester in 1905 the classes of the seminary were moved from Stiles Hall to the second floor of the church building. The seminary building itself was never built but the institution at last had a home. (Raab, 93)

Much may be learned from the 1904-1905 catalog of the Berkeley Bible Seminary. It stated that "[Dean Van Kirk's] success in the ultra-conservative atmosphere of Berkeley has been gratifying, and promises much for the future influence of the Seminary." Through representation on the university faculty Dean Van Kirk had given instruction to more than 400 students of the University of California between 1902 and 1905. (Berkeley Bible Seminary - *Catalog* -1904-1905: 7)

The faculty for 1904-1905 consisted of Henry D. McAneney, A. M., LL. D., President and Lecturer in Church History; Hiram Van Kirk, B. D., Ph. D., Dean and Professor of Biblical and Historical Theology; Allen Mandeville Elston, B. D., A. M., Myers Instructor in Public Speaking [supported from an endowment established by Mary R. Myers]; Robert Perry Shepherd, Ph. D., Instructor in English Bible and William Perry Bentley, A. M., Lecturer on Missions. (Berkeley Bible Seminary - *Catalog* -1904-1905: 3)

Robert Perry Shepherd (1867-1941), an 1895 graduate of Hiram College, earned a Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1903. Shepherd taught courses in the English Bible and, as an authority on religious education, a course on "The Art of Religious Teaching." In addition to teaching, Shepherd also became pastor of the Disciples Berkeley congregation.

William P. Bentley, a graduate of Bethany College with an M. A. degree from Ohio State University, was a world traveler with experience as a missionary to China. Bentley for several years was the seminary's lecturer on missions. Allen M. Elston had been persuaded to return to the classroom to give instruction in public speaking. (Berkeley Bible Seminary, *Catalog* -1904-1905: 8f.)

By 1904 Berkeley Bible Seminary was not only cooperating with Pacific Theological Seminary (Congregational) but also with the Pacific Coast Baptist Seminary (American Baptist), a Unitarian seminary (now Starr King School of Ministry), San Francisco Theological Seminary (Presbyterian) and Church Divinity School of the Pacific (Episcopal). In

the summer of 1905 these schools cooperated in a “Federated Summer School of Theology.” (Berkeley Bible Seminary, *Catalog* -1904-1905: 8 and Hogue, 77)

Dean Van Kirk commented on the advantages of such cooperation. These seminaries

furnish additional departments of instruction not possible to our own Seminary.. .. Thus there is grouped at Berkeley a force for theological instruction not to be surpassed outside of the leading universities of our country.... The harmonious working relation of these seminaries promises much in the promotion of future Christian Union. (Berkeley Bible Seminary, *Catalog* -1904-1905: 8f.)

Van Kirk continued

The Berkeley Bible Seminary is an annex to the University of California. As such it has no corporate connection with the State Institution, but is maintained and controlled, wholly, by the Christian Churches of California. Its students, however, are admitted to all University classes for which they can show adequate preparation...In this way they depend upon the University for their general education, and upon the Seminary only for their Biblical instruction and professional training for the ministry. Thus, the Seminary students have the advantage of educational facilities which could be provided only by a church college, endowed with millions of dollars. (Berkeley Bible Seminary-*Catalog* 1904-1905: 8)

However, times were changing for ministerial education. A generation of Disciples ministers, beginning in 1891 with the opening of the University of Chicago and continuing until the formation of the North American Christian Convention in 1927, were destined to live in a time of bitter tension in the Stone-Campbell movement. Standards were being raised and many persons believed that because of biblical criticism the Disciples “plea” for the restoration of the New Testament church was in jeopardy.

Young men (and it was mostly men) entering the ministry discovered the need for a high school diploma, many found it advantageous to attend college, and an increasing number after college determined to attend seminary. The Berkeley Bible Seminary recognized these needs and sought to provide for the new educational standards the times required. The struggle between the traditional preparation of pastors and the new standards had fueled the attack on Dean Van Kirk by the *Christian Standard*. The acceptance of biblical criticism by a number of Disciples scholars marked a turning point in Disciples history.

The ensuing disagreement between those who accepted the new learning and those who repudiated it eventuated in a second division in the Stone-Campbell movement symbolized by the organization of the North American Christian Convention. (The first division had occurred in 1906 over several issues among them the support of missionary societies and the use of musical instruments in worship.) These developments were to be seen in the rise and fall of the Berkeley Bible Seminary.

For the academic year 1904-1905 Dean Van Kirk attempted to raise standards by requiring freshman standing in the University of California for admission to the seminary. Exception was made in the case of “ministers of acknowledged ability and long and successful experience, even though they may not have had all the advantages of a high school education.” Other students had the possibility of conditional enrollment in the “popular” courses of the seminary while attending high school or “any of the numerous preparatory schools of Berkeley.” Van Kirk suggested that a special tutor could be obtained from the university to prepare students for particular examinations. In all cases “the qualification of any

matriculate must be passed upon by the Dean.” (Berkeley Bible *Seminary-Catalog* -1904-1905: 9)

After the convention’s vote of confidence in 1903 and with the housing of the seminary settled by December of 1904 the churches of California improved their support of the seminary. The seminary program continued to grow both in numbers of students and in curriculum.

Dean Van Kirk gave up his classes at the university in 1905 but, nevertheless, had his hands full teaching seminary classes as well as courses at Pacific Theological Seminary. During the academic years 1905-1906 a total of 14 Disciples were enrolled at Berkeley Bible Seminary in addition to a number of students from Pacific Theological Seminary. Due to the San Francisco earthquake in April of 1906 classes were dismissed; both faculty and students volunteered for relief work. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, July 5, 1906: 852)

The dean in the midst of his busy schedule found time to edit his doctoral dissertation for publication in early 1907 by the Christian Publishing Company, St. Louis. The book was titled *A History of the Theology of the Disciples of Christ*.

The spiritual life of the faculty and students was not neglected as there was a weekly devotional meeting led by President McAneney. The students of the seminary on the week-end supplied many of the northern California congregations without full-time pastors and were well received. Once a year the congregations of the entire state, north and south, participated in an “Education Sunday,” at which time a special offering was taken for the work of the seminary. (Raab, 95)

Dr. Hiram Van Kirk resigned his position as dean and professor at Berkeley Bible Seminary to be effective August 1, 1908. He had accepted an appointment as Instructor in systematic theology at Yale Divinity School to begin with the fall semester and was the first Disciples scholar to be on the Yale seminary faculty. (Becker, 13 and Raab, 95)

The Berkeley Bible Seminary was without a dean until the appointment of Dr. Harvey Guy in May of 1909. President McAneney announced that “Dean Guy is a man of scholarly taste and habits.... Although still comparatively young, he is at the height of his intellectual powers and is ambitious to make his life count for the most in the Master’s service In his theological positions he is conservative.” (Raab, 95)

Harvey Hugo Guy (1872-1936), born in Kansas, earned the A. B. and B. D. degrees from the University of Chicago and in 1903 received the Ph. D. degree from the University of Chicago. Between 1893 and 1899 he was a missionary and teacher in Japan and known as a gifted linguist. (Raab, 167) Dr. Guy arrived in Berkeley in 1908 to serve as superintendent of a Japanese mission begun in 1904 to serve Japanese students at the University of California. When the trustees of the seminary began looking for a dean, Dr. Guy was at hand and came naturally to mind. (Raab, 110)

The seminary catalog for 1909-1910 showed Henry D. McAneney continuing as president; Harvey H. Guy, dean and Professor of Biblical Literature; Walter Stairs, Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis; Allen M. Elston, Instructor in Public Speaking; Hjalmar J. Loken, Instructor in New Testament; Isaac N. McCash, Instructor in Pastoral Work and Methods; Harvey O. Breeden, Instructor in Evangelistic Work and Methods; Edwin W. Thornton, Instructor in Bible School Work and Methods. (Raab,96)

Prof. Walter Stairs had been educated at the College of the Bible in Kentucky, Yale Divinity School and the University of Chicago. Stairs previously had taught at Drake University, Des Moines and Texas Christian University, Fort Worth. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, March 24, 1954:281)

Hjalmar Jorgensen Loken (1875-1957), was a man who would have a major and lasting impact on the Berkeley Bible Seminary. Born in Norway, baptized and confirmed in the Lutheran Church at an early age, Loken came to America at the age of 15 and worked his way through the University of California. He received the A. B. degree in 1904 near the top of his class. With the encouragement of the university faculty he took a year of graduate study to prepare himself for a career teaching philosophy.

Loken, however, believed himself called to the Christian ministry. Through Van Kirk's university classes Loken discovered the Disciples of Christ and was baptized by the dean in 1903. Loken enrolled in Berkeley Bible Seminary and served as pastor of the nearby Richmond Christian Church until he graduated from the seminary in 1906. He attended Harvard Divinity School through the academic year 1906-1907, receiving the B. D. degree. Upon returning to California Loken served congregations at Colusa and Alameda. In the fall of 1909 he began teaching at the seminary with classes scheduled to meet in the mornings so they would not interfere with his pastoral duties. (Raab, 59-62)

Another important faculty appointment in 1909 was that of Isaac Newton McCash (1861-1961), born in Cumberland County, Illinois, he graduated from National Normal University of Ohio in 1882. Ordained in 1890 he served University Place Christian Church in Des Moines while earning an M. A. degree from Drake University in 1902. McCash became pastor of First Christian Church of Berkeley in July, 1907 and also taught on the seminary faculty. Because of effective service as pastor in several congregations he was an ideal person to teach "Pastoral Work and Methods" and was destined to be an outstanding educator as president of Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma from 1916 to 1938. (Raab. 49-51)

It seems obvious from this listing of an expanded faculty that following the resignation of Hiram Van Kirk the board was seeking to chart a new course for the seminary. The new appointments were in practical fields of the ministry as well as the classical studies in Bible. The Berkeley Bible Seminary was moving rapidly from the Bible chair concept and, in the years ahead, would relate more to the other Berkeley seminaries than to the university. (Raab, 97)

Anticipating the opening of the fall term of 1909, President McAneney stated in a release to the Disciples journals that in the coming academic year the seminary would offer only such courses as were designed to prepare men and women for Christian work. In addition to courses in ministerial preparation, work in evangelism, Bible school and missionary training would be offered. It was hoped the new curriculum would increase enrollment. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, July 1, 1909:820)

McAneney announced that there were now three courses of instruction: 1) an advanced course of three years for college graduates leading to a B. D. degree; 2) a less comprehensive course of three years for those without a degree; and 3) a course of two years designed to prepare men

and women for general Christian work.

In December of 1909, after only two years in Berkeley, Dr. I. N. McCash presented his resignation as an instructor in the seminary and as pastor of the Berkeley congregation. Almost immediately the congregation extended a call to Hjalmar J. Loken to be its minister. He preached his first sermon at Berkeley on January 16, 1910. (Raab, 66)

A report in May of 1910 indicated the Berkeley Bible Seminary had just closed one of the best years in its history. During the academic year 1909-1910 there had been a total of 58 students: 30 preparing for the ministry and 28 anticipating other forms of service such as Christian education or missions. The question of faculty loyalty to traditional Disciples doctrines had been settled with the resignation of Hiram Van Kirk. It was believed that securing Dr. Harvey Guy as dean had been a wise move. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, June 30, 1910:940)

By the fall of 1910 H. J. Loken, in his seminary teaching, had moved from the field of New Testament to the field of Christian Ethics. As he taught Christian Ethics through the fall his conscience became increasingly troubled. Loken recalled his need to be rebaptized when he joined the Disciples in 1903 even though he had been baptized previously in the Lutheran church. He had never been comfortable with the Disciples insistence that individuals coming to them from other denominations who had not been immersed should be re-baptized. (Raab, 67f.)

Among those who had been attracted to the congregation under Loken's leadership were five outstanding workers who had been baptized in other denominations but were affiliated with First Christian Church and they now desired full membership in the congregation. On Sunday, December 10, 1911, after serving the congregation for nearly two years, Loken preached a sermon in which he proposed a change in the congregation's policy. He suggested that the baptism of those persons be recognized and that they be accepted simply on their affirmation of Christian faith. (Raab, 68)

Van Kirk's alleged teaching of higher criticism brought on a storm of protest; Loken's proposal of what Disciples called "open membership" created winds of hurricane proportions. Those who opposed higher criticism of the Bible were certain that such teachings would lead to an abandonment of traditional Disciples doctrines among which believer's baptism by immersion was foremost and here was proof they had been right.

On Monday, December 11, 1911 the *Los Angeles Herald* carried a short notice from San Francisco saying, among other things, that in regard to Loken and "open membership" in the Berkeley congregation, "Loken was tainted as a student of Hiram Van Kirk." (quoted by the *Christian Standard*, December 23, 1911: 2130) When word spread throughout the Bay area reporting Loken's sermon and, later, when it was known throughout the state and nation, reaction was immediate. Much was written pro and con in the local newspapers and by Disciples journals. Pastors of sister congregations scathingly rebuked Loken. (Raab, 68)

Loken's proposal was discussed at a meeting of the Berkeley congregation the following Wednesday evening. Members of the congregation were divided in their reactions; he was denounced as a troublemaker and highly commended as a man with the courage of his convictions. Loken himself remained silent during the meeting but the

next day issued a statement saying, "Here in Berkeley, we propose to receive those of other creeds whom we recognize as Christians. Why reject them, as long as they come from denominations whose Christianity we have never questioned?" (Raab, 69)

Realizing the sensitivity of the issue, H. J. Loken immediately resigned his teaching position not wishing to involve Berkeley Bible Seminary in the congregation's controversy. However, others of the faculty were members of the congregation and "open membership" became a divisive issue involving not only the congregation but inevitably the seminary. (Raab, 99)

The controversy remained unresolved for over three months, creating a considerable disturbance among the members. The matter was settled in a congregational meeting held on Sunday, March 24, 1912 at which time the liberal views of the pastor were supported by a majority vote. Those members not in agreement withdrew their membership shortly thereafter. (Raab, 72)

Like most things in life the issue was more complicated than it appeared. The surface concern was "open membership" but actually Hjalmar J. Loken was bringing into the open an increased interest within the larger seminary community as well as the congregation in what was then called "Christian union" but today is known as "Christian unity."

The Stone-Campbell movement had come into being to restore the unity of a broken church. Through the interaction of First Christian Church of Berkeley, Berkeley Bible Seminary, Pacific Theological Seminary and other seminaries of the area, many individuals connected with these institutions believed the time had come to act on their professed concern for Christian unity.

As early as 1902 Dean Hiram Van Kirk was teaching one or two courses at Pacific Theological Seminary. Every year after that one or more of the Berkeley Bible Seminary professors taught at the other institution. As Berkeley Bible Seminary became primarily a place of ministerial education, its faculty and students found themselves increasingly involved with Pacific Theological Seminary and to a lesser extent with Pacific Coast Baptist Seminary, the American Baptist institution. (Raab, 98)

The students of Berkeley Bible Seminary turned to the Congregational seminary for course work to supplement that at their own seminary. By 1910 the more ambitious students were desirous of taking sufficient work at Pacific Theological Seminary to obtain a bachelor of divinity degree from the institution with the greater prestige. Many Disciples students took as much as two-thirds of their work in classes at Pacific Theological Seminary. (Raab, 96-98)

It was only a matter of time before the administration and professors of both seminaries began to consider ways in which the two schools could become one. In the fall of 1911, only a short while before Loken's "open membership" sermon, a serious discussion had begun exploring the possibility of uniting Berkeley Bible Seminary with Pacific Theological Seminary. (Nash, 1)

President Charles S. Nash (1856-1926) of Pacific Theological Seminary was greatly interested in the idea of "undenominational" education for ministry. Nash presented the question of a possible union of Berkeley Bible Seminary with Pacific Theological Seminary to the members of the

executive committee of his board of trustees on February 9, 1912. (Hogue, 55f., 92) The executive committee, however, deemed it advisable first to call a special meeting of the board of trustees to consider the matter. (Minutes of the Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, Pacific Theological Seminary [Pacific School of Religion], February 29, 1912)

The called meeting of the board of trustees of Pacific Theological Seminary was held in Oakland on March 20, 1912. President Nash presented the possibility of a union of Pacific Theological Seminary and Berkeley Bible Seminary. He spoke of the desirability of such a union and also perhaps the inclusion of other seminaries.

In preparation for the special meeting of Pacific Theological Seminary's board, Nash had been asked by his executive committee to prepare a statement. In this statement Nash gives us an outsider's view of Berkeley Bible Seminary. He briefly reviewed the relations between the two institutions which "have enjoyed uninterrupted good fellowship and cooperation." He continued, "The professors in either seminary had often expressed the wish that the two schools were one."

Berkeley Bible Seminary had decided that it would be best to await an overture from Pacific Theological Seminary before considering uniting, Nash reported. For the fall of 1911 the Disciples school had only seven or eight students, and Nash expressed his opinion that conditions at Berkeley Bible Seminary were quite unstable; "the income is less than the outgo."

Among the Disciples churches all over the land, Nash wrote, there are wide conservative and liberal differences "and both wings are noisily flapping." Nash continued, "The conservatives are suspicious of the modern learning of which they consider Berkeley a hotbed.... The liberals sympathize with the instruction in the school but do not like the administration [McAneney] which has continued to be too close to the conservatives." Nash reported that the current agitation over "open membership" had turned away financial support for the Disciples seminary. (Nash, 5)

The Berkeley Bible Seminary board of trustees tried to protect itself from the vote of First Christian Church of Berkeley which favored "open membership." In a special meeting February 15, 1912 they took the following action: "Resolved that we, the Board of Trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary, hereby declare and define the position of the Seminary to be in full accord with the plea and position of the great body of the disciples of Christ throughout the United States; and, therefore to be opposed to all innovations subversive of the doctrines and teachings of the New Testament."

At an April 24, 1912 meeting of Pacific Theological Seminary's board of trustees, a resolution was passed extending to the trustees of the Berkeley Bible Seminary an invitation to confer as to the possible union of the two seminaries. As an indication of the serious concern for ecumenical endeavor on the part of the Pacific Theological Seminary's trustees, it is worth quoting an important part of their resolution: "Resolved, that this board affirms its conviction that the progressive union of churches and denominations for the reunion of Christendom has risen to a primary place in the permanent duty of the church, and that the training of ministers and expert lay leaders...can best be administered in union undenominational institutions." (Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Pacific

Theological Seminary [Pacific School of Religion], April 24, 1912)

The joint conference between the two seminaries was held and on April 29, 1912 a document was agreed upon which could be submitted to the board of trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary for their approval. There was a problem, however. The Disciples seminary board knew they were under the direction of the state convention and that such a proposal would have to be referred to the annual convention for a final decision. The convention would not meet until the middle of July.

The board of trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary was divided in opinion on the matter. Some of the trustees must have been disturbed by the possibility of a deeper involvement with Pacific Theological Seminary, for a meeting of the board was called on Thursday, May 23, 1912. By this time conservative members of the board had learned that the seminary's two full-time professors, Harvey Guy and Walter Stairs, had endorsed the "open membership" resolution of the Berkeley congregation.

Giving the poor financial condition of the seminary as the reason, a motion was made to dismiss the two members of the faculty; Henry McAneney, the president, was to remain in office. By this action the board essentially closed the seminary until the future direction of the institution could be determined by the convention. (*The Christian-Evangelist*, June 6, 1912:813)

The document submitted to the Berkeley Bible Seminary trustees for their consideration had been worded carefully. A formal statement of the terms of union was presented. Details such as the terms of admission for students, administration of student scholarships and the selection of faculty were outlined. Provision was made for the selection of a Disciple to be a member of the faculty. The teaching of the distinctive tenets and history of each denomination was to be permitted. Finally, three Disciples were to be elected to the board of trustees of the reorganized seminary. (Communication from the board of trustees of Pacific Theological Seminary to the board of trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary, April 29, 1912)

Anticipating there might be difficulty in convincing the Disciples annual convention of the values to be gained by joining Berkeley Bible Seminary with the stronger institution, a meeting of approximately twenty of the more open-minded laymen and a few pastors, calling itself a "Laymen's Christian Union Committee," was held on Monday, July 8, 1912 to discuss what might be done. (Raab, 101)

The most important action taken that day was the forming of a Christian Union League the specific purpose of which was to promote cooperation with Pacific Theological Seminary in seeking to unite the two institutions and in undertaking the raising of enough money to support a Disciples professor in the proposed merger. Individuals from a number of different congregations were represented in the group. There was no formal connection with First Christian Church of Berkeley even though its pastor H. J. Loken. was behind the movement to organize the League. (Raab, 75ff and 101)

The annual convention of Christian Churches met at Santa Cruz, July 15-21, 1912. President McAneney gave an encouraging report on behalf of the seminary's trustees in spite of the controversy over baptism and the dismissal of the faculty. He announced that the yearly receipts for the seminary had been \$3,832.81, fairly good considering the troubles. As a

part of McAneney's report the invitation for Berkeley Bible Seminary to join forces with Pacific Theological Seminary was read. As might be expected reactions to the proposal were varied. The Disciples in California were clearly divided over the future of the Berkeley Bible Seminary.

A number of those present saw the positive possibilities of the suggested union. The more liberal Disciples saw the invitation from Pacific Theological Seminary as a golden opportunity to take Christian unity seriously. Several delegates spoke of the document as one that should have been initiated by the Disciples considering their historic interest in unity. Other delegates, however, both pastors and laypersons, were suspicious of the modern teaching rumored to be taught in the classrooms of both institutions; the attacks of the *Christian Standard* in 1903 and again in 1909 were remembered. The "open membership" vote of the Berkeley congregation was very much on the minds of other delegates. (Raab, 101)

Undoubtedly the convention leadership sought to avoid offending either side. When the organization of the Christian Union League and its proposal to finance a professor at Pacific Theological Seminary was reported, the convention passed a resolution disclaiming any responsibility. It was pointed out that Berkeley Bible Seminary was a creature of the convention and was to be directed by it; furthermore, The Christian Union League had proceeded without authority.

Lest some Disciples might be offended at the convention's failure to recognize the League, the convention passed a second resolution: "Resolved further, that we disclaim any intention whatever of indicating opposition to the proposed union of the two seminaries as set forth in a careful document and submitted...by President Nash...and we greatly admire the spirit in which said document was presented..." (Raab, 102)

Not only did the convention disavow the work of the Christian Union League but the Education Committee also submitted a resolution regarding the rumored appointment of Harvey H. Guy to the faculty of Pacific Theological Seminary. The resolution, while recognizing the right of individual Christians to provide means for the support of Guy (and his right to accept the position), was critical of the claim that such an appointment would be as a representative of the Christian Churches of California or that it would represent "the union of the Congregational and Christian bodies in the work of preparing people for service" and, therefore, disclaimed any responsibility for the arrangement. The motion passed unanimously. (*Christian Standard*, September 21, 1912:1526)

The next vote of the convention authorized the trustees of the seminary to take whatever action they deemed wisest and most conducive to the interests of the seminary. Provision was made that such action would not be considered final until at least two-thirds of the board of trustees and two-thirds of an advisory committee of the convention gave their approval.

The problem was that the trustees found it impossible to agree on the best plan for the future of the institution. From the wording of the resolution passed by the convention disclaiming any intention of opposing Pacific Theological Seminary's proposal, many persons assumed a union would take place.

The Berkeley Bible Seminary trustees refused to approve the document on the grounds that as the proposal was worded the institution would lose its identity. In their communication to the Pacific Theological Seminary

board they protested that there was no assurance that in the future Disciples would be elected to the faculty or to the board of trustees. Moreover, the first mention was made of the Christian Churches of Southern California's intention to work with the Berkeley Bible Seminary in the creation of a new institution for the Disciples. (Communication of the trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary to the trustees of Pacific Theological Seminary, September 18, 1912)

At the time of the 1912 convention of the Christian Churches, President McAneney did not know whether classes at the seminary would resume in the fall or not; there was no faculty. Having refused to approve the proposal to unite with Pacific Theological Seminary, the board of trustees had to consider the appointment of a new dean. They turned to D. A. Russell.

Denison A. Russell (b. 1876), was one of the strongest opponents of the stand taken by the Berkeley congregation on "open membership." He, along with several other pastors who believed as he did, had been elected trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary at the 1912 convention. (Raab, 99) Russell was born in Missouri but educated in California, earning the A. B. and A. M. degrees from Stanford University. He graduated from Berkeley Bible Seminary in 1901. Pastor at Hollister and Red Bluff, he had been the volunteer editor of the Disciples state paper, the *Pacific Christian*, for eight years. Resigning the pulpit at Red Bluff in 1910, he was living in San Francisco at the time of the 1912 convention. (Ware, 308 and *Year Book of the Disciples of Christ*, 1911:71)

The reconstituted seminary board gave Russell the opportunity to influence the policies of the institution. After the July 1912 convention and the refusal of the seminary's trustees to accept the proposal of Pacific Theological Seminary, Russell recommended finding a new location for the seminary where it would be "safe" from the liberal influence of Berkeley. The board approved his recommendation. At the time of his election Dean Russell was serving the congregation at Palo Alto. In order to reopen the seminary he resigned and accepted a position as half-time pastor of the West Side Christian Church in San Francisco. This gave the new dean a building in which to relocate the seminary. (Raab, 99)

Undaunted by the actions of the trustees of the Berkeley Bible Seminary, the members of the Christian Union League continued to raise funds for the salary of a Disciple on the Pacific Theological Seminary faculty. It was understood that Dr. Nash, with the unanimous approval of the faculty, would recommend Dr. Harvey H. Guy for the chair of church history in Pacific Theological Seminary.

Individual members of Disciples churches were making provision for Dr. Guy's salary of \$2,700 for one year and were undertaking to raise a permanent endowment for that salary. Guy was elected to hold equal standing and salary with other professors and would begin his tenure on August 1, 1912. (Minutes of the Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, Pacific Theological Seminary, [Pacific School of Religion] August 5, 1912) The members of the Christian Union League sought and raised the funds for the salary of Dr. Guy from 1912 through 1914. (Raab, 101)

When Pacific Theological Seminary's first proposal was turned down a second plan was prepared and submitted to the trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary a year later, on April 28, 1913. It was significant that Pacific Theological Seminary indicated that the new plan was less

desirable than the proposal contemplating union. The final agreement was signed by the representatives of both seminaries on May 31, 1913 and made possible an affiliation rather than a uniting of the two institutions. (Letter of Charles Nash to Denison Russell, September 28, 1913)

The new plan was presented to and accepted by the Disciples annual convention meeting in Santa Cruz in July of 1913. George W. Brewster, Jr., later secretary of the northern California Christian Churches, and Charles E. Knox, a layman, were elected by the convention to represent the Disciples on the Pacific Theological Seminary board of trustees. Arrangements were made for the appointment of Dean Denison Russell to the faculty of Pacific Theological Seminary. (Raab, 103)

When Pacific Theological Seminary opened for classes on Tuesday, August 19, 1913 Russell was present and was introduced as a member of the faculty along with two other new professors. At first everything seemed to be working out well with the new arrangement and matters appeared to have been settled to everyone's satisfaction, but things would not stay that way long. (Raab, 103)

In fact, the concept was doomed to failure from the beginning. The plan called for a union of faculties, of student bodies and curricula while the boards remained separate. In reality most activities remained essentially as they were before. Apparently the Pacific Theological Seminary trustees, administration and faculty entered into the agreement in good faith and sought to cooperate in every way. Dean Russell and the more conservative Berkeley Bible Seminary trustees had little desire to honor the agreement.

An even deeper cause lay behind the failure of the plan. Pacific Theological Seminary and Berkeley Bible Seminary had totally different views towards the significant developments in scholarship then in process. Pacific Theological Seminary stood firmly committed to the higher criticism of the Bible and found no difficulty in accepting the new findings of science and the teachings of the university. The newly elected leadership of the Berkeley Bible Seminary, however, believed these developments were leading to the undermining of Christian faith. (Raab, 104-105)

Misunderstandings soon developed between President Nash and Dean Russell. There was a disagreement over the application of three students who could not meet the entrance requirements of Pacific Theological Seminary. President Nash wished to uphold that institution's standards, and Dean Russell believed anyone should be admitted who desired to become a minister regardless of his or her previous educational preparation.

Of the three students involved, two of the men had not completed high school and one had not completed elementary school. As these students were not permitted to enroll at Pacific Theological Seminary, Dean Russell planned to teach them, along with students not applying to Pacific Theological Seminary, in the building of the West Side Christian Church in San Francisco. President Nash interpreted this action as breaking the contract between Pacific Theological Seminary and Berkeley Bible Seminary which stated that "all courses of instruction.... shall be given in the class rooms of Pacific Theological Seminary and as parts of its curriculum." (Communication between the board of trustees of Pacific Theological Seminary, May 12, 1913; also lengthy correspondence between D. A. Russell and Charles S. Nash between September 1913 and January

1914.)

At the end of a very disagreeable year the trustees of the Berkeley Bible Seminary recommended to the Disciples annual convention in July of 1904 that the agreement between the two seminaries be terminated. The convention approved the recommendation. The secretary of the board of trustees of the Berkeley Bible Seminary duly notified the Pacific Theological Seminary's board of the convention's action. (Letter from the secretary of the board of trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary to Charles S. Nash, president, Pacific Theological Seminary)

The Christian Union League during this period continued to make its headquarters at First Christian Church in Berkeley with the congregation's pastor, H. J. Loken, giving much time and effort to the organization. Under the editorship of Loken the League published a monthly paper, *The Christian Union Advocate*. A foot-operated quarter press was purchased by the League and installed in a small room on the second floor of the Berkeley congregation's building. The paper continued publication from May of 1914 until 1916. (Raab, 75)

In May of 1914 Hugh Vernon White (1889-1984), a student of the University of California and at Berkeley Bible Seminary, became the associate pastor of First Christian Church of Berkeley with his salary paid by the Christian Union League. In addition to being the associate editor and business manager of the League's paper, he traveled over much of northern California canvassing support for the Christian Union League and raising money for the salary of Dr. Harvey Guy, the Disciples professor at Pacific Theological Seminary. (Raab, 63 and 76)

Hugh Vernon White was another of those persons associated with First Christian Church of Berkeley and the Berkeley Bible Seminary who had a distinguished career. He held degrees from Berkeley Bible Seminary, University of California, Harvard University, Pacific School of Religion and Stanford University. Because of his position favoring "open membership" White left the Disciples and became a leader in Congregational circles.

As we have seen, Christian Churches in northern California were the first to have significant organization and growth. It was for this reason a Bible chair and seminary had been established at Berkeley in 1896. Only in the early 20th century did southern California Disciples congregations begin to grow.

At first there was only one state convention of Christian Churches and that met at Santa Cruz. In similar fashion to the Disciples in northern California, the southern California convention began as a camp meeting, at Downey in 1881. The meeting of Disciples held in Santa Ana in August of 1890 is considered the first convention of Christian Churches in southern California. (Cole, 45)

One of the first actions of the convention of 1890 was to recommend the founding of a college in southern California to begin educating evangelists and pastors to serve the growing number of congregations. In the meanwhile, the congregations of southern California applied their efforts to strengthen Berkeley Bible Seminary. (Cole, 45 and 74) The alternative to sending southern California young people to Berkeley for their ministerial education was to send them to one of the Disciples schools in the mid-west or east. The College of the Bible (now Lexington

Theological Seminary) was the school of first choice of many families. (A. Reasoner Sayre in Burgh and Parker, 6)

At the convention of the Christian Churches of Southern California which met in Los Angeles in 1909, a second plea was made for an educational institution to be located in the southern part of the state. Three years later, early in 1912, the Christian Ministers' Association of Southern California named an Educational Committee, chaired by Fred M. Rogers, to look into the matter. The committee held several meetings to consider what might be done. (Cole, 74)

Frederick M. Rogers (1872-1947), educated at Kentucky University and the College of the Bible, in 1912 was pastor of the influential First Christian Church of Long Beach. Rogers worked diligently for a Disciples college in southern California and had more to do with the establishment of a school in the area than any other individual. (Cole, 174 and *The Christian-Evangelist*, March 12, 1947: 263)

President McAneney regularly promoted the Berkeley Bible Seminary in southern California and the local Educational Committee was concerned that his efforts to raise money in the south would hinder them if they sought to establish a college. In addition, after hearing McAneney's presentations, the Educational Committee could not help but be aware of the troubles then besetting the Berkeley institution. Might it not be possible for the two sections of the state to work together in developing a new college? (Cole, 74)

To this end on February 12, 1912, the committee addressed a letter to the trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary. In the letter they stated that pastors and lay leaders in southern California had a growing conviction that a local institution was needed to prepare young people for Christian service and that, since the Berkeley seminary was too far away to be useful, steps were being taken to establish an institution in their area. The letter asked if "there might not be a possibility of the transfer of the Seminary to Southern California.. ." They suggested that both groups appoint representatives to meet and discuss the matter. (Cole, 75)

The secretary of the board of trustees of Berkeley Bible Seminary replied on February 16, 1912 that a conference to consider joining forces would be welcomed, and a member of the Berkeley board living in southern California was named as the seminary's representative. After several meetings the joint committee had a recommendation to make.

The Berkeley seminary trustees voted affirmatively on July 13, 1912 to recommend to the northern California convention that the seminary unite with the churches of southern California in establishing a new Christian institution. On July 19, 1912 the convention at Santa Cruz unanimously approved the recommendation. (Cole, 75)

Later that month the southern California churches, meeting in convention at Long Beach, received a report of the Ministers' Association recommending that a committee be appointed "composed of business men and preachers, to form plans for the establishment of a college." Such a resolution was presented and passed unanimously. Charles C. Chapman (1853-1944), a leading businessman and president of the convention, offered \$50,000 as a first gift for a college conditional upon the churches raising an additional \$150,000. (Cole, 75)

After several meetings and much discussion it was discovered that even though there was a possible \$50,000 in assets to be received from

the Berkeley Bible Seminary and Chapman's offer of an additional \$50,000, economic conditions were not good; a successful financial campaign for the matching \$150,000 from the churches would not be feasible. An important step, however, was taken in 1912 anticipating the day when it would be possible to take action: an institution bearing the name California Christian College was incorporated under the laws of the state. (Cole, 76)

A small (8-page) bulletin was published for the academic year 1913-1914. Russell was listed as dean and the only instructor. Eight students were listed as enrolled full-time with two part-time students. Again, most of the students were from California. Tuition was free, the only expense being for textbooks. (Berkeley Bible Seminary, bulletin, 1913-1914) Board and room could be obtained in any of the cities in the Bay area for "\$25 per month and up." Students were told that it might be possible to work mornings and evenings to pay part or all of their expenses, but it was not recommended. Students with experience could expect to preach for a congregation near San Francisco reached by interurban rail connections. (Berkeley Bible Seminary, *Catalog*, 1914-1915)

Courses available at the seminary were described briefly. The classical ministerial course was open to applicants who had received a Bachelor of Arts degree or its equivalent with provision for mature students to take seminary work while still in college. An English ministerial course was available for students who "feel they cannot take the Classical Course." (Berkeley Bible Seminary, bulletin, 1913-1914)

For the academic year 1914-1915 additional staff assisted in the program. Denison A. Russell remained as dean with Miss Isabel Hall as instructor in languages. There were two special lecturers: George W. Brewster, Jr. in pastoral theology and R. L. McHatton in the history of the Christian Church in California. The seminary had 20 full-time and four part-time students, most of whom were from California. (Berkeley Bible Seminary, *Catalog*, 1914-1915)

By the summer of 1916 both H. J. Loken and Hugh Vernon White realized that there were too few liberal spirits to aid their efforts toward Christian unity as expressed in cooperating with Pacific Theological Seminary. Money for Dr. Harvey Guy's salary was increasingly hard to raise, and Pacific Theological Seminary understandably was concerned that the Disciples were not helping financially. In 1916 that institution celebrated its 50th anniversary and changed its name from Pacific Theological Seminary to Pacific School of Religion, the name by which it is known today. (Hogue, 94)

In August of 1916 both Loken and White resigned as pastors of First Christian Church of Berkeley. White left Berkeley to work on a degree at Harvard University while Loken stayed with the congregation until January of 1917. With Loken's departure the Christian Union League went out of existence and the League's paper ceased publication. As Loken prepared to close his ministry in Berkeley the local *Daily Bulletin* made this statement: "... during his pastorate here Dr. Loken has been conspicuous as a leader of the liberal or progressive thought of his denomination." It was this ecumenical and forward looking leadership that was Loken's greatest glory as well as his downfall. (*Berkeley Daily Gazette*, Monday, January 8, 1917 as quoted in Raab, 77 and 78)

Somehow the Berkeley Bible Seminary struggled through the years

1916 to 1918 with a small number of students and an ever smaller income. In 1918 the Berkeley Bible Seminary was renamed California Bible College. The possibility of a Disciples college in southern California may have played its part in the name change. The convention of the Christian Churches of Northern California held in July of 1918 gave approval to the name change.

A large house located at 1297 Geary in San Francisco (on the corner of Geary and Franklin streets) had been purchased and was ready for occupancy by the middle of August of 1918 in time for the opening of the school year. Students both lived and studied in the new building; Russell also had living quarters there. (*The Christian Evangelist*, August 8, 1918:824)

The outbreak of World War I in 1917 had delayed the Christian Churches of Southern California in further consideration of a college in their area. By January 8, 1918 President Woodrow Wilson had issued his fourteen points for peace and the end of war was in sight. On February 19, 1918 the incorporation papers for California Christian College were reissued. The time was almost at hand for the creation of the new institution which the Christian Churches of California, north and south, had long desired. The leaders were seeking a college whose purpose would be "to provide [Disciples] young people with a sound education for Christian leadership." Such a college was necessary "to prepare young men [sic] for the ministry and to encourage organization of mission churches" in a rapidly growing and developing California. (A. Reasoner Sayre in Burgh and Parker, 4f.)

Prosperity returned in the days following World War I, and the leaders of southern California Disciples realized the time was right for a financial campaign. Plans for merging with Berkeley Bible Seminary had been completed. At the 1919 Disciples convention at Long Beach, Fred M. Rogers, now secretary of the missionary society, reminded those attending that it was time to take action. He announced that C. C. Chapman was willing to do more than he had announced previously. Chapman was prepared to make a gift of \$200,000 for endowment (later raised to \$400,000) provided the congregations raised an additional \$100,000 for land and buildings. (Cole, 77 and A. Reasoner Sayre in Burgh and Parker, 5)

A financial campaign was launched almost immediately, and on April 7, 1920 the proper papers were filed with the Los Angeles office of the California Department of State. California School of Christianity was to be the name of the new institution agreed upon by the joint committee appointed by the southern California churches and the trustees of the Berkeley Bible Seminary. (A. Reasoner Sayre in Burgh and Parker, 5)

By July 15, 1920 the members of the Christian Churches of both northern and southern California had more than met Chapman's challenge. Sufficient money was at hand to open the new institution on September 13, 1920. Ten students and two faculty members assembled in temporary quarters in the Wilshire Boulevard Christian Church, Los Angeles. One of the faculty members was Cecil F. Cheverton, later the first president of the college, teaching religious education and Bible; the other was Denison A. Russell, formerly dean of the Berkeley Bible Seminary (renamed California Bible College), teaching theology and ethics. (Cole, 77 and A. Reasoner Sayre in Burgh and Parker, 6)

The first twenty-five books in the California School of Christianity library were brought from the former San Francisco school. Shortly after the new institution's opening the trustees of the northern California seminary, acting in the name of the Berkeley Bible Seminary, transferred their remaining assets of approximately \$50,000 to California School of Christianity. The influence of Berkeley Bible Seminary continued as trustees of that institution continued on the board of the California School of Christianity. (Burgh and Parker, 16)

From the beginning there was concern over the name chosen for the new college. The purpose of a "School of Christianity" was not clear; some of the leaders were concerned that the institution's purpose might be construed as entirely for ministerial preparation. At the dedication of one of the college buildings in January of 1923, it was announced that the the board of trustees had voted to return to the name originally incorporated, California Christian College.

In 1934 the trustees of the school, now mainly a liberal arts college, changed its name to Chapman College to honor the man and family that had meant so much in the beginning. Chapman College became Chapman University in 1991, but that as they say, is another story.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Becker, Edwin L., *Yale Divinity School and the Disciples of Christ: 1872-1989*, Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1990.

Burgh, Frederic S. and Parker, Lucy, *Chapman Remembers, A History of Chapman College*, Orange, CA: Chapman College, 1959.

Cole, Clifford A., *The Christian Churches of Southern California*, St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1959.

Ferrier, William W., *Ninety Years of Education in California*, Berkeley, CA: Sather Gate BookShop, 1937.

Hogue, Harland E., *Christian Seed in Western Soil*, Berkeley, CA: Pacific School of Religion, 1965.

McAllister, Lester G. and Tucker, William E., *Journey in Faith*, St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1975.

Raab, Idalene M., *The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) At Work in Berkeley: 1893- 1968*, unpublished manuscript.

Ware, E. B., *History of the Disciples of Christ in California*, Healdsburg, CA. 1916.

Year Book of the Disciples, Cincinnati, OH: American Christian Missionary Society, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

Catalogs and Periodicals

Berkeley Bible Seminary, *Catalog*, 1897-1898, 1904-1905,

1909-1910, 1910-1911, 1913-1914, 1914-1915.

Christian-Evangelist, The, St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication.

Christian Standard, Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company.

Other Sources

Book of Remembrance, Pilgrim Place, Claremont, CA.

Communication, from Board of Trustees, Pacific Theological Seminary to Board of Trustees, Berkeley Bible Seminary, April 29, 1912; also, May 12, 1913.

Communication, from Board of Trustees, Berkeley Bible Seminary to Board of Trustees, Pacific Theological Seminary, September 18, 1912.

Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Nashville: card catalog.

Letters between Denison A. Russell and Charles S. Nash, September, 1913 through January, 1914.

Letter from the secretary of the Board of Trustees. Berkeley Bible Seminary to Charles S. Nash, Pacific Theological Seminary, August 22, 1914.

Letter from Hiram Van Kirk to James H. Garrison, December 30, 1903.

Nash, Charles S., Statement before Board of Trustees, Pacific Theological Seminary, March 20, 1912.

Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Pacific Theological Seminary, [Pacific School of Religion], February 29, 1912 and March 20, 1912.

Joe and Nancy Stalcup Seminar
for
Local Church Historians

THE BASICS OF BEING A LOCAL CHURCH HISTORIAN

**September 12-14, 2002
Nashville, Tennessee**

Workshops:

**Collecting Stories
Recording Oral History
Writing History
Celebrating Anniversaries
Preserving Archives
Engaging Youth**

Also:

**Dinner at historic Avalon House on the Lipscomb Campus
Singing with the Harpeth Valley Sacred Harp Singers**

**Registration: \$50
Arrangements may be made for housing/meals at
Scarritt Bennett Center for \$130**

Enroll now!

**Send your name, address and name of local congregation
with your check to:**

**Disciples of Christ Historical Society
1101 19th Avenue South
Nashville, TN 37212**

The most important thing to remember
is that you are not alone.

Let's get started.

THE FIRST STEP IS TO GET A CLEAR IDEA OF WHAT YOU WANT TO ACHIEVE.

It's important to have a clear goal in mind before you start.

Remember:

- 1. Set a clear goal.
- 2. Break it down into smaller steps.
- 3. Stay motivated.
- 4. Don't give up.

Good luck!

Remember, the only way to achieve your goals is to take action. Start today!

It's not about how much you know, it's about how much you do.

Keep going!

Remember, success is not a destination, it's a journey.

Let's get started!

Remember, you are capable of more than you think.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

ORDER OF THE STONE-CAMPBELL FELLOWSHIP

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society has been blessed through the years with gifts from estates. Some have come unsolicited; others have been planned in advance with leadership of the Society. These gifts have measurably strengthened the ministry of the Society. Through the Order of the Stone-Campbell Fellowship the Society can recognize these intended gifts and express appreciation to those planning the gifts.

SUCH A FELLOWSHIP EXPRESSES CONFIDENCE IN THE FUTURE OF THE SOCIETY

Members of the Fellowship are persons who have a hope and a dream for the future of the Society as it continues to serve individuals and the church. They have named the Historical Society in their Will, established a charitable gift Annuity or Trust, made a gift of life insurance, or given their home or personal property while retaining lifetime use of the property. Some of these provisions were made early in the days of the Society's 50 year history while others were made in recent months. Each is a testimony to a life of stewardship and an expression of faith in the purpose and mission of the Historical Society.

THE FELLOWSHIP IS NAMED FOR TWO OF THE EARLIEST CHURCH LEADERS

Barton Warren Stone was the first of the major leaders to appear on the scene in 19th century America. Soon thereafter Alexander Campbell's voice was heard. From the followers of these men a church was born which continues to spread the gospel. The history of that movement housed in the Thomas W. Phillips Memorial is a legacy of their early faith and witness. Their gifts live on in the life of the church and the Disciples of Christ Historical Society.

DISCIPLIANA

The Quarterly Historical Journal of the
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

**FLOATING AT RANDOM BETWEEN LIBERTY AND
OBEDIENCE? BACKGROUNDS TO THE SECOND
GREAT AWAKENING'S EMOTIONAL EXERCISES**

Richard C. Goode

**THE ENCOUNTER OF NORTH AMERICAN STONE-
CAMPBELL CHRISTIANS WITH THE PENTECOSTAL/
CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT**

Amy Collier Artman



Volume 62 • Number 3 • Fall, 2002

Published by DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Peter M. Morgan, President (mail@dishistsoc.org)

Founding Editor Claude E. Spencer

Editorial Committee D. Newell Williams, Editor (nwilliam@cts.edu)
Douglas A. Foster
Loretta Long
Henry E. Webb
Karen-Marie Yust
Richard Cherok

Editorial Consultants Carisse Berryhill Paul M. Blowers
James O. Duke Richard T. Hughes
David A. Jones Erma Jean Loveland
Mark G. Toulouse Daisy L. Machado

Board of Trustees Officers Chairperson James R. Reed
Vice-Chairperson Gordon B. Dalrymple
Secretary Zola Walker
Treasurer Robert H. Edwards

DISCIPLIANA (USPS 995-060) is published quarterly for \$20.00 per year by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society which was established in 1941 "to maintain and further interest in religious heritage, backgrounds, origins, development, and general history of Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, Churches of Christ and related groups." Members of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society receive *DISCIPLIANA* quarterly, along with other benefits. Annual membership categories are: Sustaining - \$50 to \$249, Participating - \$30, Regular - \$20, Students - \$10.00, Non-U.S. - \$25. Life Memberships are: Life - \$250, Life Link - \$500, Life Patron - \$1,000.

Contributors to *DISCIPLIANA* should submit manuscripts on 3.5 floppy disk in Wordperfect 5.1 or "text" format. Electronic manuscript submission via "text only" formatted e-mail or attached file accepted at dishistsoc@aol.com. Postal mail should be addressed to: *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 Nineteenth Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196.

Phone: (615) 327-1444. Fax: (615) 327-1445. E-mail: dishistsoc@aol.com.
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society Home Page: <http://users.aol.com/dishistsoc>
Periodical postage paid at Nashville, TN.

Copyright 1997. Disciples of Christ Historical Society
Indexed by Restoration Serials Index
ISSN 0732-9881

Indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals, the Index to Book Reviews in Religion, Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975- on CD-ROM, and the ATLA Religion Database on CD-ROM, published by the American Theological Library Association, 820 Church Street, Evanston, IL 60201-5613. atla@atla.com <http://atla.library.vanderbilt.edu/atla/home.html>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 - 19th Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196. Please give both old and new addresses and attach a mailing label from an old issue. USA: Please provide nine-digit code (ZIP+4).

— From the Editor's Desk

Few topics in American religious history have generated as much popular interest and dispute as have what are variously called "emotional exercises" and "gifts of the Holy Spirit." From the Cane Ridge Meeting of the Second Great Awakening to the Pentecostalism of the early twentieth century to the Charismatic Movement of 1960s and '70s, Americans have sought to understand these phenomena and have divided over their differing views of the role of such phenomena in the Christian life.

In "Floating At Random Between Liberty and Obedience? Backgrounds to the Second Great Awakening's Emotional Exercises," Richard C. Goode focuses on trends in the historiography of such phenomena. These trends are driven by questions concerning (1) the social function of revivalism, (2) physiological sources of religious experience, and (3) what can be learned about ecclesiastical communities by looking at their revivals. Goode's teasing out of the discussion produced by these questions supports his contention that the emotional exercises of Second Great Awakening, despite their seemingly chaotic appearance, may in reality have been controlled forms of community formation. Goode suggests that examining Scottish ecclesiological debates might help to disclose the internal logic and historical consciousness of the communities that inspired the revivals of the Second Great Awakening.

Amy Collier Artman's "The Encounter of North American Stone-Campbell Christians with the Pentecostal/Charismatic Movement" traces the reaction of Stone-Campbell Christians to "emotional exercises" from Cane Ridge through the nineteenth-century Holiness and twentieth-century Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements. Artman describes notable differences in the responses of Stone and Campbell to the emotional exercises of the Second Great Awakening, but shows that they shared a common view of the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion that ultimately supported the rejection of emotional exercises. Noting that Stone-Campbell, Holiness, Pentecostal and Charismatic Christians claim Cane Ridge as a founding event, Artman suggests that a conference of scholars from these traditions developed around the topic of Cane Ridge would make for exciting scholarship and stimulating debate and would appropriately honor that unifying and chaotic event. Goode and Artman's articles were first presented as papers to the Society's 2002 Kirkpatrick Seminar on the theme "Exercised by the Spirit: Ecstatic Experiences and the Stone-Campbell Movement." Carmelo Alvarez's "Mission as Liberating Spirit: Disciples and Pentecostals in Venezuela," also presented to the seminar, will appear in a later *Discipliana*.

— D. Newell Williams

— From the President's Desk

The Historical Society is itself learning from history. Across our Stone-Campbell Movement our work beyond congregations was born from the passion and commitment of volunteers. I know that story best from my own place within the Disciples of Christ. Our mission societies (now Homeland Ministries and Overseas Ministries) were founded by volunteers, as were the National Benevolent Association, Church Extension, etc.

The Society's history of service is alive now as we tap the gifts and commitment of a volunteer to reach out to congregations.

Linda Chenoweth leads local church "History Alive" weekends as part of the ministry of DCHS. Such activities as examining family quilts and remembering local "saints" and their stories help enliven the present with God's energetic spirit and inspire the congregation to envision its future.

This innovative staffing helps strengthen the congregation - the foundational expression of Christ's ministry today. Contact the Society if you are interested in a "History Alive" weekend.

Those weekends hold great potential for bringing the Spirit's electricity in empowering your congregation as a dynamic, mission-driven people of God.

—Peter M. Morgan

FLOATING AT RANDOM BETWEEN LIBERTY AND OBEDIENCE?

Backgrounds to the Second Great Awakening's Emotional Exercises

Richard C. Goode*

Introduction

Alexis de Tocqueville's nine-month journey through American life and culture in 1831-32 left him conflicted. By and large, America offered noteworthy successes and virtues, which thrilled and inspired optimism in him, yet the nation also exhibited some foreboding traits. Because of its seemingly unsystematic, unreflective, erratic nature, American Christianity was one of these more disconcerting cultural elements. "Men cannot do without dogmatical belief," Tocqueville warned. Such beliefs are necessary because life is intricately related to religious issues, thus "fixed ideas about God and human nature are indispensable" to daily life. Individuals, in other words, need a good religion to manage the routine of living their respective lives. Moreover, societies need religion to provide moral and ethical cohesion. Lose religion and both societies and individuals fall apart. So important were these dogmatic beliefs, Tocqueville warned, that they ought not be subject to complete religious independence—as he perceived the case in America. Average folk have neither the leisure nor expertise to appreciate legitimate, orthodox dogmatic beliefs. Instead they are apt to create all kinds of strange Christian variants. Lacking the expertise to handle the responsibility, Christians in the United States would tend toward theological extremes, and would "float at random," Tocqueville predicted, "between liberty and obedience." For Tocqueville it was simply unimaginable how the apparently wild and unregulated American religious expressions of the last generation—like those at Cane Ridge in 1801—could be signs of a healthy and socially sane society. Such religious anarchy would undermine Christianity's ability to maintain community. Thus, Americans would either gravitate toward liberty and sacrifice all dogmatic beliefs and become atheists, or, sensing the need for the social stability dogmatic beliefs provide, Americans would move toward a more hierarchical and authoritarian religion.

Although his predictions are logical, Tocqueville's worst fears have not been fulfilled. Americans have by and large chosen neither atheism nor the most authoritarian forms of Christianity. Tocqueville may have failed to discern how the apparently chaotic could, in its own way, be its own form of order. Far from undermining the American Christian community in a fit of atomistic democracy, what may have seemed to outsiders as bewildering, confusing, even bizarre religious expressions, could in reality have been controlled forms of community formation. Ironically, the genius of American Christianity's persistence and growth over the last couple of centuries may be its very ability to float—just not entirely at random—"between liberty and obedience."

Charting some relevant historiography may help to tease out this idea, and suggest a fruitful direction for future research. For this Kirkpatrick presentation I was asked to reflect on some Presbyterian and Methodist

*Richard C. Goode is Associate Professor of History at Lipscomb University, Nashville, and a Faculty Fellow in the University's Center for International Peace and Justice.

antecedents to spiritual exercises like those occurring at Cane Ridge in 1801. Where did those Great Revival expressions come from, and what might we learn by “back streaming” a bit? Because the trajectories of this question are legion, this investigation will focus on some trends in the historiography, for which three key questions have provided some driving energy. First, for years the social function of the revivals has served as the primary question. Historians have been especially interested to illustrate how the revivals served certain social roles or larger cultural purposes. The close connection between American religious, political, and economic thought and expression, in other words, provides evidence of the larger social issues at work in American religion. Thus, one way to read the state of the culture at a given moment, is to discern the purpose behind religious practice and expression. Second, historians have questioned why people have religious experience. Instead of focusing on large cultural trends, this line of investigation looks intensively at the individual person. And a third question governing revival research has focused on what might be learned about the communities that gave rise to the revivals. Revivals were more than social constructions of unrestrained democratic individualism, or physiological episodes. Revivals were creations of religious communities, and as such provide opportunities of insight into the life, thought, and aspirations of those communities. Far from seeing the church as another cultural projection, the question is what we learn about the uniqueness of religious communities by looking at their revivals. One possibility is that these American religious communities drew heavily on their respective histories. Even though some of the revival groups seemed most ahistorical and unreflective in their thinking, in actuality they drew mightily and creatively from their histories, and were not necessarily tossed about by every wind of social change. Such an adaptive historicism enabled them to “float between liberty and obedience,” and stave off the catastrophic religious revolution Tocqueville feared.

The Question of Revivalism’s Social Function

For more than a decade now, Nathan Hatch has been for early American revivalism what Perry Miller was in the second half of the twentieth century for New England Puritanism. Hatch’s *The Democratization of American Christianity* has become a starting point for historiographical work because he offered new, more even-handed descriptions of the interaction of Christianity and American culture, which had not always been true of the historiography of the Second Great Awakening.¹ As Leigh Eric Schmidt noted in last year’s Reed Lectures, some explanations of the emotional exercises have been dismissive and condescending. Attributing the religious expressions to excessive piety, these historians portrayed the actors lapsing into child-like tantrums, as if the religious actors were not yet responsible enough to take control of their spiritual experience. Just as ungoverned children feed upon each other’s energy and ultimately spiral out of behavioral control, so the revived at places like Cane Ridge ratcheted up their experiences until they erupted into exercises like the barks and jerks. Other historians chalked the expressions up to primitive religion’s lack of refinement. Either way, religious expressions like those at Cane Ridge were a matter of unrefined cultural setting and unrestrained social chaos.²

Hatch’s work also played off historians who highlighted the socially

conservative nature of the revivals. Winthrop Hudson had theorized, given the large unchurched population in the late eighteenth century, that the “recruiting technique” of revivalism “proved exceedingly effective” in helping maintain some social relevance. Revivalism enabled the church to continue “standing beside the courthouse on the village square” and maintain “good order” in society.³ According to Sydney Mead, because revivalism “sanctified the whole Society unto God” and protected the clergy’s social leadership, revivalism became the pragmatic mission of the church and the predominant model for Evangelical ministry before the Civil War.⁴ Perhaps Richard Hofstadter best summarized this utilitarian interpretation of revivalism when he suggested that at the turn of the nineteenth century Christianity was in jeopardy of losing its cultural status, with traditional creedal and liturgical appeals generating little allegiance among average Americans. What saved the day for Christianity in America was “a primitive emotional appeal.” “Emotional upheavals took the place of the coercive sanctions of religious establishments.”⁵ By adding the techniques of social history Donald Mathews came to conclusion that revivalism was more than “quaint, exotic, irrational forms of collective behavior” exposing the actors’ “lack of sophistication.” Instead revivalism honored its social function by conserving social structure. Potentially destabilizing factors such as race and age were, through the revivals, realigned so as to conserve social unity and stability.⁶ And in his own way, Paul E. Johnson added another dimension of this “revivalism-as-conservative-force” concept by stressing the effect of social control. Religious revivalism, in other words, relieved (or redirected) insecurities generated by a rapidly modernizing society, thus allowing the emerging entrepreneurial class to manipulate and pacify the masses.⁷

Hatch, however, was zealous to illustrate just how modern, radical, and liberating those revivals actually were. Far from escaping the realities of a rapidly modernizing world, American religion boldly adapted the social and political protest ideology of post-Revolutionary America and recreated itself to advance modernizing trends.

For those schooled in the more conservative branches of the Stone-Campbell tradition, Hatch’s insights were revelatory. Distinctives such as no clergy-laity dichotomy, no creeds, congregational autonomy, and a populist hermeneutic certainly shaped and defined our heritage, but we had been taught that these trademarks were direct and authentic replications of the church’s first-century providential pattern. Hatch, however, exploded that myth. He illustrated not only that such traits were common among the Stone-Campbell movement’s religious contemporaries, but that these shibboleths were more importantly expressions of America’s early national character and radical ideology.⁸ Believing they could read the Bible like no one had ever read it before, and simply implement the “self-evident truths” of scripture, Americans were in reality recreating Christianity in their image. Far from a socially conservative force, Evangelical revivalism enabled American Christians to claim their liberty and radically invert authority.

Hatch’s interpretation also offered some explanation for one of the more unsettling and confusing parts of the Second Great Awakening story. He suggested that these Christians, flush with democratic enthusiasm, seized the authority to revel in self-authenticating spiritual experiences. Unlike the New

England Puritans who had to submit their religious experience for authentication to the scrutinizing authority of the clergy and the scrupulous visible saints of the congregation, now the individual religious encounter was self-authenticating—no matter how unorthodox. “Those volatile aspects of popular religion, long held in check by the church,” Hatch noted, were freed to become common religious currency.⁹ Try the barks or the jerks in a high church, liturgical tradition, and the powers-that-be would quickly put an end to such enthusiasms. At the nineteenth-century frontier camp meeting, by contrast, one could revel in the most colorful spiritual exercises and no authority existed to call it out of bounds. If it was one’s experience, it was good. Thus the revivals, in all their emotional splendor, were festivals of democracy and protest rallies allowing common folk to revel in their newly found spiritual license. All things considered, the revivals might have been rather adolescent expressions, yet they were nonetheless part of the maturation process of American Christianity. If Hatch is right, these exercises served as a rite of confirmation symbolizing the individual’s progress from the state of obedience as a minor to the liberty of adulthood.

Physiological Questions behind Revivalism and Religious Experience

While the “social function of revivalism” theme continues to produce fruitful dialogue, another research trend focuses much more intensively on the individual religious experience. The method is to dissect the revival emotion especially with an eye toward what is taking place within the one so revived. Given recent progress in the study of the brain, it is not surprising that this line of research has developed some physiological hypotheses. About a year ago the *National Catholic Reporter* ran a piece on Andrew Newberg, physician and fellow of the Division of Nuclear Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School. Newburg studies the effects spiritual experiences have on the brain, and has set out to discern how and why people experience the “God phenomenon”—or what he calls “neurotheology.” He believes that “the human brain has been genetically wired to encourage religious belief.”¹⁰ Thus far his research suggests that certain regions of the brain, triggered by the spiritual reflection, inspire real biological episodes—be they more mystical and contemplative, or perhaps energetic and charismatic. Newburg, therefore, believes that profound religious experience can temporarily shut down normal brain functions. The section of the brain that orients persons spatially, i.e., what is “up” and “down,” or respective distances, can be suppressed, and without this orientation humans will stumble, fall, and roll. Margaret Poloma, of the University of Akron, has tried to make some connections between the physiological understanding of the brain and the experiences of individuals in the Pentecostal-Charismatic movements. Employing Victor Turner’s work, Poloma has investigated the “Toronto Blessing,” which has had its share of spiritual exercises. She suggests that “bodily movement of the type experienced by participants in the renewal may be controlled by the instinctual brain. Although some of the thrashing, rolling, falling down, deep laughing, etc. that has come to characterize this renewal may be learned behavior, much of it may be involuntary . . . tap[ping] a primal vestige, which may be responsible for triggering the physical or bodily manifestations.”¹¹ In a similar vein, V.S. Ramachandran and Sandra Blakeslee postulated in their 1998 *Phantoms in the Brain*, that individuals

with temporal lobe epilepsy may be unusually focused on religious matters and may evidence a tendency toward ecstatic experiences. Perhaps, their theory goes, individuals like Teresa of Avila, Fedor Dostoyevsky, or even the Apostle Paul suffered from such a condition.¹²

Although the physiological interpretation of spiritual experience sounds modern and cutting edge, it is not entirely new. As Ann Taves' recent work *Fits, Trances, and Visions*¹³ illustrates, though the understanding of human physiology has progressed, American researchers have for at least 300 years located the roots of religious expression in certain biological criteria. Charles Chauncy, for example, argued that enthusiastic revivalists were guilty of toying with the physiological inclinations of their listeners, unleashing animal spirits and passions in the human blood. Individuals most susceptible to such manipulation were those with weaker minds and bad nerves, because they were less capable of using their reason to override the rush of base emotional intensity. Not surprisingly perhaps, Chauncy found women the most likely candidates. Women had, according to Chauncy, a natural, biological proclivity to yield to passions and exhibit spiritual enthusiasm because of their supposedly inferior physical, emotional, and mental constitutions. In her book *Damned Women*, Elizabeth Reis has illustrated that chauvinism like Chauncy's had a storied history in early Anglo-American religion and occasionally manifested itself in sinister ways.¹⁴ Puritans were inclined to accuse women of witchcraft, for example, because women supposedly were physically and emotionally—and therefore by default spiritually—less successful than men in resisting Satan's lure.¹⁵ Thus some of the witchcraft hysteria, which in narrative accounts looks similar to revival expressions, was attributed to physiological "wiring." So, why do people have enthusiastic religious experiences? In contrast to the social-function school, some historians look within the revived.

The "Ecclesiastical" Question

Ann Taves pushes the historiography in new and interesting ways, for her the central question is how religious communities nurture, make sense of, and manage the spiritual experiences. What is learned by watching the way communities shape, control, and process the experiences? What does revivalism reveal about the religious communities out of which it has arisen? "A mythic worldview is inscribed on the body of the individual and/or group," Taves contends, "as people gain mastery of practices in ritual contexts wherein the mythic discourses, images, and/or structures are embedded. The sacralization of experience thus involves cultivating and maintaining those practices through which a community understands, locates, and experiences the sacred."¹⁶ So, why do communities allow, recognize, and even facilitate "fits, trances," and other unusual behavior? As a case study, Taves dissects, in part one of her book, how late eighteenth-century Americans took European Methodism and created new ways of forming community—especially through the use of spiritual and emotional exercises. She illustrates that early American Methodism floated between liberty and obedience, but did so in thoughtful and historical ways, rather than "at random."

On one level Taves is asking questions reminiscent of those once asked by Hudson, Mead, and Hofstadter. What is different about Taves' approach, however, is her willingness to accept communities—like the Methodists—on

their own terms. Her question is more about “communal integrity” than social utility. Instead of cutting through and dispensing with the religious community’s rhetoric and expression to expose the “real,” albeit hidden, ulterior social motives, Taves challenges historians to find the social significance precisely *in* the community’s rhetoric and expression. A classic example of asking old questions, only from new perspectives.

Today’s post-modern approaches concede that groups have their own epistemological realism. In other words, groups have truths, logics, and systematic understandings that are unique unto themselves.¹⁷ Historians formerly presumed the world to have one definitive truth, which would be the same for all humans, in all times and places. Based on this presumption, one of the historian’s essential tasks was to cut through the peculiar superstitions or traditions that clouded a group’s practice, and highlight the truths that were “really” at work. To arrive at the kernel of social truth, historians were supposed to slough off the odd emotional behavior, or rhetorical chaff. Switching metaphors, Taves wants to understand the “language of Canaan,”¹⁸ a vernacular that would allow one to “read” the community’s experiences from the inside. More than a merely unique syntax or lexicon, the language of Canaan narrates experiences of communities and hints at the logic, ethos, or mentalité, that made sense only to those inside the community—not from some supposedly objective vantage point. Thus, from Taves’ point of view, rightly interpreting the spiritual exercises and expressions becomes a process of appreciating the community for what it was and the ends it held most dear.¹⁹ The historian must be properly catechized, schooled in, or in-grafted to understand how historical actors put their world together and ordered their community, and how the community created normative identity for the individual. One of the real strengths of Taves’ work is her concern to take religious expression as natural, historical, and spiritual.²⁰

In this case, an essential part of the early Methodist lexicon was the “shout.” “I locate what I take to be the shouters’ central interpretive act—the association of weeping, crying out, falling to the ground, and shouting for joy with the presence of God,” she notes, “in relation to the grassroots pressures to make preaching and worship more interactive.”²¹ In particular, what worked for the creation of a British Methodist community required evolution and adaptation so as to help cultivate an American Methodist community. Finding initial root in the Chesapeake region in the last third of the eighteenth century, and because nearly half of the region’s population was of African descent, American Methodism had to speak the dialect. So, Wesley’s reasonable enthusiasm was thrown into the American multicultural crucible, which included the African emphasis on “rhythmic interaction.” As Eugene Genovese and Albert Raboteau illustrated twenty-five to thirty years ago now, enslaved Africans brought with them their religious beliefs and expressions. Their audible cadence and corresponding physical movements were retentions of the traditional African ring shout.²² So, to form a Methodist style that was true to the new community, Isaac Watts, for example, required reworking to fit the new interactive American idiom.

Providing the language to narrate the event, or express the experience, in early American Methodism the “classes, bands, love-feasts, watch nights” and assorted “experience-meetings” gave identity and history to individuals.

“In each instance these religious expressions were intimately associated with the presence of the power of the Lord *in the congregation*. This latter point cannot be stressed too highly.”²³ Thus the emphasis is on community, vis-à-vis individualism. Indeed Taves is concerned to illustrate how even the “mourning circles” operated from the premise that “spiritual development [was] a communal (rather than solitary) process, and the traditional African emphasis on knowing the Spirit through the dynamic rhythmic interaction of individuals within a group.”²⁴ Stated otherwise, instead of a democratic railing against authority, the shouting and other vigorous eighteenth-century Methodist revival expressions may have been, in their own way, catechetical. The emotional fits, jerks, barks, and other spiritual expressions may have been less individual assertions of liberty, and more exercises for admission to a desired community. If so, such a bodily-engaged worship became a key process for community formation. It provided a communal, didactic process whereby common folk could discern the work of the Spirit and achieve integration into the church’s story. The American Methodist community, in other words, employed interactive, emotional revival exercises to train its body and give it definition. Far from being a practical strategy for responding to social threats and manipulating the larger culture, revivals were what American Methodists did.

Ultimately the frontier camp revival itself became sacred history and space—a place where God’s people gathered and sojourned. More than mere rhetorical device, the camp became to the community a little bit of Heaven on earth. And the patterns of behavior appropriate to the biblical narrative were especially apropos for the camp meeting. “First, shouters linked ‘extravagant emotions and bodily exercises’ with God’s power and presence in the context of group interaction, and second, they used biblical typology to locate the body of the believer and the space of the camp within the collective narrative of the people of God.”²⁵ Thus, the exercises were left neither to happenstance, nor to individual pursuits. To borrow the old popular African proverb, in the same way it takes a village to raise a child, it required a community to nurture a Methodist somewhere between liberty and obedience.

Like Ann Taves, Leigh Eric Schmidt has been more interested to focus on the communal meaning of revivals than on the cultural cause and consequence. Historians such as William McLoughlin²⁶ and Timothy Smith²⁷ made exceptional contributions to the understanding of how revivals inspired social, economic, and political reform movements. And their insights must not be discounted. Yet Schmidt seems interested to research the ways essential rites and rituals breathed their own life and logic into Christian communities.²⁸ Schmidt has proven himself most adept at reading what material culture and ritual says about the internal theology of religious subcultures. One of his most helpful works in this area is his 1989 volume *Holy Fairs* in which he raises such central questions as: “How did revivals help the participants give shape to their world? What did they mean to those amid them? How were such festal occasions interrelated with community and boundaries that defined it? How did specific rituals or cultural performances contribute to the formation of different social relationships, patterns of authority, and webs of meaning?”²⁹

Going back to post-Reformation Scotland, Schmidt finds Protestants torn over the proper way to celebrate the Eucharist. No longer Roman Catholics,

neither transubstantiation, nor deference to the clergy was viable. Consequently Scottish Protestants would neither kneel in adoration of the host, nor receive the elements from the hands of a priest. Instead they sat during the observance, and handed the elements of bread and wine to one another. Scottish Protestants were clearly moving away from obedience to authority, but Presbyterian leaders began to fear where such license might lead. The sacrament called the church both to honor the sacrifice of Christ and affirm the one holy, catholic, and apostolic church. If the Lord's Supper became overly privatized and individualistic, Protestantism would gut the sacrament of its intrinsic meaning. Indeed, one need not look too far in the seventeenth-century Anglo world to find reminders of religious libertarianism. Presbyterian leaders needed to help their community float between liberty and obedience.

Replacing the altar with the communion table, Scottish Presbyterians symbolically replaced hierarchical rites with more republican rituals. Nowhere is this clearer, Schmidt argues, than in the creation of the communion fair. Such festivals were intentionally designed to capture the full sacramental meaning for the new Protestant community while maintaining historical rootedness. Through the creation of the communion fair, in other words, Scottish Presbyterian leaders led their communities through the Scylla of medieval Catholic retentions, and the Charybdis of radical Protestant individualism. So, what appeared to be a break from history actually turned out to be a thoughtful Scottish Presbyterian adjustment designed to meet their community's immediate sacramental needs. "Into this gap between Reformed expectations and popular desires entered a Presbyterian solution," Schmidt maintains.³⁰

According to Schmidt, the look and feel of these fairs is just as significant as the social, political, or economic factors that gave rise to them, because the festivals' look and feel bespoke or revealed the movement's essential identity. The distinctives included: outdoor, extemporaneous, tag-team preaching by several popular ministers; to large gatherings comprised of folks from a large geographical area; lasting several days; during which time raucous conversion experiences would erupt; all ultimately consummated in a mass communion service where literally thousands sat at tables together. So, more than 175 years before Cane Ridge, Scottish Presbyterians began forming the model for what would become the American frontier revival—emotional exercises and all. In one 1624 festival, for example, James Glendinning was able to "rouse up the people and waken them with terrors" to the point that "many are stricken and swoon with the Word—yea a dozen in one day carried out of doors as dead, so marvellous was the power of God smiting their hearts for sin."³¹ At Cane Ridge, Americans admittedly took these festivals to a new level in size, scope, emotional expression, and ecumenical inclusion, but the essential design was Scottish. James McGready and Barton Stone, two of the early Second Great Awakeners, occasionally made a direct link between the American revivals and their Scottish antecedents.

So what? What if events like the Great Revival had clear roots in seventeenth-century Scottish religious culture? How does it help us understand something of how they put their world together? First, it suggests that the revivals and their emotional outbursts were more than mere random events or happenstance. "These were not spontaneous, unusual, or infrequent awakenings,

but part of the very fabric of religious and social life,” claims Schmidt.³² Second, if these revivals were so historically rooted, then they may have been more than democratic lay-driven events, or Early National protest campaigns. Seventeenth-century Presbyterian clergy served as the original architects of the festivals, and the design reflects the thought and purpose of the designers. So, here I would like to go beyond what Schmidt offers in his book. For while he effectively outlines the connection between Scottish and American revivals, there is more room to tease out the important implications of his findings.

One of the more telling conversations these very same seventeenth-century Scottish Presbyterian leaders had was with their more democratically-minded Congregationalist counterparts. Through books and sermons, the two sides maintained a rather vigorous dialogue over much of the early seventeenth century. At the heart of their debate was the “*clavis potestatis*” issue, or the “key of power.” Who ultimately held pre-eminent authority in the church? Was it vested in the clergy, or in the laity?

According to the Congregationalists, the clergy had only the authority the people conferred upon them. The clergy, for example, ought to be selected by the people and serve at the people’s discretion. Should the congregation desire a change, they could revoke their recognition of the minister’s role over them and the minister would consequently be devoid of power. In fact, in the Congregationalist system a minister could not even preach to a congregation without an expressed invitation, for preaching was an act of power. As Richard Mather maintained, the people should have “no minister or church officer lord over them, but they [the ministers] ought to be under the church for which they are servants.”³³ Congregations, therefore, temporarily commissioned individual clergymen to edify and instruct the specific congregation that called them, and to serve as the congregation’s ambassador at gatherings like the classis, kirk session, or synods. But, “no man is bound absolutely to submit to, or to rest in the judgment of any man or counsel, but to try them by Scripture and then consent with them no further than they appear to consent with that rule,” argued Congregationalist theologian John Davenport.³⁴

The Presbyterians agreed that issues of power, authority, and order defined the debate. One of the fundamental problems of the Congregationalist model, however, was its tendency to create excessive liberty in the church, the results of which could be catastrophic. The Congregationalists’ notion of individual liberty was a “strange tenet [that] seemeth to be either the root or fruit, or the mother or daughter of all the rest of their [i.e., Congregationalist] error,” lamented Robert Baillie. “A few persons having locked themselves up within the narrow walls of one congregation, having made themselves uncontrollable by any or all upon the earth, they open a wide door to any erroneous spirit, to mislead them toward whatever fancy can enter into any cracked brain.”³⁵ Thomas Lechford concurred, noting that instead of getting rid of bishops, the Congregationalists’ insistence on independence actually made everyone a bishop in his or her own eyes, and would unavoidably lead to “anarchy and confusion.”³⁶ “The whole people are not,” asserted Samuel Rutherford, “over the whole people; they are not kings reigning in Christ’s government over kings, but divided into governors and governed.” Consequently, ecclesiastical leaders, “by the power of office are over the church to command, sentence, judge, and

judicially to censure.” The democratic system whereby “all are Kings, Rulers, Guides, and all have the most supreme power of the keys, and all govern over all,” concluded Rutherford, was a comical, unwieldy, and unscriptural error.³⁷

Although the whole debate is immensely interesting and teeming with implications, for our purposes we should not get lost in the ecclesiological minutiae. The very Scottish Presbyterian leadership who helped create the communion festivals that inspired the American revivals were no advocates of a democratic empowerment of the laity. Indeed, the Presbyterians were repulsed by the independent polity because it created “a greater usurpation and tyranny over the souls and consciousness of men than the Bishops themselves did ever exercise.” Democracy made the church “all eye, and all tongue, no diversity of members, all governors, none to be governed,” lamented William Rathband.³⁸ And these Presbyterian leaders invoked church history for evidence of the illogic of democratic polities. For over 1,600 years the most independent, egalitarian-sounding groups like the Montanists, Donatists, Cathari, and Anabaptists actually tended toward the “highest encroachments upon Christian liberty and the strict binding of men’s consciences by human constitutions.”³⁹ If the Scottish Presbyterians were so aware of, and opposed to, the pitfalls of religious libertarianism, would they at the same time create a ritual to practice it?

If Schmidt is correct, the implications of the Scottish roots of American revivalism may be more significant than appears at first glance. Moreover, his findings in *Holy Fairs* may raise more interesting possibilities for our understanding of the communal function of revivalism. Perhaps as historians we should read the creation of the communion festivals in light of the Scottish Presbyterian ecclesiology, i.e., from within the movement. In so doing we may find that the fairs were clergy-led rituals designed to stave off the most dangerous aspects of democratic excess latent within Protestantism. Granted these festivals and their American revival offspring were a significant departure from obedience to old forms of authority, but they may not have been as radical as sometimes depicted. By creating such seemingly informal environments as the communion fairs and revivals, did the clergy help steer the laity into safe zones of religious experience and expression? Did the religious authorities determine and sanction a level of lay participation deemed simultaneously safe for the unity and stability of the church, while flexible enough to keep folks interested? Was the genius of the Second Great Awakening the clergy’s ability to delimit the extremes of liberty and obedience, while offering a remarkably broad, free-ranging, fuzzy center?

In conclusion, going back into some of the Scottish ecclesiological debates might proffer some helpful insights, in the same way that Taves’ work has, for discerning the inner logic and historical consciousness of the communities that inspired the revivals. What appeared to outsiders like Tocqueville and historians as random religious expression, conservative social control, or radical progressive protest, may have been a community-designed form for making sense of the world and forming disciples.

NOTES

¹ Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

² Leigh Eric Schmidt, "'A Practicall Remembrance' Cane Ridge in Historical Memory," *Discipliana* 61 (Summer 2001): 42-43.

³ Winthrop Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), 95.

⁴ Sidney E. Mead, "The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America: 1607-1850," in *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives*, eds. H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), 226.

⁵ Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1962), 84.

⁶ Donald G. Mathews, *Religion in the Old South* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 244-ff. See also Mathew's earlier essay, "The Second Great Awakening as an Organizing Process, 1780-1830: An Hypothesis." *American Quarterly* 21 (Spring 1969): 23-43.

⁷ Paul E. Johnson, *A Shopkeepers Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978). Among others who promoted the social control thesis, Johnson stood on the work of Whitney Cross, *The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950).

⁸ Hatch's thesis relates closely to Gordon Wood's argument for early American radicalism in *Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969), and *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1992). Hatch also works well with the John D. Hicks-C. Vann Woodward-Lawrence Goodwyn-Robert McMath school of thought that interprets American populism as a socially liberal and progressive protest tradition.

⁹ Nathan O. Hatch, "The Democratization of Christianity and the Character of American Politics," in *Religion and American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the 1980s*, ed. Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 96.

¹⁰ Rich Heffern, "Exploring the Biology of Religious Experience," *National Catholic Reporter* (April 20, 2001).

¹¹ Margaret Poloma, "Mysticism and Identity Formation in Social Context: The Case of the Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement." Paper delivered at the Identity and Character Conference, Washington, D.C., November 1997.

¹² V.S. Ramachandran and Sandra Blakeslee, *Phantoms in the Brain: Probing the Mysteries of the Human Mind* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1998).

¹³ Ann Taves, *Fits, Trances, and Visions: Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).

¹⁴ Elizabeth Reis, *Damned Women: Sinners and Witches in Puritan New England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

¹⁵ See also Ann Taves, "Sexuality in American Religious History," in *Retelling U.S. Religious History*, ed. by Thomas Tweed (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 27-56.

¹⁶ Taves, *Fits, Trances, and Visions*, 47.

¹⁷ Leigh Eric Schmidt's *Hearing Things: Religion, Illusion, and the American Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000) is a useful addition to the literature here, for it illustrates how all systems of interpretation work from their own epistemological realism. For some 200 years, for example, the Enlightenment provided a modernist epistemological lens that presumed to impose sense and non-sense on religious truth claims. Every culture and sub-culture, however, operates from its own basis or definitions of reality. Historians must, therefore, avoid the tendency to drag their subjects into their own epistemological paradigms. A more fair and fruitful goal might be the discernment and appreciation of the communal logic and order their subjects have created.

¹⁸ Christine Leigh Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 3-27.

¹⁹ Michael Baxter has provided some provocative insights on how far to take this idea. Arguing that historical narration is "first and foremost a theological task," Baxter calls on historians to "narrate once again the identity of the church as a 'pilgrim city,' as Augustine did in the *City of God*." In other words, historians ought to depict the church as a different, alternative form of community from that of the larger society, one with its own "complex web of Christian belief and practice." I think it would be most helpful for someone to do for Stone-Campbell historiography what Baxter has done for U.S. Catholic historiography. (See "Writing History in a World Without Ends: An Evangelical Catholic Critique of United States Catholic Historiography," *Pro Ecclesia* 5[no. 4]:440-69.)

²⁰ A quick look at American Indian historiography might illustrate the point here more starkly than Evangelical revivalism. Fred McTaffart's *Wolf That I Am: In Search of the Red Earth People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1984), and Calvin Luther Martin's *The Way of the Human Being* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), both illustrate the need to catch snatches of alternative indigenous epistemologies and communal structures before historians can really learn anything about the American Indian. Interpreting American Indians by the light of our Western worldview tells us precious little. An Indian powwow or shaman often engaged in ecstatic religious exercises. One difference, of course, is in the way respective communities found truth, history, and meaning in those expressions. Therefore, before considering questions of function, the historian must fathom something of the community's internal logic—on its own terms.

²¹ Taves, *Fits, Trances, and Visions*, 78.

²² Eugene Gevoese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Random House, 1972); and Albert Raboteau, *Slave Religion: The "Invisible Institution" in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978).

²³ Taves, 87. Emphasis in the original.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 103.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 116-7.

²⁶ *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform: An Essay on Religion and Social Change, 1607-1977* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).

²⁷ *Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957).

²⁸ I suspect that Schmidt's recent work is something of what David Lotz had in mind back in 1989. In his chapter "A Changing Historiography: From Church History to Religious History," Lotz charted the 100-year historiographical ebb and flow between the sacred and secular in writing church/religious history. At that point, Lotz believed social, political, and economic interpretations reigned supreme over the historiography. "In sum: *church* history since the sixties has been secularized and rendered pluralistic, and therewith transmuted into *religious* history" (p. 334). Thus, Lotz desired another disciplinary evolution so that the church historian would become "one whose distinctive vocation is to know and narrate just what it is that is always going on *inside* Christian gatherings that both *makes* and *keeps* them what they are, namely, the church catholic. As such, the church historian does not rest content with a description of the churches as social institutions of a religious character . . ." (p. 339). (See *Altered Landscapes: Christianity in America, 1935-1985* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989].)

²⁹ Leigh Eric Schmidt, *Holy Fairs: Scottish Communion and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 6.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 20 and 21.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 29.

³² *Ibid.*, 58.

³³ Richard Mather, "Essay on What the Visible Church Is, and the Government of It," 1633, Mather Family Papers; American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts; Folio vol.1, 34.

³⁴ John Davenport, *An Apologetical Reply to a Book Called An Answer to the Unjust Complaint of W.B.* (Rotterdam: Isaac van Waesberghe, 1636), 230.

³⁵ Robert Baillie, *A Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time* (London: Samuel Gillibrand, 1646), 112.

³⁶ Thomas Lechford, *Plain Dealing or News from New England* (London: Nathaniel Butter, 1642), 5.

³⁷ Samuel Rutherford, *The Due Right of Presbyteries, or, A Peaceable Plea for the Government of the Church of Scotland* (London: Andrew Crook, 1644), 24.

³⁸ William Rathband, *A Brief Narration of Some Church Courses Held in Opinion and Practice in the Churches Lately Erected in New England* (London: Edward Brewster, 1644), 9 and 26.

³⁹ John Ball, *A Trial of the New Church Way in New England and in Old* (London: Thomas Underhill, 1644), 19-20 and 80-81.

ANNOUNCING FOR YOUR CONGREGATION

HISTORY ALIVE WEEKEND

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society is reaching out to congregations with “History to Go” weekends. A “History Alive Weekend” may include a retreat, all-church fellowship event, church women’s group, church school, quilting-storytelling workshop, youth groups, and/or preaching. The resource person will have consulted with local leaders to plan the weekend; she will then be present to lead the events.

President Peter Morgan describes this new ministry offered by the Historical Society: “This bold venture in local church ministry all began when Linda Chenoweth moved to Celebration, Florida, and sought God’s new call for her life. Her personal discernment process brought her to the Historical Society. After our discussion she and her husband Amos made a commitment to personally fund her new ministry. It is an inspiring story of vocation, stewardship and promise for congregations.”

Mrs. Chenoweth, an experienced minister/educator, has volunteered up to eight weekends per year with minimum costs to congregations or host groups. The only cost request is reimbursement of local housing, meals and transportation. Expenses for travel to events will be paid as an act of stewardship by Mr. and Mrs. Chenoweth.

Events are to be scheduled through the President’s office of the Historical Society: 1101 19th Avenue South, Nashville, TN 37212 (615-327-1444), or mail@dishistsoc.org. After eight events in one year, scheduling will be done on a case-by-case basis.

Chenoweth comments as she begins her new ministry, “In our congregational story we learn of God’s gifts for the present and God’s vision for the future.”

THE ENCOUNTER OF NORTH AMERICAN STONE-CAMPBELL CHRISTIANS WITH THE PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT

Amy Collier Artman*

If we could open the family albums of the Stone-Campbell, Holiness and Pentecostal movements, images with shared backgrounds would be everywhere. We would see people gathered together on the American frontier, breathing the same air of freedom and new ideas of the new country. But the images themselves would be different: Alexander Campbell debating rational faith, Azusa Street with its ecstasies and emotion, Walter Scott speaking about the logical plan of salvation, Agnes Ozman speaking in tongues. But as we flipped through the pictures of the early days, with the albums side-by-side, suddenly we would run across two images of the same event. The albums share one striking similarity: the Cane Ridge revival. The Stone Campbell, Holiness and Pentecostal churches all claim this event as theirs. Since we share this heritage, why are we so distant today? The answers are multiple, but when one looks at the interaction since 1801 between the groups, interesting patterns emerge. The interaction between the Stone-Campbell, Holiness and Pentecostal movements is characterized by an overall difference in understanding of the proper role of emotion¹ in the Christian life, and focused on conflicting conceptions of the Holy Spirit and disagreement over the true nature of charismata, or gifts of the Holy Spirit.

In the 19th century, the Campbell Disciples and the Stone Christians shared the religious world with Methodists, and soon, the Holiness movement which emerged from Methodism. The Holiness movement represented a radicalizing of the Wesleyan concept of full sanctification, but its first phase was solidly within Methodism.² Steven Lee Ware interpreted this type of Holiness as less extreme than the more radical brand of Holiness that developed in the years following the Civil War. Douglas M. Strong agreed. Early Holiness was, in general, “comfortable with the church’s hierarchical structures” and represented definite “adjustments to middle-class culture.”³ Holiness, then, in the early part of the nineteenth century was not “new” in many ways that were extreme. One concept, however, set it apart and set the stage for the more radical Holiness to follow: a strong emphasis on the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

The first phase of Holiness was an important part of the new emphasis on the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The teaching of the leaders of Oberlin theology, such as Charles Grandison Finney and Asa Mahan, contributed in the middle of the nineteenth century to the development of this distinct tenet of Holiness Methodism. Phoebe Palmer, a colleague of the Oberlin teachers and prominent first-phase Holiness leader in her own right, used the language of holiness as well as baptism in the Holy Spirit with equal comfort. Later in her life in particular, she asserted with fervor that the experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the “indispensable, absolute necessity of all the disciples of Jesus.”⁴ Donald W. Dayton asserted that the doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, not prevalent in British Wesleyan Methodism, was first developed in a sustained way at

*Amy Collier Artman is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Chicago and a co-pastor of North Side Christian Church, Chicago, with her husband David.

Oberlin College in the mid-1800s.⁵ A new Holiness emerged based upon this new emphasis.

Still to come, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, was a different kind of Holiness from what had been seen before in America. This is what Steven Ware called “radical Holiness,” or “Holiness proper.” Ware dated the emergence of Holiness as a distinct movement with the organization of the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness in 1867. He added, “While this designation is not meant to deny the existence or profound influence of the earlier holiness renewal, it is intended to note the watershed which began to be apparent after this event.”⁶ What emerged within Holiness from this point forward was a “come-outism” that had not been prevalent before. This was due in part to the fact that the hierarchy of Methodism began to view the holiness movement with increasing suspicion. Holiness groups began to publish their own literature, a sure sign of independence in that journal-oriented world. Ware noted that “by 1892 there were forty-one holiness periodicals in circulation, all of which ran very much against the grain of the tightly organized Methodist Church.”⁷ The irenic party spirit of earlier Holiness leaders began to seem increasingly distant. Soon, there was a large-scale exodus of Holiness advocates, which led within a decade to the organization of the largest number of new churches in American religious history.⁸ But organizational issues were not at the core of the differences between Methodism and Holiness. The presenting problems around issues of discipline were only symptoms of an increasingly disparate interpretation of a foundational Wesleyan concept: sanctification.

John Wesley taught sanctification, but it was a sanctification more focused on the work of Christ in the believer than the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Whether or not this was an event or process is debated in Wesleyan scholarship, but it is clear to writers such as Dayton that the Holiness movement effected a definite shift in the understanding of sanctification toward an emphasis on the Holy Spirit. “Wesley taught a doctrine of Christian perfection,” Dayton argued, “not a Baptism of the Holy Spirit.”⁹ Adherents of Holiness then and now would disagree. Even Christ Himself, according to Holiness writer Asa Mahan, was dependent upon “the indwelling and influence, and baptism of the Holy Spirit.”¹⁰ Radical Holiness advocates, as Ware designated them, developed the concept of sanctification into this form, the one most commonly associated with Holiness and later Pentecostalism.

This type of sanctification is what I want to focus upon for the purposes of comparison with the Stone-Campbell movement. It is helpful, then, to define carefully what these Holiness come-outers meant by sanctification. Vinson Synan offered a summary:

For decades holiness teachers and preachers had taught that there were two “blessings” offered to believers. The first, justification by faith, was also called a “new birth.” This crisis of conversion was a common understanding and experience for most evangelical believers in America. The Wesleyans, however, claimed a “second blessing,” which, using Wesley’s language, was called “entire sanctification,” an instant experience that gave the believer victory over sin and perfect love toward God and man.¹¹

This entire sanctification was brought about by a direct action of the Holy Spirit, which operated through an “indwelling” in the believer. It was an experience, as

Ware stated, of “the cleansing and empowering experience of the Holy Spirit.”¹² This emphasis on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit was the flash point of conflict with the Stone-Campbell Christians.

Simultaneous to the emergence of the Holiness movement, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, and Walter Scott were teaching and preaching their own brand of American Christianity on the frontier. Interestingly, Holiness adherents shared much in common with the nineteenth-century Stone-Campbell Christians. Both groups saw themselves as returning to a primitive or ancient Christianity, and desired the restoration of the pure New Testament church. In the same way that Campbell and Stone followers chose “Disciples” and “Christians” as the biblical names of their movements, Holiness congregations chose the title “Churches of God.” Both groups urged unity in order to bring about the conversion of the world, but each desired unity on their own terms, through the following of their own interpretations of the biblical plan of salvation. There was much in common, but also much to dispute.

It is understandable that Alexander Campbell reacted strongly against the Wesleyan Holiness type of Christianity. He had fought long and hard against the Calvinism of his day that demanded a demonstrable sign of the Holy Spirit’s action before the penitent could be assured of his or her conversion. He rejected the mourner’s bench and its demand for proof of Holy Spirit activity outside of the Word. For Campbell, it was vitally important to teach that Christian faith was not some illogical experience that needed emotional validation. Christianity was not on a basic level about feeling something; it was about believing something: the evidence of the New Testament about Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit acted on the person through the Word of the New Testament proclaimed. In his Eight Articles of Faith, Campbell stated plainly, “I believe in the operation of the Holy Spirit through the Word, but not without it in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.”¹³ This was a faith that was accessible to everyone, not just to those who could show proof of a Holy Spirit experience. Anyone who was given the basic ability to hear and reason could come to saving faith. A special indwelling or presence of the Holy Spirit was not needed in order to effect conversion. The Holy Spirit did not act directly upon the person to convert, but operated through the Word. In this distinction, Campbell disagreed dually with Methodist Holiness. No emotional proof was needed of the Holy Spirit’s direct action in conversion because the Holy Spirit acted through the Word, not immediately on the person.

As further proof, Campbell made the following comments in his writing entitled “Hints to the Advocates of a Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things, and the Proclaimers of the Ancient Gospel”:

Within the last ten days I have been twice from home; and, on each occasion, proclaimed the old gospel for the purpose of converting men to God. On these two occasions thirty persons obeyed the gospel, were immersed for the remission of their sins and translated into the kingdom of God’s own Son. Many of those converts had no more intention of obeying the gospel one hour before, than I now have of becoming a Presbyterian. Nor can it be said that they were ignorant, and unlearned persons, an easy prey to error, enthusiasts, or weak-minded. They were a fair average of the whole community. They were of both sexes, from eighteen to sixty years of age. Amongst them was one lawyer, one physician, and some of them were in full communion in Methodist,

Presbyterian, and Episcopalian churches. Some of them had lately been skeptics in all religion, and one of them on the morning of the day of his conversion reviled and spoke evil of the ancient gospel. I left these converts rejoicing in God, in their new relation to him, in the pardon of their sins, and in being the adopted sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty.

All of these converts had come to saving faith through the simple declaration of the plan of salvation as laid out in scripture for all to hear and believe. Tellingly, Campbell added, "Nor could it be said that there was any thing like what is called 'a revival' in those vicinities. One of them, where I immersed eighteen persons, was a Presbyterian settlement: every thing as dry as the season of the year, and as cold as December. But this only by the way."¹⁴

It was not "only by the way." Campbell's dislike of the emotionally dramatic and affective revival methods was deep and well-grounded in his overall understanding of the foundational truths of Christian faith. There was no reason to preach in a lather, to stir up emotion in order to persuade and convict. Granville Walker summarized the type of Christian teaching that Campbell rejected in this way: "Faith came only through the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit, and was therefore inaccessible to man except by the direct interposition of the Holy Spirit. Since the Disciple pioneers to a man regarded this conception of faith as sinful error, they opposed it. In fact, they attacked it in almost every sermon and in their writings."¹⁵ Dwight Stevenson recorded a telling account from Campbell's journal, *The Millennial Harbinger*, in which his regard for emotional religion was clear. "With mingled amusement and consternation [Campbell] wrote about a meeting of the Dover Baptist Association addressed by a certain Elder Carr. The excitement stirred up by Elder Carr, though he was a Baptist, was 'equal to Wesleyan Methodism in its palmyest days. What a shaking there was in the camp! What a hugging of men with men! What a weeping of females! . . . I thought I had got into a Methodist camp-meeting."¹⁶ This description, if there is any doubt, was not complimentary.

Campbell argued throughout his life against the emphasis on the emotionally volatile action of the Holy Spirit in conversion. The Word proclaimed would convict through its plain truth, passionately argued and impressed upon the listener, without the need for histrionics. For Campbell, emotional preaching "converts more persons by an anecdote, a shout, a denunciation; or by the word 'damnation' at the top of the voice, or by 'hell-fire,' uttered in the midst of great animal excitement, than by all the gospel facts or arguments from Genesis to the Apocalypse."¹⁷ Passionate preaching of the Word was welcome in Campbell's restoration of the ancient order. But such preaching was meant only to impress upon the listener the truth of the Word, so that the hearer could believe and repent. Preaching in order to elicit emotional proof of conversion and sanctification, as taught by many of the Wesleyan Holiness advocates, was unacceptable. As shown by Campbell's attitude toward Methodist camp meetings and preachers, the early interactions between the two groups were limited by different understandings of the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion.

Campbell disagreed in his teachings not only with opponents, but with colleagues as well. In their ministry, Campbell and Stone developed different attitudes toward the experiential Holy Spirit religion found in Methodist Holiness and the revivals of the Second Great Awakening on the American frontier. Still,

although Barton W. Stone and Alexander Campbell had their disagreements, the basic scheme of salvation was not an arena of dramatic dissension. Paul Conkin summarized Stone's understanding of saving faith as "the one doctrinal position that moved him closest to a view . . . accepted by Alexander Campbell." Stone shared with Campbell the basic understanding of faith as "simple belief or intellectual assent to the scriptures," as opposed to a faith "that was impossible for anyone to affirm without the prompting of the Holy Spirit and thus the special initiative of God."¹⁸ In Stone's opinion, Alexander Campbell presented an accurate account of the scheme of salvation in his teaching.

Stone and Campbell were firmly united in their understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit before conversion. Stone had personally struggled with the Calvinist demands for a visible sign of the Holy Spirit's action. He recalled this in his autobiography. "According to the preaching, and the experience of the pious in those days, I anticipated a long and painful struggle before I should be prepared to come to Christ, or, in the language then used, before I should get religion. This anticipation was completely realized by me. For one year I was tossed on the waves of uncertainty--laboring, praying and striving to obtain saving faith---sometimes desponding, and almost despairing of ever getting it."¹⁹ Stone followed a roller coaster of emotions, not willing even to believe when the emotions felt right, falling into despair in his belief that "this cannot be the mighty work of the spirit, which you must experience—that instantaneous work of Almighty power, which, like an electric shock, is to renew the soul and bring it back to Christ."²⁰ Conversion that required an indwelling of the Holy Spirit seemed beyond him.

Stone at last rejected Calvinism, in part because he became "convicted that God did love the whole world, and that the reason he did not save all, was because of their unbelief; and that the reason why they believed not was not because God did not exert his physical, almighty power in them to make them believe, but because they neglected and received not his testimony given in the Word concerning his Son."²¹ In "An Address to the Churches," written in 1821, Stone made several statements supporting this assertion. "The Bible plainly teaches that the whole work of regeneration and salvation from sin is the work of the Holy Spirit. It is also plain that God begins, carries on, and perfects this work by means of his word. It is equally plain that God does this whole work in us by means of the word believed by us, and not in unbelief."²² In contrast to Wesleyan Holiness advocates, the Holy Spirit for Stone did not come and effect a transformation of the person through direct action or indwelling. It operated through the Word, never "in unbelief," or in other words, never before the person confessed faith in the scriptural truth of Jesus as Lord.

The Spirit does not work on the person before belief, only after. In this assertion, Stone and Campbell agreed.²³ The work of the Holy Spirit in conversion was not a topic of debate for them. How the Spirit worked in and on the hearer after conversion was another thing entirely. The emotionalism of the revivals, and Stone's part in them, produced disagreement between the two men that lasted throughout their shared leadership. A basic knowledge of their approaches to the Holy Spirit with regard to the revivals is foundational for understanding the relationship of the Stone-Campbell, Holiness and Pentecostal movements.

The Great Revival at Cane Ridge was a pivotal point in the life of Barton

W. Stone. As William Garrett West stated, "The revival was [Stone's] proof that salvation could invade men's lives without years of waiting."²⁴ In contrast to Campbell, Stone was comfortable with the religious excitement that could accompany the dramatic revival conversions. In 1801, Stone traveled to a camp meeting in Logan County, Kentucky, already encouraged by news of events that were stirring the religious torpor of the area into excitement. "The scene to me was new, and passing strange," Stone recounted in his autobiography. "It baffled description. Many, very many, fell down as men slain in battle . . . after lying thus for hours, they obtained deliverance." The dramatic and emotional exercises culminated in astonishing recoveries. Stone spoke of the recently "slain" rising to "address the surrounding multitude in language truly eloquent and impressive. With astonishment did I hear men, women and children declaring the wonderful works of God, and the glorious mysteries of the Gospel." In a divine full circle, Stone watched as the Word, now preached by the newly converted to those around them, brought forth even more conversions. "Under such addresses," Stone said, "many others would fall down into the same state from which the speakers had just been delivered."²⁵ The exercises drew attention to the newly converted, drawing people to them, into hearing distance, so that the Word could again be proclaimed boldly for their salvation. It was an effective process of conversion leading to conversion, using the dramatic effects of the Spirit as the draw.

Stone understood that the assent to Gospel truth, in its terrifying power, could have physical consequences for the believer. "What is generally meant of every man having the spirit, is what I call the light of truth," Stone asserted. "By this light sinners are often made to tremble for fear of being convicted of their sin and danger."²⁶ Trembling, jerking, barking, running, all of these powerful manifestations were not the result of the direct interposition of the Holy Spirit, but of the overwhelming power of Gospel truth. The experiences of the Great Revival solidified Stone's beliefs, already in place, about the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion. As Newell Williams stated, "[T]he notion that God transforms sinners' wills through the Gospel, without a previous work of the Holy Spirit . . . was consistent with the remarkable conversions of the revival."²⁷ The conversions, even with their excesses, were comforting proof to Stone of the validity of his beliefs.

Despite his comfort with the agitations of the revivals, Stone was not ignorant of the dangers of enthusiasm. "Much then did I see, and much have I since seen, that I considered to be fanaticism," Stone wrote in his autobiography published in 1847, "but this should not condemn the work."²⁸ In addition, he noted that "The Devil has always tried to ape the works of God, to bring them into disrepute. But that cannot be a Satanic work, which brings men to humble confession and forsaking of sin—to solemn prayer—fervent praise and thanksgiving, and to sincere and affectionate exhortations to sinners to repent and go to Jesus the Saviour."²⁹ These statements by Stone regarding his patience with the emotional excesses at Cane Ridge are often quoted. It is important to note, therefore, that he had great reason to fear and reject emotional religion.

Two of Stone's closest colleagues in the formation and dissolution of the Springfield Presbytery, Richard McNemar and John Dunlevy, converted to

Shakerism in 1804, a defection Stone blamed in part on the increased emotionalism of their Christianity. In Stone's words, the coming of the Shakers to the Kentucky churches "came at a most inauspicious time. Some of us were verging on fanaticism; some were so disgusted at the spirit of opposition against us, and the evils of division, that they were almost led to doubt the truth of religion in toto." In addition he noted that "some were earnestly breathing after perfection in holiness, of which attainment they were almost despairing by reason of remaining depravity."³⁰ Stone walked a delicate line in his acceptance of religious excitement and sometimes found himself in reluctant competition with groups such as the Shakers and Holiness Methodists, and often in disagreement with his new colleague, Alexander Campbell.

In the years following the deaths of the founders, Campbell's interpretation of the Holy Spirit and emotional religion held the day. The majority of the succeeding generations of Stone-Campbell leaders followed in Campbell's footsteps in regard to their attitude toward Cane Ridge and its revival legacy. Emphasis was placed upon the spirit of unity at Cane Ridge rather than the revival chaos. This was despite the fact that Stone devoted an entire chapter of his autobiography to the exercises and much less paper to their unifying effects. As early as 1846, Elder John Rogers felt the need to add the following commentary to his biography of Stone, which included the accounts of the spiritual exercises: "In view then of the fanatical, bitter and censorious spirit which often associates itself with these bodily agitations, and is highly promotive of them, the writer is decidedly opposed to them."³¹ The Cane Ridge revival decreased in importance in the Stone-Campbell churches to such a degree that Colby D. Hall was able to report the following in his book *The New Light Christians*:

Permit the author, here to insert a personal experience that will illustrate how easily we can allow the familiarity of an experience to dull the sense of its importance in the long run of history. During the years 1899 through 1902 I was a student in the College of the Bible and Kentucky University (now Transylvania). Among my teachers were J.W. McGarvey [and other] men whose careers reached back into the period of the pioneers. They had labored in Kentucky for some years. Nevertheless, during those three years I had never heard of Cane Ridge, though it was not far away. No doubt these teachers were too busy making history to take time to teach it. My first trip to Cane Ridge was many years later.³²

Cane Ridge had already begun to fade away in the historical memory of the Stone-Campbell movement, a mere fifty-five years after Barton W. Stone's death.

As the subject matter of Colby D. Hall's book indicated, he was biased toward Stone and the New Light Christians of the Great Revival. Nevertheless, his assessment of the response within the Christian Churches at the turn of the twentieth century to Cane Ridge as an historical event was accurate. The images of the Cane Ridge revival and its embarrassing emotionalism were either forgotten or sweetened into pictures of unity amidst diversity, a memory of old time religion that left out the barks and jerks. Interestingly, the very aspects of Cane Ridge history repugnant to Stone-Campbell heirs were to become the treasured possession of a new brand of Christians, the Pentecostals.

At the turn of the twentieth century came a new group, emerging in part from Holiness roots, and declaring a type of primitivism at once familiar and strange to the Stone-Campbell churches.³³ Holiness/Pentecostal scholar Vinson

Synan traced the Pentecostals directly from Cane Ridge, gladly claiming the direct descent from the revival to Pentecostalism and beyond.³⁴ From Holiness roots, most scholars agree, grew the “touchstone doctrine of Pentecostalism,” as Ware called it. This was “the insistence that speaking in tongues was the necessary initial physical evidence of having received the baptism of the Holy Spirit.”³⁵ This new emphasis separated the Pentecostals from the Holiness Christians by further accentuating the assurance of sanctification provided by a visible, physical sign. Holiness Methodists pushed the issue of sanctification to the forefront, and now the newly forming Pentecostal bodies placed it not only front, but center.

The Pentecostal movement developed from the teachings of leaders such as Charles Parham and William Seymour, both Holiness preachers. The members of the movement generally traced its emergence in the twentieth century to the night in 1901 when Agnes Ozman spoke in tongues at Parham’s Bible College in Kansas (although in true primitivist fashion they claimed their actual origins to be in the New Testament church). Its true arrival on the religious scene of America occurred in the revival at Azusa Street in California in 1906. Pentecostals taught that the New Testament church had been restored in their communion, including the full charismata, or gifts of the Holy Spirit, which followed sanctification. The Pentecostals asserted that all of the gifts were active, including the miraculous charisms of healing, exorcism, prophecy, and speaking in tongues.

The Stone Campbell churches, which by this time had divided into the Disciples of Christ and the Churches of Christ, were nonetheless unified in their rejection of any suggestion that the miraculous gifts of the Spirit were available to the modern church. Their reasons differed, but their conclusion was the same: no miracle healing, no exorcism, no prophecy, and no tongues. For the Churches of Christ, the teaching of the Pentecostals was an unforgivable perversion of the New Testament restoration message. David Edwin Harrell, speaking in particular about Pentecostal healing revivals, summarized it this way: “Militant and aggressive in their own teachings, Churches of Christ spokesmen believed the miraculous gifts had ceased.” He continued:

Churches of Christ frequently bought advertisements in local newspapers challenging the healers to publish evidence that miracles did occur in their meetings and offering cash rewards for proof. They repeatedly sought public debates and published a flood of polemical literature challenging the claims of the healing revivalists. They openly labeled the revivalists “fake healers.”³⁶

In the first third of the twentieth century, a battle raged for the hearts and loyalties of Christians who claimed New Testament restoration in their churches. Central to this contest was the correct understanding of what the Holy Spirit would, and could, accomplish in the modern world.

For some in the Churches of Christ, the rejection of the gifts proclaimed by the Pentecostals was based upon a premillennial dispensationalism that saw the end of miracles with the end of the Apostolic Dispensation and the beginning of the Dispensation of the Church. As Grant Wacker pointed out, many Pentecostals were themselves dispensational premillennialists at this time. He noted, “Pentecostals did not exactly reverse [the premillennial dispensationalist] argument, but they tinkered with it to make it fit their own purposes.”³⁷ The sign

of the end times was found in the restoration of the gift of tongues. Wacker noted, “[A]bove all it was the restoration of one gift, the gift of speaking in unknown tongues, that proved to the first generation Pentecostals that the Church Dispensation was drawing to a close.”³⁸ It was the sign that the millennium was at hand. It was, literally, the end of the world; and it was the impetus for passionate evangelizing and impressive growth by the Pentecostal churches.

The newly formed Churches of Christ found themselves quickly forced to fight for their place as The Church of Christ against the upstart Pentecostals. As Harrell stated, “Pentecostals were the arch enemy of the Churches of Christ.”³⁹ Class and regional issues linked Churches of Christ and Pentecostal bodies, but similarities in demographics led to even more bitter rivalry. In good Campbell fashion, the Churches of Christ challenged the Pentecostals to debates and published arguments against them in order to defeat their dangerously misguided teaching. But they were fighting with weapons suited for rational battle against an enemy armed with emotion.

Let’s be clear, however, that it was not the case that the Churches of Christ lacked passion, any more than had Alexander Campbell. Campbell had advocated determined, passionately presented rational arguments in order to convert the sinner to belief. In the same way, Harrell defended the Churches of Christ in this way: “What has often struck outsiders as intolerance may be better understood as conviction.” He also observed, “We take ourselves with deadly seriousness. It is the nature of our business.”⁴⁰ The Churches of Christ were passionately committed to their mission. But they faced a competitor that desired, as Wacker put it, “to return to the ancient tradition of the New Testament where the Holy Ghost, and only the Holy Ghost, ruled the hearts and minds of the faithful. That long-lost world was, in a sense, an Edenic realm pulsating with supernatural signs and wonders.”⁴¹ Pentecostals desired to reclaim the Cane Ridge legacy of emotional Christianity as strongly as the Stone-Campbell churches desired to leave it behind.

For the Disciples, the advent of scientific rationalism and historical-critical approaches to the scriptures prevalent at the turn of the twentieth century caused the abandonment of the restorationist plea and challenged the reality of the miraculous in Christian history overall. The idea that miracles could still occur in the twentieth century was barely even worthy of debate. In 1905, J.H. Garrison reflected upon the spiritual gifts in his book on the Holy Spirit. For Garrison, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit found in scripture had passed away as a sign “not of retrogression,” he argued, “but progress.” He continued, “[The cessation of the miraculous] indicated not a declining faith and waning spiritual power, as many seem to think, but a faith strong enough to stand without such extraneous helps, and a spiritual development which could dispense with supernatural or extraordinary gifts.” The gifts were a condition of the infant church, and in its now more mature stage, “such infantile helps would no longer be necessary.”⁴² Gifts of the Holy Spirit had served their purpose, and in the mature, spiritually developed world of the twentieth century, they were no longer necessary.

The teaching against miraculous works of the Holy Spirit in the modern day was dominant in Disciple circles, but it did not go unchallenged. In a small volume entitled “The Acts of the Holy Spirit Among the Disciples of Christ

Today,” published in 1974, several writers shared their frustrations. This pamphlet was a part of the then-flourishing charismatic renewal, a movement in which the teaching and form of Pentecostalism made headway into the mainstream churches, even the Disciples of Christ. In his chapter in the pamphlet, Dr. J. Daniel Cougar argued, “Too often, [the denominational leaders] are silent where the Bible speaks. . . For example, the New Testament is not silent on the subject of the Holy Spirit. Yet the Holy Spirit is seldom referred to by Disciple ministers.” And in conclusion, “The gifts of the Holy Spirit, described throughout the New Testament, are available to all believers.”⁴³ Even more provocatively, J. A. Dennis of Austin, Texas had these words for the Disciples:

When I was ordained as a lay minister in the Christian Church in 1935, I was thrilled at what the leaders gave as the Creed of the Church: No creed but Christ; no book but the Bible; where the New Testament speaks, we speak.” I said, “you can’t beat that. God must have brought me to the right place. But when I got to studying the Word, especially the New testament, I found that it spoke very loudly on some things that the Disciples of Christ were mighty silent about, and one of these subjects was the baptism in the Holy Spirit. They taught me that this experience, the gifts of the Spirit, and miracles of healing passed away with the apostles and those on whom they laid their hands. But God had put a hunger in my heart to see today what I was reading about as having happened in the first century church.”

Dennis concluded, “To my joy--and consternation--I found that Jesus had willed me the Holy Spirit baptism and I was being cheated out of it.”⁴⁴ The charismatic renewal movement, in full force when this volume was published in the 1970s, brought the Disciples of Christ a challenge from their own revival past.

During the course of the twentieth century, the various ecclesiological children of the Stone-Campbell, Holiness and Pentecostal movements continued to find themselves at odds with each other. It is my hope that this broad essay can contribute to a better understanding of the reasons why the interactions between the Stone-Campbell, Holiness, and Pentecostal churches have been so difficult. During the two centuries from Cane Ridge to today, these groups developed differing interpretations of the work of the Holy Spirit, the reality of miraculous charismata, and, perhaps most importantly, the proper role of emotion in faith. Our interactions have indeed been characterized by conflict. Conflict, however, can serve as a basis for exciting scholarship and stimulating debate. In the same way that the Disciples Historical Society brings together the estranged members of the Stone-Campbell family, perhaps a conference could be developed around the unifying event of Cane Ridge, involving Holiness, Pentecostal, Charismatic and even Shaker scholars, as well as our own Stone-Campbell historians. What better tribute to the image of the Cane Ridge revival as one of unity (the image preferred by the Stone-Campbell churches) than to use it as the impetus for a family reunion? And what better tribute to the legacy of Holy Spirit movement, chaos, and power in the Cane Ridge meeting, so beloved by Holiness adherents and Pentecostals, than to invite the children of that revival experience to come back home? It’s certainly something to think about.

Citations

Campbell, Alexander. *The Millennial Harbinger* 1, no.7 (July 5, 1830):

Conkin, Paul K. *American Originals*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Dickinson, Hoke S. *The Cane Ridge Reader*. Kentucky: Cane Ridge Preservation Project, 1972.

Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International. *The Gifts of the Holy Spirit Among Disciples of Christ Today*. Los Angeles: Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International, 1974.

Garrison, J.H. *The Holy Spirit*. St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1905.

Hall, Colby D. *The New Light Christians*. Ft. Worth: Stafford-Lowden Co., 1959.

Harrell Jr., David Edwin. *All Things Are Possible*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975.

Hughes, Richard T., ed. *The American Quest for the Primitive Church*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988.

Hughes, Richard T. *The Primitive Church in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995.

Leonard, Bill J., ed. *Christianity in Appalachia*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999.

Mathes, James M. *Works of Elder B.W. Stone*. Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, Keys and Co., 1859.

Richardson, Robert. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1869.

Richey, Russell, Kenneth E. Rowe, and Jean Miller Schmidt, eds. *Perspectives on American Methodism*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993.

Stevenson, Dwight E. *Disciple Preaching in the First Generation*. Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1969.

Stone, Barton W. *An Address to the Churches*. [text on-line] Lexington: I.T. Cavins and Co., 1821, accessed January 14, 2001; available from http://www.mun.ca/rels/restmov/texts/bstone/ST_MENU1.HTM, Internet.

Synan, Vinson. *The Century of the Holy Spirit*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001.

Thompson, Rhodes. *Voices from Cane Ridge*. Kentucky: Cane Ridge Preservation Project, 1954.

Ware, Steven Lee. "Restoring the New Testament Church." Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1998.

Wesleyan-Holiness Study Center of Asbury Theological Seminary. *Methodism and the Fragmentation of American Protestantism*. Kentucky: Wesleyan-Holiness Study Center, 1995.

West, William Garrett. *Barton Warren Stone*. Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1954.

Williams, Newell. *Barton W. Stone: A Spiritual Biography*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000.

NOTES

¹ It is important here to note ongoing difficulties concerning the proper

terminology to use regarding religious emotion. I am speaking of religious excitement, often called enthusiasm in the nineteenth century. However, *enthusiasm* was a pejorative term in the nineteenth century and so is problematic, as I do not wish to cast this type of religiosity in a negative light. Other terms are no less problematic. "Religious excitement" can include phenomena I am not focused upon, such as deep trances. "Religious emotion" is equally ambiguous, as one can be religiously emotional without being demonstrative or excited physically. For the purposes of this essay, I will use the term "religious emotion" to refer to the type of excitement or "enthusiasm" seen and experienced at the Cane Ridge revival and in other revivalistic communities such as Pentecostalism.

² Steven Lee Ware, "Restoring the New Testament Church" (Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1998), 33-34.

³ Wesleyan-Holiness Study Center of Asbury Theological Seminary, *Methodism and the Fragmentation of American Protestantism* (Kentucky: Wesleyan-Holiness Study Center, 1995), 4-5.

⁴ Russell Richey, Kenneth E. Rowe, Jean Miller Schmidt, eds., *Perspectives on American Methodism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 293.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 290-291.

⁶ Ware, "Restoring the New Testament Church," 35.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁸ Bill J. Leonard, ed., *Christianity in Appalachia*, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press), 230.

⁹ Richey, Rowe, Schmidt, eds., *Perspectives on American Methodism*, 289.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 294.

¹¹ Vinson Synan, *The Century of the Holy Spirit* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 98.

¹² Ware, "Restoring the New Testament Church," 120.

¹³ Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1869), 616.

¹⁴ Alexander Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger* 1, no.7 (July 5, 1830): 334.

¹⁵ Dwight E. Stevenson, *Disciple Preaching in the First Generation* (Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1969), 76-77.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 74.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 75.

¹⁸ Paul K. Conkin, *American Originals* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 9.

¹⁹ Rhodes Thompson, *Voices From Cane Ridge* (Kentucky: Cane Ridge Preservation Project, 1954), 39.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 41.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 63.

²² Barton W. Stone, *An Address to the Churches* [text on-line] (Lexington: I.T. Cavins and Co., 1821, accessed January 14, 2001); available from http://www.mun.ca/rels/restmov/texts/bstone/ST_MENU1.HTM, Internet.

²³ Paul Conkin asserted in his book *American Originals*, "Stone never denied, as did Alexander Campbell, the active role of the Spirit in bringing sinners to repentance; everything he observed in the revivals attested to this." If by this

Conkin meant Stone believed the Spirit worked independently of the Word this is incorrect, as shown here by Stone's own writing.

²⁴ William Garrett West, *Barton Warren Stone*, (Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1954), 41.

²⁵ Thompson, *Voices from Cane Ridge*, 64.

²⁶ James M. Mathes, *Works of Elder B.W. Stone*, (Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, Keys and Co., 1859), 153.

²⁷ Newell Williams, *Barton W. Stone: A Spiritual Biography* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000), 63.

²⁸ Hoke S. Dickinson, *The Cane Ridge Reader* (Kentucky: Cane Ridge Preservation Project, 1972) 35.

²⁹ Thompson, *Voices From Cane Ridge*, 65.

³⁰ Dickinson, *Cane Ridge Reader*, 64.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 383.

³² Colby D. Hall, *The New Light Christians* (Ft. Worth: Stafford-Lowden Co., 1959), 94.

³³ For extensive research and work into the shared restorationist/primitivist orientation of Pentecostals and the Restoration Christian Churches, see Richard T. Hughes, editor, *The Primitive Church in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995) and Richard T. Hughes, ed., *The American Quest for the Primitive Church* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988).

³⁴ Synan, *The Century of the Holy Spirit*, 34.

³⁵ Ware, "Restoring the New Testament Church," 183.

³⁶ David Edwin Harrell Jr., *All Things Are Possible*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975), 100.

³⁷ Hughes, ed., *The American Quest for the Primitive Church*, 204.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 205

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 243.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 243; 240.

⁴¹ Hughes, *The Primitive Church in the Modern World*, 143-144.

⁴² J.H. Garrison, *The Holy Spirit* (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1905), 155.

⁴³ Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International, *The Gifts of the Holy Spirit Among Disciples of Christ Today* (Los Angeles: Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International, 1974), 14-15.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 17.

Kirkpatrick Historians' Seminar

*(Meeting in conjunction with the
American Society of Church History)*

May 8-10, 2003
Louisville, Kentucky

Separation and Reunion in the Stone-Campbell Movement

1. "The Separation of the Springfield Presbytery from the Synod of Kentucky"
D. Newell Williams, Christian Theological Seminary
2. "The Separation of the Campbells from the Baptists"
Jesse Fletcher, Hardin Simmons University
3. "Stone-Campbell Reunion Dialogues"
Douglas Foster, Abilene Christian University
4. "Stone-Campbell Christians and COCU/CUIC"
Nadia Lahutsky, Texas Christian University

For further information contact:

Disciples of Christ Historical Society
1101 19th Ave. S.
Nashville, TN 37212
e-mail: mail@dishistsoc.org

(Fees for the 2003 seminar have been waived; a meal function is being planned, charges to be determined)

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Order of the Stone-Campbell Fellowship

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society has been blessed through the years with gifts from estates. Some have come unsolicited; others have been planned in advance with leadership of the Society. These gifts have measurably strengthened the ministry of the Society. Through the Order of the Stone-Campbell Fellowship the Society can recognize these intended gifts and express appreciation to those planning the gifts.

Such a fellowship expresses confidence in the future of the Society

Members of the Fellowship are persons who have a hope and a dream for the future of the Society as it continues to serve individuals and the church. They have named the Historical Society in their Will, established a charitable gift Annuity or Trust, made a gift of life insurance, or given their home or personal property while retaining lifetime use of the property. Some of these provisions were made early in the days of the Society's 50 year history while others were made in recent months. Each is a testimony to a life of stewardship and an expression of faith in the purpose and mission of the Historical Society.

The fellowship is named for two of the earliest Church leaders

Barton Warren Stone was the first of the major leaders to appear on the scene in 19th century America. Soon thereafter Alexander Campbell's voice was heard. From the followers of these men a church was born which continues to spread the gospel. The history of that movement housed in the Thomas W. Phillips Memorial is a legacy of their early faith and witness. Their gifts live on in the life of the church and the Disciples of Christ Historical Society.

THE HISTORY OF THE

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

DISCIPLIANA

The Quarterly Historical Journal of the
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

**MILLENNIAL THEMES IN THE
RESTORATION MOVEMENT:
CIVIL WAR TO 1900**

James Stephen Wolfgang

**MISSION AS LIBERATING SPIRIT:
DISCIPLES AND PENTECOSTALS IN
VENEZUELA**

Carmelo Alvarez



Volume 62 • Number 4 • Winter, 2002

Published by DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Peter M. Morgan, President (mail@dishistsoc.org)

Founding Editor Claude E. Spencer

Editorial Committee D. Newell Williams, Editor (nwilliams@cts.edu)
Douglas A. Foster
Loretta Long
Henry E. Webb
Karen-Marie Yust
Richard J. Cherok

Editorial Consultants Carisse Berryhill Paul M. Blowers
James O. Duke Richard T. Hughes
David A. Jones Erma Jean Loveland
Mark G. Toulouse Daisy L. Machado

Board of Trustees Officers Chairperson James R. Reed
Vice-Chairperson Gordon B. Dalrymple
Secretary Zola Walker
Treasurer Robert H. Edwards

DISCIPLIANA (USPS 995-060) is published quarterly for \$20.00 per year by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society which was established in 1941 "to maintain and further interest in religious heritage, backgrounds, origins, development, and general history of Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, Churches of Christ and related groups." Members of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society receive *DISCIPLIANA* quarterly, along with other benefits. Annual membership categories are: Sustaining - \$50 to \$249, Participating - \$30, Regular - \$20, Students - \$10.00, Non-U.S. - \$25. Life Memberships are: Life - \$250, Life Link - \$500, Life Patron - \$1,000.

Contributors to *DISCIPLIANA* should submit manuscripts on 3.5 floppy disk in Wordperfect 5.1 or "text" format. Electronic manuscript submission via "text only" formatted e-mail or attached file accepted at dishistsoc@aol.com. Postal mail should be addressed to: *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 Nineteenth Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196.

Phone: (615) 327-1444. Fax: (615) 327-1445. E-mail: mail@dishistsoc.org
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society Home Page: www.dishistsoc.org
Periodical postage paid at Nashville, TN.

Copyright 1997. Disciples of Christ Historical Society
Indexed by Restoration Serials Index
ISSN 0732-9881

Indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals, the Index to Book Reviews in Religion, Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975- on CD-ROM, and the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606, E-mail: atla@atla.com, WWW: http://www.atla.com/

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 - 19th Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196. Please give both old and new addresses and attach a mailing label from an old issue. USA: Please provide nine-digit code (ZIP+4).

—From the Editor's Desk

Millennialism was a driving force in antebellum American Christianity. Building on the hopes of eighteenth century American Christians, Barton Stone and others saw in the Great Revival of the early nineteenth century evidence of the near approach of Christ's reign on earth. The *Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell's name for the journal that he initiated in 1830, reflected the optimism characteristic of antebellum American Protestants. In "Millennial Themes in the Restoration Movement: Civil War to 1900," James Stephen Wolfgang challenges the accepted view of Stone-Campbell historiography that most vestiges of millennial thinking in the Movement were obliterated by the carnage of the Civil War and the turmoil of Reconstruction. On the contrary, Wolfgang finds evidence of continuing interest in millennialism in the period up to 1900 across a broad spectrum of the Stone-Campbell Movement.

The fastest growing movement in twentieth century Christianity was Pentecostalism, which saw in the gift of tongues evidence of the imminent Second Coming of Christ to establish his earthly reign. As an expression of its commitment to the unity of the church, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) has nurtured relations with Pentecostal denominations. In "Mission As Liberating Spirit: Disciples and Pentecostals in Venezuela," Carmelo Alvarez tells the story of the relationship of the Disciples to the Evangelical Pentecostal Union of Venezuela.

As Christian unity has been critical to Stone-Campbell views of God's future (pre, post, a-millennial and otherwise!), these articles, especially when read together, may well encourage reflection on the contemporary calling of the Stone-Campbell Movement in relation to God's future. Both articles were initially presented to the Society's Kirkpatrick Seminar for Historians of the Stone-Campbell Movement.

— D. Newell Williams

— From the President's Desk

The Historical Society is on the threshold of historic advances in our service to researchers. That progress is being led by our Director of Library and Archives, Sara Harwell. She shares an update.

— Peter M. Morgan

The Library and Archives of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society has long served its mission of preserving and making available to researchers the many books, periodicals, and documents housed in the Thomas W. Phillips Memorial in Nashville. The library staff has fulfilled this mission admirably using the traditional methods of cataloging, arranging, and placing materials on the shelves to await potential users.

We now live in a new era, the Information Age, primarily brought to us by the Internet, specifically the World Wide Web. The imperatives of this new and exciting, if unsettling, age demand that we look at our traditional library methods and distinguish between those that are still of value and those that have outlived their usefulness. We who provide information to facilitate scholarship recognize that the world of scholarly research has become increasingly inter- and multi-disciplinary and less concerned with whether the information sought is in books, periodicals, pamphlets, documents, photographs, videotapes, or computer files. The best methods of describing and establishing intellectual control of all collections must be developed to the point where information is accessible to users without regard to the particular physical form that information might take. In addition, information about library and archival collections must be made available over the Internet.

Steps are presently being taken to make these goals a reality. Our library catalog, containing records of books and pamphlets, was brought online in May, and is now available over the Internet at voyager.dishistsoc.org. And we are now implementing a system to place guides and indexes to archival collections on the Internet. The online library catalog and the archives descriptive system are designed to work together so that users need only perform one search to obtain information about all items in our library and archives collections. Once we get a "critical mass" of information *about* our collections online, we plan to begin digitizing the collections themselves to be available over the Internet.

Our ultimate goal is to offer all resources to researchers from a single access point on the Internet, integrating descriptions of all our collections, regardless of location or physical format. More users will find our collections, and they will find them easier to use. Users can then be assured they are obtaining access to all the information on any given subject that the Historical Society has to offer.

Sara Harwell
Director of Library and Archives

MILLENNIAL THEMES IN THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT Civil War to 1900

James Stephen Wolfgang*

The historiography of the American Restoration Movement reveals two diametrically opposite extremes regarding the role of millennial thought and themes in the post-Civil War era. One extreme seems to find millennialism, particularly of a premillennial variety, nearly “on every high hill and under every green tree.” Perhaps the best-known instance of this pole is E.L. Jorgenson’s *Faith of Our Fathers* – an attempt by a leader of the 20th century premillennial movement among Churches of Christ to locate Restoration notables including Barton Stone to John W. McGarvey, Daniel Sommer and others under a premillennial banner.¹ Such an attempt is reminiscent of similar efforts in the broader premillennial movement of American Protestantism. Timothy Weber’s *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming*, for instance, recounts a list in the *Christian Workers Magazine*, published by Moody Bible Institute in Chicago, enumerating 245 premillennial leaders – including such well-known premillennialists as Martin Luther, John Calvin, Philip Melancthon, John Knox, Richard Baxter, and John and Charles Wesley. When challenged and later forced to recant, the editors acknowledged that some on the list were “not premillennialists in any sense whatever,” but they had felt justified in including them “because they were not *postmillennialists*.”²

An opposite pole in American restorationism acknowledges the strong strain of postmillennial thought in many antebellum Restoration leaders, but holds that most if not all vestiges of millennial thinking were obliterated by the carnage of the Civil War and the turmoil of Reconstruction. As what had been intended as the marriage supper of the Lamb became the “Great Barbecue” of the Gilded Age, any anticipation that the amelioration of the social system would usher in God’s kingdom had long since, it seemed, perished on the altar of Mars. This concept has perhaps become one of the few orthodoxies agreed upon by the most liberal “modernists” of the Disciples and the “anti’s” of the opposite extreme among Churches of Christ. A.T. DeGroot, for example, citing Ronald E. Osborn, argues that Disciples “should not expect to find the pages of their history crowded with discussions of the strange but recently popularized theme of ‘last things.’”³

On the other end of the restorationist spectrum, David E. Harrell’s study of 19th-century Disciple thought stipulates that while “not one first-generation leader of the church ignored the apocalyptic portions of the Scriptures and some of them were almost totally preoccupied with discussing prophetic passages,” the situation changed radically with “the rise of second-generation leaders who had not shared in the enthusiasm of the sect’s youth and who were openly disinterested in millennialist speculation.” Specifically, Harrell also identified Isaac Errett and David Lipscomb as “persistently unwilling to discuss the subject” of millennialism.⁴

*James Stephen Wolfgang teaches history at the University of Kentucky and continues his twenty-year preaching ministry at the Lexington Avenue Church of Christ in Danville, Kentucky.

If indeed it were true that Restorationists said nothing regarding millennial themes during the last third of the 19th century, that fact itself would be worth reporting and analyzing. But is it not possible that we have here simply another example of an accepted verity of Restoration history, such as “Disciples did not divide over the Civil War,” or “Churches of Christ had no contact with Fundamentalism”⁵ – accepted truths which may comfort some but which do not survive closer scrutiny? It is my intention that this paper will help to situate this discussion relative to the historiography of millennialism, and serve as a down payment on a fruitful but relatively unexplored area of thought in the 19th-century Stone-Campbell movement

The Course of Millennial Thought

It is quite true that many of the leaders or “editor bishops” of the Restoration commented on millennial themes only sporadically following the Civil War. Others, however, were quite ready and willing to advance the discussion of eschatology. In October, 1864, Moses E. Lard opened the second volume of his *Quarterly* with a long, front-page article, “A Theory of the Millennium.”⁶ Not content with that installment, he featured in the next issue a ten-page, detailed review of Moses Stuart’s commentary on Revelation. When Edward E. Orvis responded to Lard’s original article, an exchange ensued between Lard and Orvis, coupled with another article, “Thy Kingdom Come,” by David Walk – material covering nearly 100 pages in toto.⁷ In his own words Lard’s theory was that

Just before the millennium, then, all the wicked dead will die, and die instantly . . . The millennium will commence in the precise instant in which Satan is bound and locked up in prison. The battle in which the wicked die, will end. Immediately thereafter, Satan will be seized, and bound for a thousand years . . . a period of a thousand years precisely. It will not consist of an indefinite number of years, or merely a long time; but of a thousand years, neither more or less . . . Of the events which are further to characterize its commencement we shall now speak more particularly.

1. All the living saints will be changed . . . It will consist in putting off these mortal bodies, and in putting on these glorious spiritual bodies which await the finally faithful 2. The sleeping saints will all be raised . . . I not only believe that all the saints who are alive at the coming of Christ will then be changed, but also that all who sleep, not one excepted, will then be raised and also changed. 3. The actual personal and literal reappearance of the Savior. We confidently expect this event to take place in the commencement moment of the millennium.

Having elucidated his data from the Scripture, Lard proceeded: “Certain of the disciples are represented as being alive, as remaining to the coming of the Lord; then the dead arise, the living are changed, and all are caught up together with the Lord in the air.” He then arrived at this conclusion: “This does not sound like anything else than a strictly literal detail of facts. Accordingly, I cannot look upon it in any other light. I hence conclude that Christ will literally come in person at the commencement of the millennium, and literally remain here on earth during the entire thousand years.” Futhermore, at the end of this millennium,

Satan is to be loosed for a little season. . . He will again go out to his ancient work of deceiving the nations, and stirring up war. . . There are to be two great battles in the future . . . The first occurs just before the millennium commences. In this only a part of the wicked will be present — those alive at the time. The second happens at the end of the millennium. In this every wicked human being of earth

will be present. Not one will be absent. . . Fire comes down from heaven, from God, and devours them . . . Earth's last battle has now been fought, and its strife brought to a close. . . .

Two more points yet merit notice: 1. The second death. This, as will be readily perceived, is not a literal death. It consists in casting away the wicked, after judgment, into the lake of fire and brimstone. . . 2. The baptism in fire. . . Now we request the reader to place himself on the margin of that lake of fire just after the judgment. Watch the countless thousands of the wicked as they approach its brink, and fling themselves into it. If this be not the baptism in fire, then we are ready to admit that we cannot even imagine what it is.

Possibly foreshadowing his controversial work on the nature of eternal punishment published just before his death,⁸ Lard anticipated a possible objection to this last point: "It may be objected, that this takes too literal a view of the subject, that, in other words, it unjustifiably materializes the punishment of the wicked. In reply to this we have nothing to say, except that we distrust those exegetes which convert such language as we are now considering into mere figures of speech or rhetorical flourishes." Finally, Lard describes the "new heavens and new earth:"

We are brought..to the point where the new heavens and the new earth come into view...It appears, then, that no change will take place in the earth at the commencement of the millennium; nor any at its end, until the last great battle is fought, and the judgment ended, and the wicked cast away...This, therefore, seems a fitting time to renew both earth and heaven. Where the saints shall be during this event we cannot say. Caught up, it may be, to meet the Lord in the air, as he now descends from the throne of judgment, to dwell with his people forever...the old earth, like the old body, must be changed, and the last stain of sin be blotted out forever. . . the earth will be wrapped in a sheet of flame; and in an instant more, all will pass away. The new earth now lies beneath . . . decked in light and loveliness such as the unfallen only know.

Emphasizing his conclusion about the nature of Christ's earthly reign, Lard closed insistently, "And now to this earth, thus refitted up, the saints return to dwell forever and ever. This is to be their eternal home, their everlasting habitation . . . The notion, so very prevalent, that the Christian's future home lies far away in some immeasurably distant region, is only a vulgar error. No foundation whatever exists for it. God built this earth for man, and he does not intend to be defeated in his purpose. . . The earth in its renewed form will be man's everlasting dwelling-place. On it will stand the New Jerusalem, the true city of the Great King, and the home of God's ransomed children."⁹

Lard's theorizing did not go unchallenged. Upbraiding him for teaching a mere "theory," Edward E. Orvis, a lawyer who also preached for churches in Pennsylvania and Kentucky, responded: "Now, whence comes this idea of renewing the earth, of refitting it up, and of the saints returning to it? Surely not from the Bible. It contains no intimation of any such events. . . There is not the slightest intimation that the new earth will merely be the old one renewed – 'refitted up.'" Regarding the millennium itself, Orvis affirmed the following propositions: "1. That the Bible says nothing concerning the millennium, in the current acceptance of that term. The word is not used in the Bible, nor is the idea ordinarily associated with the word contained in that book. 2. That the Bible leaves no space – no room, so to speak – for a thousand years of sinless, painless, bliss on this earth, between the present time and the final dissolution of the earth, the consignment of the wicked into eternal perdition, and the

entrance of the saints upon their endless life of bliss in heaven.” Having reviewed Lard’s theory, Orvis offered his own, seemingly “amillennial,” theory, stated largely in literal, Biblical quotations:

1. That Christ will actually and really return . . . to this earth. 2. That from the present time until Christ comes again, the moral and religious condition of the world will be much the same as it now is. . . 3. That when Christ comes the righteous dead will all be raised. 4. That when Christ comes the righteous living will all be changed. 5. That when Christ comes the wicked dead will also be raised. 6. That when Christ comes all men – the quick and the dead, the saint and the sinner – will stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and be judged according to the works done in the body. 7. That at the coming of Christ, the wicked will go away into eternal punishment – be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. 8. That at the coming of Christ he will receive his saints unto himself in heaven, that where he is, there they may be also. 9. That at the coming of Christ the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.¹⁰

Tolbert Fanning also seemed ready for a re-evaluation of the millennium in an 1866 article on “The Coming of the Lord.” Fanning, one of the founders of the *Gospel Advocate* and president of Franklin College which produced a generation of southern preachers, summarized his thinking regarding the kingdom of prophecy thus:

Our reading has lead us to the conclusion that . . . Christ has a spiritual Church; that it is at war with the powers of the earth; that the subjects of Christ’s kingdom will really subjugate, overcome, and put down, by the Gospel of peace, all of Satan’s subjects that can be saved; and afterwards the Lord will reign with the people a thousand years. At the end of the thousand years Satan is to be loosed for a little season, just long enough to collect his forces around the Saints, when the Lord will send down fire to destroy the King’s enemies, the judgment will take place, the righteous will be saved, the wicked damned, and God’s government will be approved.¹¹

While described by his biographer as “the most lucid of Fanning’s statements regarding prophecy,” it is also true that “his eschatology was very general, lacking the minute details of depth study” and characterized by “the reluctance of exploration” rather than the “attitude of conviction which emerges from thorough investigation.”¹² Still, only a few months after his original article, Fanning felt compelled to clarify his views about “the speculation of all second Adventists, who look for the Savior to restore fleshly Israel to Palestine,” which, to Fanning, “not only carnalizes the Christian religion, but really denies that the Lord has a spiritual empire on the earth, and what is promised is not a spiritual institution, but a bloody one, little, if any better than the old Jewish yoke.”¹³

The persistent myth of the disappearance of restorationist millennial thought is the more puzzling given the attention paid it in a pair of popular published works by Robert Milligan, President of Kentucky University. His frequently reprinted 1868 book, *The Scheme of Redemption*, has been used by generations of restoration preachers of all varieties, appearing in more than a dozen editions and still in print at the dawn of the twenty-first century. In an entire section of the book devoted to the “Fortunes and Destiny of the Church,” Milligan provided a detailed description of his version of things to come.¹⁴ Milligan’s *Commentary on Hebrews*, published in 1875, also addressed various millennial themes which would become items of dispute for later generations. When the Gospel Advocate Company reprinted the volume in 1946, E.L

Jorgenson was quick to enlist some of Milligan's comments on Hebrews 2:5-8 as support for the aspects of premillennial theory, arguing that God intended the re-establishment of man's rule over the earth as an expression of God's dominion.¹⁶ The *Gospel Advocate*, however, was unlikely to publish any volume which would give unqualified endorsement to premillennial theory, and Jorgenson seems to have skipped over other comments to which Milligan specifically refers readers, e.g., at Hebrews 1:6.¹⁵

In any event, Milligan was careful to distance himself from "second Adventists." Describing the "peculiar tenets" of the theory that "at the beginning of the millennium Christ will descend from Heaven and reign personally on Earth for a period of one thousand literal years" when the righteous dead will be "raised in immortal bodies, and assist Christ in the government of the world during the Millennium," Milligan seems to have found particularly objectionable the feature of premillennial theory which held "that at the beginning of this period the world will be subdued, not by the moral power of the Gospel, but by the personal presence and reign of Christ."¹⁶

A reading of Restorationist journals during Reconstruction also reveals that an optimistic postmillennialism had not necessarily perished in the Apocalypse of the Civil War. In 1873, Dallas M. Brown, describing "The Millennium" for readers of the *Christian Record*, noted that "We are taught in the Bible to look for the dawning of a bright epoch in the history of our world . . . the Millennium, or age of peace." Observing that "the truth is steadily progressing" and that "people are being so educated as to refuse the various dogmas of the land, unless they are taught in the Bible," the perception that "Pedo-baptism has but few advocates today, whereas it once had many" was of particular significance to Brown, who inquired further:

But what are the signs if any, of the dawning of the millennium? Christianity is now exerting an influence among the nations of the earth such as it never has in all the history of the past. . . Every revolution that sweeps over any of the nations of Europe makes a step toward religious liberty. . . we also behold a mighty change in the land where the Crescent wields its power — the kingdom of Turkey. . . now the gospel may be proclaimed even there.

Furthermore, "the Atlantic has been cabled, and thereby three thousand miles has been reduced to talking distance. Another great power in harmonizing the nations is our system of diplomacy." Most significantly, "all this is the work of Christianity." Consequently, Brown concluded that "the time is not far distant when the mild beams of the Sun of Righteousness will have such an influence as to drive war from our land, and plant in its stead the sweet olive of peace."¹⁷

But the premillennial version of prophetic themes was without doubt becoming dominant on both sides of the Atlantic following the Civil War. In the very first volume of the new journal, the *Christian Standard*, Isaac Errett published a letter from G. Greenwell of Liverpool, England, reporting "great agitation and discussions on the Second Coming of the Lord." Noting that "all prophetic expositors, though differing much in data and in points of departure, and schemes of exegesis and calculation, yet reach the conclusion that we are close to the opening of some sublime age — either the glorious appearing of the son of God, or some Golden Age to be inaugurated in another manner." Endorsing such conclusions, Greenwell observed that "Some by critical inquiry,

some by spiritual instinct, and others by observing the signs of the times, moral and political, have reached the conclusion that we are living in the last days. It is an immense conclusion, and I think it is a sound one."¹⁸

The prophecy speculations had not escaped the attention of editor Errett, who noted that, as in England, "in our country there is a widespread and growing interest in the study of prophecy, as is evident from the number of books and pamphlets constantly issuing from the press" – books in which "the prevalent tendency at present is to what is called Chiliasm — the premillennial advent of the Messiah and his personal reign of a thousand years on the earth." Alerting his American readers to the "great diversity of opinion as to the nature of the events to transpire" and alarmed at such "perplexing and unprofitable" speculations, Errett forcefully expressed his dismay at the "proneness to extremes" of the "numerous ingenious attempts to force peculiar interpretations" and the "pernicious results of much of the literalistic and dogmatical interpretation now so fashionable." Still, Errett was equally dismayed by the opposite extreme of neglecting the study of Biblical prophecies: "Nor are we prejudiced against the study of prophecy although we think it may be exalted into undue importance." Urging his subscribers to avoid the opposite extreme – "the sin of a large portion of the ministry and the church . . . the unbelief which ignores the second advent of the Messiah" – Errett launched into his own discussion of prophetic interpretation in three articles under his editorial byline.¹⁹

Befitting his often moderate role (in which role he frequently seems to have frustrated his more enthusiastic brethren on either side of numerous issues), Errett urged readers to adopt a *via media*, avoiding "one extreme [which] quenches the inspiration of the 'one hope' so dear to the apostolic church" and "another extreme—that of exalting this theme into the place of the Gospel . . . burdening the divine promise of the Savior's return with such a medley of sensuous, dogmatic, and absurd literalisms, as to bring the theme itself into contempt." But Errett's greater disdain for prophecy-mongers whose absurd conclusions discredited legitimate prophetic study was transparent:

Every variety of extravagant conception is gravely put forth as the certain teaching of the Scripture. . . . The second chapter of Daniel refers to the United States! Louis Napoleon is the Man of Sin! The Battle of Armageddon is to be fought in the Mississippi Valley! Preachers go into the pulpits with their pockets filled with *Tribunes* and *Heralds* . . . and demonstrate that the "little horn" that symbolizes Louis Napoleon is at least one eighth of an inch longer than it was at the last lecture. . . . An earthquake, the rising of an island out of the sea, a rumor of war, a commercial panic, or a bit of gossip about what Napoleon said is a god-send to these interpreters.

Such "incurable pruriency for the marvelous, the supernatural, and the sensuous," in Errett's view, "links itself with materialism, and . . . not the least among its disastrous workings, is the contempt into which it brings the study of prophecy, and the hope of the second advent of the Messiah."²⁰

For Errett, this consequence was a tragedy of tremendous magnitude, since while prophecy "was never a leading theme in the preaching of the Gospel" it was nonetheless "a theme of great power, not only to comfort the sorrowing, but to invigorate the faith of the toiling Christian." To neglect the expectation of the Lord's return could seriously hamper the attempts of modern

Christians to restore the features of the early church.²⁴

Orthodox Russia, Islamic Turkey, and Biblical Prophecy

Postmillennialism thus seemed to wane somewhat, losing its explanatory power for many Christians confronted by a bewildering series of world events and the changing religious and cultural landscape of American society. Without doubt, sensational premillennial claims to be able to explain these events became more attractive for some Christians. By the close of Reconstruction, at least two events in particular called the attention of many Christians and Disciples to consideration of Biblical teaching about the kingdom of God in the light of world events. The first of these was the Russo-Turkish war of the late 1870s which brought to the attention of nineteenth-century Americans Balkan place names still familiar to us at the dawn of the twenty-first century – Bosnia, Serbia, Pristina, and a host of other battle-scarred locations, featured not only in the daily newspapers of America, but on the front page of at least two issues of the 1877 *Christian Standard* as well.

Russia had long been a staple of millennial writers even before the time of the Millerite excitement of the 1840s – but normally as an enemy of God’s people, rather than an ally. At least from the time of Wilhelm Gesenius (1786-1842), a German Hebraicist at the University of Halle, many Bible students had identified the “Rosh” of Ezekiel 38 as “Russia.” Indeed, Gesenius, whose 1828 Hebrew-Chaldee lexicon became a standard reference work, went so far as to identify “Meschek” in the same chapter with Moscow – and “Tubal” with the Siberian city, “Tobolsk.”²²

The Ottoman Turks, on the other hand, had an even longer career as the anti-Christ, dating from at least the sixteenth century, when Luther identified them as Gog of Ezekiel 38 in the 1530 edition of his German Bible – as did a variety of Roman Catholic commentators. Indeed, “the Islamic Turks had long been regarded as an antichristian power throughout the European world, and had been viewed as such in earlier English and American works of prophetic interpretation,” becoming by the late eighteenth century “a major theme in American millennial literature.”²³

These events, and their religious implications, did not escape the attention of American Christians. Isaac Errett himself may not have had much to say regarding millennial thought, but he was quite willing to prominently publish commentary by those who did. Responding to these world events with a series of eight articles on “Turkey in Biblical Prophecy” – replete with at least two large maps of the Balkans, covering half or more of the front page of two issues of the *Christian Standard* – was a prominent Ohio Disciple, Amos S. Hayden.²⁴

Explaining how to interpret “Turkey in the Light of Prophecy,” Hayden argued what was, to him, self-evident from passages such as Daniel 8 and Revelation 9: “The sanctuary being the church, . . . the Prince of the host is none other than Jesus Christ . . . the ‘horn,’ Islamism, the religion of Mohammed, has a host of warriors given him against the saints, the followers of Jesus.” Having identified the cast of characters, Hayden described the plot of the drama for his readers:

By the Mohammedan power, the place of the sanctuary, the whole territory of

the primitive church of Christ, was invaded, overrun with fire and sword in the hands of the 'locusts,' the armies of war . . . They have literally 'trodden down' the place of the sanctuary, the lands of the Christian Church. And they have held all these lands in vassalage to the Moslem rule from the time the Apocalyptic locusts began their ravages to the present hour.

For Hayden, such events were a transparently clear consummation of Biblical prophecies. "And who does not see," he inquired, "in the complete and overwhelming overthrow of the Christian religion, effected by the Califs of that new and vigorous imposture, the exact fulfillment of the prophecy before us in the eighth chapter of Daniel, and the ninth chapter of the Revelation?" Hayden drew from this understanding of prophecy a stirring conclusion: "What a wonderful and convincing demonstration the prophecy affords of the truth of the Bible."²⁵

Equally obvious to Hayden were the causes of the temporary triumph of Islam. "The Christianity invaded by Mohammedanism was not the pure and white-robed religion that triumphed over idolatry in the days of the Roman Augustus" — indeed, the degradation of Christianity was self-inflicted, since corruption grew up in the church. She lost her first love. Dogmatics took the place of the truth . . . ambition and pride and avarice filled the high places of the church . . . Heresy, fanaticism, and division prevailed. Monasticism was introduced, and spread rapidly. The worship of images, prayers for the dead . . . and innumerable other departures from the faith were accepted. . . .

The outcome had to be obvious for anyone with eyes to see and ears to hear: "The culmination of this state of defection was the fully developed 'man of sin,' with Rome as the seat and center of it, and the overthrow of the churches of the East by the victorious arms of the Arabian prophet."²⁶

While not devoting as much space to the Russo-Turkish War as the Standard, even Lipscomb's *Gospel Advocate* informed readers with this analysis of the "Religious Phases of the War" from the *New York Observer*:

What shall be the effect of the war upon the religious condition of the East is a question of deep interest, but one to which the Christian faith alone supplies an answer. Its immediate effect upon the Christian missions will undoubtedly be disastrous, and on that account, as on many others, it is to be deplored. . . . But it is the same God that rules over the governments and nations of the earth, and over the Church of Christ in all its interests, and it is easy for him to overrule the commotions and changes that are made by war, for the furtherance of his cause . . .²⁷

The Prophetic Conference of 1878

A second event, occurring in America the following year, had perhaps even more far-reaching implications for the shape of things to come with respect to how American Christians would think about millennialism well into the next century. The Prophetic Conference of November 1878 was the first of a series of such events to occur over the next forty years, and would galvanize premillennial believers into one of what Ernest Sandeen described as the "Roots of Fundamentalism."²⁸

Taking note of the Prophetic Conference, an unidentified editorial in the *Christian* observed that, "It is evident that the idea of the pre-Millennial reign of Christ is gaining ground within the past few years. It has for its advocates now a large number of talented men who could not be classed as fanatics."²⁹ Furthermore, many of the advocates responsible for the Prophecy Conference had taken pains to remove some of the more odious aspects of

millennial theorizing.

It was no part of the effort of the late Prophetic Conference to ascertain the day or the year of Christ's second coming. Several of the essayists not only disclaimed any knowledge of the time of His appearing, but also the idea that such knowledge was possible to mortals. It is not Millerism, they claim, coming to life again.

And while frank to say that "the arguments offered to support this denial [that Christ had not established his kingdom on earth] are far from convincing to us," the unidentified editor was clearly ready to abandon any allegiance to a post-millennial understanding of Biblical prophecy: "The point seems to us well made, and the arguments against the idea of the conversion of the entire world prior to the second coming of Christ seem to us unanswerable." While cautious about some of the excesses of premillennial teaching, the author could also see advantages to emphasizing the prayerful watchfulness characteristic of many premillennial advocates:

It cannot be denied that some have allowed themselves to be so completely absorbed in contemplating the "rapture" of the saints at Christ's coming, as to be unfit for the sober duties of life. But it is equally evident that the great body of Christian people, today, are far too careless and unconcerned about the glorious appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.³⁰

Two weeks later, after the conference had concluded, J.W. Mountjoy gave his enthusiastic if not unqualified endorsement of the enterprise. Declaring that he had "read with pleasure the utterances of faith and hope from these eminent teachers in Israel," Mountjoy commended the "well-prepared addresses in regard to the second coming of Christ." In his view, they presented "the teaching of the Bible on that subject," as expressed in one of the "fundamental propositions" of the Conference, namely:

The Scriptures nowhere teach that the whole world will be converted to God, or that there will be a reign of universal righteousness and peace before the return of our blessed Lord, but that only at and by his coming in power and glory will the prophecies concerning the progress of evil and the development of anti-Christ, the times of the Gentiles and the ingathering of Israel, the resurrection of the dead in Christ and the transfiguration of his living saints receive its fulfilment and the period of millennial blessedness its inauguration.³¹

But the Conference was focused not only on discrediting the seemingly threadbare postmillennial theory. Attempting to address a common criticism of premillennialism, "Dr. Brookes, of St. Louis, offered the following resolution: that the doctrine of our Lord's premillennial advent, instead of paralyzing evangelistic and missionary efforts, is one of the mightiest incentives to earnestness in preaching the gospel to every creature 'till He comes.'" No doubt one of the strongest features, in the view of many Disciples, was the cooperative tone of the conference. Mountjoy noted that "it is pleasing and refreshing to observe the unanimity of sentiment and harmony of action of leading men of various Protestant parties in regard to one of the most prominent and fundamental elements of the doctrine of the Bible and the faith and hope of every Christian." Commending the proceedings for the reading pleasure of all Christians, he concluded by noting that "the *New York Tribune* has done a good service . . . by publishing an extra containing the addresses and proceedings of the conference . . . for fifteen cents."³²

Among the readers of the *Tribune* special was *Gospel Advocate* editor David Lipscomb, who advised his subscribers that "those feeling an interest in the subject will be repaid by a perusal of these addresses." Cautioning readers

that “the only danger in this question is of narrow-minds making it a hobby to disturb the peace of churches,” the future teacher of Robert H. Boll in the Nashville Bible School assessed the Conference thus:

The speeches, so far as we have read them, are in good spirit and do honor to the word of God. There is no hobbyism about it that we see. Christ's coming is taught as a part of God's revelation to man. It should be studied, taught, and cherished as a part of God's will to man. Whether his coming precedes or succeeds the conversion of the world to God we have not decided. We are glad to see that they distinctly disavow a belief in the ability of any man to know the time of the savior's appearing.³³

Thus, while refusing to be drawn into a denominational premillennial camp, or to be identified as a “premillennialist,” Lipscomb's neutral reaction to an early form of premillennial teaching make it easier to see how the thinking of full-blown premillennialists such as Robert H. Boll might flourish against such a backdrop. While Lipscomb and others on the *Gospel Advocate* staff certainly did not endorse many of the specific tenets of premillennial thought, they refused to be goaded into open condemnation of the developing theory, at least until the controversy became more acrimonious in the twentieth century.³⁴

However, as Lipscomb feared it might, the millennial controversy became more acrimonious as the twentieth century approached. As dogmatism and theory-driven advocacy of the church as a “parenthesis” in the Divine scheme of redemption (a proposition peculiarly unacceptable to many committed to restoring the New Testament church) became more strident, Lipscomb and others connected with the *Gospel Advocate* grew less enthused with such “hobbies.” Asked by a reader to comment on a list of millennial texts, Lipscomb replied, “We cannot write a commentary on the New Testament under the head of 'Queries, nor do we understand much about the millennium. . . . Practice the precepts and follow the example of the Savior, and this will do a thousandfold more to fully bring about the reign of Jesus on earth than a thousand discourses and theories about what the millennium is or when it begins or ends.” Asked in a second question about Daniel 8, the ‘little horn,’ the sanctuary and the 2300 days, Lipscomb replied, “I am not up on the interpretation of prophecy. Unless the Holy Spirit somewhere interprets it, I have but little confidence in any man's interpretation” – venturing only that “When Daniel spoke, the Jews were in captivity in Babylon, and these prophecies all found their fulfillment in the changes that took place in the kingdoms of Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece. The host and the sanctuary referred to the Temple at Jerusalem and its destruction.”³⁵

Another editor of the *Gospel Advocate*, E.G. Sewell, was equally disinclined to pursue prophecy speculation. Asked a series of questions about the thousand years, replied, “I know so little about the millennium that I do not feel inclined to attempt to answer this. It is an untaught question, and therefore no man's salvation depends upon an answer to it, and it would aid no man in his soul's salvation to know about it.” Indeed, in Sewell's view, “No matter what answer might be given to this question, it would be a very speculative opinion of the man giving it, and all such opinions in the whole world could not save one soul.”³⁶

Furthermore, for many members of Churches of Christ, the kingdom of God was identified with the church and established on Pentecost. This

identification of the kingdom with the church is reflected in several debates during the late 19th century, and is no doubt a major factor explaining why many members of Churches of Christ strongly rejected any millennial theory which separated the two or made the church simply a “parenthesis” or temporary forerunner to a future kingdom.³⁷

Conclusion

While this initial foray into the prickly thicket of late-nineteenth century millennialism is perhaps too frail to support the weight of dogmatic conclusions, a few tentative observations seem in order.

First, even a cursory reading of the literature dispels any misguided notion that Restoration thinkers immediately abandoned postmillennialism, or ignored other forms of eschatological discussion, in the years following the Civil War. Not only did postmillennial concepts cling to life well into the 1870s, but when postmillennialism became unable to explain developments in world events, or when some disciples adapted it to accommodate an increasing secularism, other restorationists from across the spectrum of fragmenting Disciple thought were willing to give premillennial theories a favorable look rather than abandon prophetic explanations altogether. It would be unwise to overstate the case, and attempt to portray the majority of postbellum Disciples and Christians as wild-eyed prophecy advocates, consumed with eschatological concepts. But neither is the equally improbable and unbalanced contention that they were almost entirely uninterested in prophetic themes, or oblivious to world events or the speculations which intrigued their religious neighbors, an accurate understanding of the situation among late-19th century restorationists.

Second, in such a fluid circumstance, it is impossible to impose on these nineteenth-century millennial thinkers the sort of clear-cut categories assigned by many twentieth-century millennialists. One cannot always find clear delineations between pre- and post-millennialists, and certainly subdivisions between staunchly dispensational pre- or mid- or post-tribulation advocates are absent during this period. As Paul Boyer has observed, “The welter of interpretive approaches, and their complex interactions, underscore the difficulty of charting a straightforward evolution of prophetic belief systems. One approach will flourish and then wane, to be replaced by another, or by an interval when prophecy interest recedes.”³⁸ It seems fair to state that the relatively undefined nature of various millennial conceptions, and the continued revision and recombination of the many features of multitudinous theoretical details about the kingdom of God, allowed the variant advocates to tolerate each other – opposing viewpoints and all.

Third, it is clear that nineteenth-century pre- and post-millennialists had much in common. As Ruth Bloch has argued persuasively, “in this respect premillennialists and postmillennialists were agreed; they all sought to ground their millennial visions in some precise variant of biblical interpretation.”³⁹ Indeed, as George Marsden reminds us, nineteenth-century premillennialists and post-millennialists may have had much more in common with each other than their differences might lead some to believe. Premillennialism of the mid-nineteenth century “did not differ greatly from the postmillennialism of the same

era” since

Both saw history as controlled by a cosmic struggle, both allowed for interpreting some biblical prophecies literally, and both thought that some prophecies about the time immediately preceding the millennium were already being fulfilled in current events. They disagreed primarily over whether Christ would come before or after the millennium.⁴⁰

Without doubt, one significant factor in pre- and post-millennial commonality in the nineteenth century was their commitment to a literal understanding of Scripture. In Marsden’s words, they believed “that the Bible was absolutely reliable and precise in matters of fact, that its meanings were plain, and that wherever possible it should be taken literally.”⁴¹ This aspect of millennialism is clearly present in nearly every expression of restorationist millennial thought, whether pre- or post-millennial, in the nineteenth century. Indeed, from my perspective, it seems obvious that this commitment to literalism, however it was expressed in the specifics of millennial theorizing, helped keep the varying kinds of millennialists among the Christian Churches and Disciples in the same churches until after World War I.⁴²

But as the twentieth century loomed, postmillennialism began to take on newer and different, more secularized meanings – a path well-known to many Disciples of Christ in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.⁴³ To use only one example, consider the changing interpretations of Gog and Magog in Ezekiel 38. As Paul Boyer explains, “With the rise of historical-critical Biblical scholarship, the identification of Russia as Gog had come under attack. According to the more “modern,” critical view,

Ezekiel was poetry, not history or eschatology, argued Ernst Hengstenberg, professor of theology in Berlin, in a commentary published in English in 1869. Specifically rejecting Gesenius’ Rosh=Russia theory, Hengstenberg observed, ‘The poor Russians have been here very unjustly arranged among the enemies of God’s people.’⁴⁴

As newer forms of postmillennial thought began to depend increasingly upon human effort and improvement to realize its vision (often at the expense of anything resembling a literal understanding of Scripture), it is not difficult to see how those who might previously have been inclined to ante-Bellum expressions of postmillennialism might be driven into some of the least explicit forms of premillennialism. After all, to borrow again from Marsden’s description, premillennialists in the late nineteenth century

reached a central conclusion which was equally distant from that of their liberal contemporaries. Christ’s kingdom, far from being realized in this age or in the natural development of humanity, lay wholly in the future, was totally supernatural in origin, and discontinuous with the history of this era. This was a point on which the new dispensational premillennialism differed from older forms of premillennialism. For the dispensationalists the prophecies concerning the kingdom referred wholly to the future. The present era, the ‘church age,’ therefore could not be dignified as a time of the advance of God’s kingdom.⁴⁵

This radical “apocalyptic worldview,” with its emphasis on the otherworldly nature of the kingdom of God, is not at all unlike that described by Richard Hughes as one of the chief strands of thought in the portion of the “Stone-Campbell” movement represented, in Hughes’ mind by a thread running from Stone, and others, through David Lipscomb and R.H. Boll.⁴⁶ And, since not all expressions of this tension with the world, or alienation from the larger culture, involved specifically pre-millennial expectations, neither is it radically

different from the mindset in a minority of twentieth-century Churches of Christ as explicated in Ed Harrell's most recent work.⁴⁷

Indeed, there were any number of Restorationists willing to follow, if not all the specific predictions of premillennial theorizing, certainly some of its more radical behavioral conclusions. Since "premillennialism taught that no trust should be put in kings or governments and that no government would be specially blessed by God . . . many premillennialists of the radically anti-worldly type followed the logic of this teaching to a pacifist conclusion . . . this thoroughly anti-political attitude consistently emphasized the hopelessness of all efforts to solve the world's problems through political efforts, whether pacifist or military." Their reasoning "was not that of Bryan or the humanitarians who opposed war because they favored peace. . . Bryan, they thought, was chasing illusions."⁴⁸ While never a majority position, there were any number among Churches of Christ who were willing to follow the assumptions of radically, other-worldly alienation from this world into the paths of righteousness and pacifism.⁴⁹ Indeed, by the early twentieth century, as many among the Disciples openly embraced an increasingly secular version of postmillennialism, some in Churches of Christ were ready and willing to embrace an ever more "detailed and aggressive" version of premillennial teaching.⁵⁰

Finally, given the assumptions of many premillennialists – assumptions so similar to those of many members of Churches of Christ that they might well have been written to describe them – the real question may be not why some Restorationists embraced premillennialism, but rather why so few did: "They were absolutely convinced that all they were doing was taking the hard facts of Scripture, carefully arranging and classifying them, and thus discovering the clear patterns which Scripture revealed."⁵¹

NOTES

¹ Elmer Leon Jorgenson, ed., *Faith of Our Fathers* (Louisville, KY: Word and Work Publishers, 1952). The likeness to LeRoy Edwin Froom, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation* (4 vols; Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1946-1954), is too obvious to mistake. Note especially the sections on Thomas and Alexander Campbell (Volume 4, pp. 33-35, 249-265).

² Timothy Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 31-32.

³ A.T. DeGroot, *Disciple Thought: A History* (Ft. Worth: Texas Christian University, 1965), p. 80. DeGroot cites a comment by Ronald E. Osborn in "Current Issues in Faith and Order," *Shane Quarterly* (July 1953): 118, in support of this view.

⁴ David Edwin Harrell, Jr., *Quest for a Christian America: The Disciples of Christ and American Society to 1866* (Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1966), pp. 39, 44. Some of the millennial themes inherent in the thought of Walter Scott are discussed in Harrell, "Walter Scott and the Nineteenth-Century Evangelical Spirit," in Mark G. Toulouse, ed., *Walter Scott: A Nineteenth-Century Evangelical* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1999), pp. 23-36.

⁵ The first of these cherished myths has been the subject of much discussion, primarily in Harrell's work, including the work previously cited, as well as Volume II of his "Social History of the Disciples of Christ;" see *The Social Sources of Division in the Disciples of Christ, 1865-1900* (Atlanta: Publishing Systems, Inc., 1973), and "The Sectional Origins of the Churches of Christ," *Journal of Southern History* 30 (August 1964):261-277. The second of these myths is challenged in James Stephen Wolfgang, "Fundamentalism and Churches of Christ, 1910-1930" (M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1990), and Michael Casey, "The Interpretation of Genesis One in the Churches of Christ: The Origins of Fundamentalist Reactions to Evolution and Biblical Criticism in the 1920's" (M.A. thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1989).

⁶ Moses E. Lard, "A Theory of the Millennium," *Lard's Quarterly* 2 (October, 1864): 1-21.

⁷ See "Professor Stuart—Millennial Items," *Lard's Quarterly* 2 (January, 1865): 212-221; E[dward] E. Orvis ["O"], "The Editor's Theory of the Millennium," *Lard's Quarterly* 4 (April, 1867): 113-124; David Walk, "Thy Kingdom Come," *Lard's Quarterly* 4 (July, 1867): 240-252; Lard, "O. on the Editor's Theory of the Millennium," *Lard's Quarterly* 4 (July, 1867): 303-323; E.E. Orvis, "O's Theory in Regard to the Millennium," *Lard's Quarterly* 4 (October 1867): 369-380.

⁸ Lard, *Do the Holy Scriptures Teach the Endlessness of Future Punishment?* (Lexington, KY: Transylvania Printing and Publishing Company, 1879).

⁹ Lard, "A Theory of the Millennium," p. 219.

¹⁰ E.E. Orvis, "O's Theory in Regard to the Millennium," pp. 377-378. The welter of pre-, post-, a-millennial, and other theories can be bewildering – to say nothing of pre-, mid-, and post-Tribulation dispensationalism. Works which have attempted to unravel the tangled threads of such theories are suggested in Wolfgang, "Fundamentalism and Churches of Christ," pp. 8, 125f, and elsewhere.

¹¹ Tolbert Fanning, "The Coming of the Lord," *Gospel Advocate* 8 (September, 1866): 601-602.

¹² James R. Wilburn, *The Hazard of the Die: Tolbert Fanning and the Restoration Movement* (Austin, TX: Sweet Publishing Company, 1969), p. 72.

¹³ Tolbert Fanning, "Immortality – No Kingdom of God and Kindred Matters," *Gospel Advocate* 9 (May 23, 1867):431-432.

¹⁴ Robert Milligan, *Exposition and Defense of the Scheme of Redemption* (Cincinnati: Chase and Hall, Publishers, 1868; rev. ed., 1877), pp. 536-577. A somewhat similar compendium by a Southern medical doctor associated with Churches of Christ, is Thomas Wesley Brents, *The Gospel Plan of Salvation* (reprint; Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1973; original edition 1874?); see Chapter VI, in which the kingdom of God is identified with the church and established on Pentecost. This identification of the kingdom with the church is no doubt a major factor explaining why many members of Churches of Christ strongly rejected any millennial theory which separated the two or made the church simply a "parenthesis" or temporary forerunner to a future kingdom.

¹⁵ Robert Milligan, *Commentary on Hebrews* (reprint; Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1961), p. 63.

¹⁶ Milligan, *Scheme of Redemption*, p. 571.

¹⁷ Dallas M. Brown, "The Millennium," *Christian Record* 7 (November

1873):500-503. The development and subsequent decline of post-millennial thought is explored in Robert K. Whalen, "Millenarianism and Millennialism in America, 1790-1880" (Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1972); and Timothy L. Smith, "Righteousness and Hope: Christian Holiness and the Millennial Vision in America, 1800-1900," *American Quarterly* 31 (Spring 1979): 21-45.

¹⁸G. Greenwell, "Items from Correspondents: England," *Christian Standard* 1 (May 26, 1866): 61.

¹⁹Isaac Errett, "The Second Coming of the Lord," *Christian Standard* 1 (June 2, 1866): 68.

²⁰Isaac Errett, "The Second Coming of the Lord," *Christian Standard* 1 (June 9, 1866): 76.

²¹Isaac Errett, "The Second Coming of the Lord," *Christian Standard* 1 (June 16, 1866): 84.

²²Russia's career as a figure of Biblical prophecy is described in Paul Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 84-86, 154-156.

²³Ruth H. Bloch, *Visionary Republic: Millennial Themes in American Thought, 1786-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985, p. 145; Boyer, pp. 61-63, 78.

²⁴Born in Mahoning County in 1813 and baptized at age 15 by Walter Scott, Hayden was an integral part of a large family of Restoration preachers. From 1850 to 1857, he was principal of the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute, which became Hiram College in 1867. Compiler of the hymnal titled *The Sacred Melodeon*, Hayden is perhaps best known for his *History of Disciples on the Western Reserve*. See "The Hayden Group of Preachers," *Christian Standard* 51 (May 13, 1916):11; and William Harold Fletcher, "Amos Sutton Hayden: Symbol of a Movement" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1988).

²⁵"Turkey in the Light of Prophecy, VIII" *Christian Standard* 12 (June 30, 1877):204-205. Hayden's series of eight articles appeared serially from May to July, 1877, accompanied by at least two large maps which dominated the front page of two different issues of the *Christian Standard*.

²⁶*Ibid.*

²⁷"Religious Phases of the War," *Gospel Advocate* 19 (May 31, 1877): 43 (from the *New York Observer*).

²⁸Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), is still probably the best, and most detailed, study of the prophecy and related Bible study conferences. Sandeen's path-breaking study of Fundamentalism, while still quite valuable, must be broadened and qualified in the light of later work such as George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1970-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

²⁹"The Prophetic Conference," *The Christian*, (November 14, 1878):4

³⁰*Ibid.*

³¹J.W. Mountjoy, "The Prophetic Conference," *The Christian*, (November 28, 1878):2. Mountjoy was a young Missouri preacher, serving two stints with the Columbia church.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ D.L. [David Lipscomb], "The Prophetic Conference," *Gospel Advocate* 20 (November 23, 1878):725. This article is included among a number of other Restorationist documents on Hans Rollman's website at the Municipal University of Newfoundland. The URL is: <http://www.mun.ca/rels/restmov/index/html>

³⁴ For recent descriptions of the course of premillennial controversies in the 20th century Churches of Christ, (in addition to sections of Hughes and Harrell's works cited above), see Douglas A. Foster, "Sectional Strife in the Midst of the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy: The Premillennial Controversy Among Churches of Christ, 1910-1940," in *Methodism and the Fragmentation of American Protestantism, 1865-1920: Papers from the Wesleyan-Holiness Studies Center Conference, September 29-30, 1995* (Wilmore, KY: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1995); and Hans Rollman, "'Our Steadfastness and Perseverance Depends On Perpetual Expectation of Our Lord': The Development of Robert Henry Boll's Premillennialism (1895-1915)," *Discipliana* 59 (Winter, 1999): 113-126.

³⁵ D[avid] L[ipscomb], "Queries," *Gospel Advocate* 40 (June 23, 1898): 397. See also, "Of Christ's second Coming, No. 4," *Gospel Advocate* 40 (June 23, 1898): 391.

³⁶ Elisha G. Sewell, "Queries," *Gospel Advocate* 37 (July 11, 1895): 437.

³⁷ See, for example, John A. Brookes and J.W. Fitch, *A Debate on the Beginning of Messiah's Reign, The Abrogation of the Mosaic Law, and the First Proclamation of the Gospel* (Cincinnati: R.W. Carroll and Company, 1870); Robert H. Miller and Daniel Sommer, *The Miller and Sommer Debate* (Mount Morris, IL: The Brethren's Publishing Company, 1889), in which the opening proposition is "The Scriptures teach that the Kingdom or Church of Christ was set up on the Day of Pentecost;" and *A Debate on First Day Adventism Between Albert T. Fitts and G.C. Minor at New Hope Advent Church, Colleton, S.C., October 16th-18th, 1900* (Knoxville, TN: S.B. Newman and Company, 1901), preface Ashley S. Johnson, in which the opening proposition is, "Resolved, That the Kingdom of Christ was Established in its Fullness on the Day of Pentecost." Brooks, a native of Mason County, Kentucky, graduated from Bethany College in 1856, preached in St. Louis, Kansas City, and Memphis, followed W.T. Moore at the West End Tabernacle in London, and was the Vice-Presidential nominee of the National Prohibition Party in 1888. On Sommer, see James Stephen Wolfgang, "A Life of Humble Fear: The Biography of Daniel Sommer" (M.A. thesis, Butler University, 1975), pp. 79-83 on the Miller-Sommer debate. Fitts, a South Carolina native who served as State Evangelist, studied with Ashley S. Johnson, graduated from Drake University and received an M.A. from Butler University.

³⁸ Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More*, p. 78; see also William R. Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse in America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976).

³⁹ Bloch, *Visionary Republic*, p. 144.

⁴⁰ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, p. 51.

⁴¹ *ibid.* Some of these themes vis-avis Churches of Christ are explored in papers by J.S. Wolfgang, Hans Rollman, Michael Casey, and John Mark Hicks from the sessions on Robert H. Boll at the 1998 Christian Scholars Conference

at Pepperdine University. These papers are posted on the server at the Abilene Christian University website. (The URL is <http://www.acu.edu>).

⁴² An interesting exploration of literalism in both legal and religious contexts by an anthropologist is Vincent Crapanzano, *Serving the Word: Literalism in America from the Pulpit to the Bench* (New York: The New Press, 2000).

⁴³ See Harrell, "Christian Primitivism and Modernization in the Stone-Campbell Movement," in Richard T. Hughes, ed., *The Primitive Church in the Modern World* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), pp. 109-120; and Lester McAllister and William E. Tucker, *Journey in Faith: A History of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1975), pp. 209-232 and 284-312.

⁴⁴ Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More*, p. 155. The changing nature of post-millennialism is explored in Jean B. Quandt, "Religion and Social Thought: The Secularization of Postmillennialism," *American Quarterly* 25 (1973):390-409; James H. Moorhead, "The Erosion of Postmillennialism in American Religious Thought, 1865-1925," *Church History* 53 (March 1984):61-77, and Moorhead's recent work, *World Without End: Mainstream Protestant Visions of the Last Things, 1880-1925* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).

⁴⁵ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, p. 51.

⁴⁶ Richard Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996). Such views are explicit in a recent paper presented by Hughes at the American Historical Association's annual meeting in Chicago, January 8, 2000.

⁴⁷David Edwin Harrell, Jr., *The Churches of Christ in the 20th Century: Homer Hailey's Personal Journey of Faith* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2000).

⁴⁸ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, p. 143.

⁴⁹See David E. Harrell, "Disciples of Christ Pacifism in Nineteenth-Century Tennessee," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 21 (September, 1962): 263-274. For an extension of restorationist pacifism into the 20th century, see Michael Casey, "From Pacifism to Patriotism: The Emergence of Civil Religion in the Churches of Christ during world War I," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* (July 1992): 376-390, and Casey, "Cordell Christian College," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Spring 1998): 20-37.

⁵⁰The phrase is from Thomas Olbricht, "Beginning of the End for Premillennialism," *Christian Chronicle*, April 2000. For additional recountings of the development of premillennialism among Churches of Christ, see David M. Owen, "The Premillennialist Movement in the Church of Christ" (M.A. thesis, Murray State University, 1989); William Woodson, *Standing for Their Faith: A History of Churches of Christ in Tennessee, 1900-1950* (Henderson, TN: J&W Publications, 1979), Chapter 11, "Premillennialism," pp. 107-130, a rather negative account which should be balanced by the perspective of Thomas G. Bradshaw, "R.H. Boll: Controversy and Accomplishment Among Churches of Christ," (M.Div. Thesis, Emmanuel school of Religion, 1992; published also in Louisville by Word and Work, 1998).

⁵¹ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, p. 56.

MISSION AS LIBERATING SPIRIT
Disciples and Pentecostals in Venezuela
Carmelo Alvarez*

This article tries to demonstrate how the interaction and partnership in mission of a mainline denomination, the Disciples of Christ in the US and Canada, and a Pentecostal denomination, the Evangelical Pentecostal Union of Venezuela, strengthen an ecumenical vocation, as a liberating experience in the Spirit.

The Evangelical Pentecostal Union of Venezuela (UEPV) was organized officially on January 12, 1957. Eleven pastors belonging to the Assemblies of God decided to initiate their own national Pentecostal movement.¹ When they decided to constitute a new movement, there was a persistent idea which they held in common: No more sectarian attitudes. These pastors experienced the Holy Spirit as liberating for simple and poor people and wanted to be in cooperation with other denominations. They felt that the Assemblies of God was a powerful and well-organized institution, controlled from the US, with well-intended missionaries, but a paternalistic attitude.²

The leaders of the new organization sought to follow in the footsteps of Gottfried Frederick Bender, whom they viewed as their mentor, friend, and brother in Christ. Bender, whom they referred to as "Federico" Bender, was the German missionary and naturalized American citizen who had founded Venezuelan Pentecostalism.³

Ramón Castillo traces the context and origins of Venezuelan Pentecostalism by detecting five crucial moments in the history of Venezuelan Pentecostalism: From 1919 to 1942 the pioneer efforts of Gottfried Bender and his wife Cristina. Second, The Assemblies of God initiated their work in 1946 with three national districts and a National Convention in 1947.⁴ The third impulse comes when the group of pastors left the Assemblies of God and founded the UEPV in 1957. The fourth moment starts with the "divine healing" movements coming from Puerto Rico and the US in the 1960s. The fifth crucial moment is the establishment of tele-evangelism and neo-pentecostal movements.⁵

Pentecostalism became a religious movement in Venezuela during a time of political and economic transition. By the end of the nineteenth century Venezuela was a coffee and coconut producer. This situation was changed in 1908 with the coming of General Juan Vicente Gómez, a caudillo that governed the country until 1935. Those two decades are essential in the transformation of Venezuela from an agrarian economy to an oil economy.⁶ Gómez was a dictator that united the country with his all-powerful national project based on multinational petroleum companies. Venezuela became the second largest oil producer in the world.⁷

Bender, the founder of Venezuelan Pentecostalism, was converted in a Holiness congregation of the Evangelical United Brethren in 1902 and was baptized in the Holy Spirit at a Christian and Missionary Alliance congregation in 1907. Bender was a student at Nyack Bible Institute. While at Nyack he met

*Carmelo Alvarez is Dean of Students, Director of Cross-Cultural Studies and teaches Church History and Theology at Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis.

Fred Bullen, who later became an agent of the American Bible Society in Venezuela. Hans Waldvogel, a pastor at an independent Assemblies of God church in Brooklyn, New York was the other friend and collaborator with Bender in his initial incursions in Venezuela.

Bender was a man of prayer, deep convictions and sense of calling into missionary work. One day while praying he had a vision in which a world map was shown with Venezuela as the only territory drawn. He was very reluctant, at the beginning about the calling to go to Venezuela.⁸ Rev. Gerald Bially was the director of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Venezuela, and a friend to Fred Bullen. Bullen provided this contact for Bender. On February 24, 1914, Bender departed for Venezuela. While in Caracas Bender attended the Bible Institute “Hebrón.” There he was trained as a missionary and learned Spanish.

His friend Fred Bullen died and Bender continued the efforts to discern a role and future in Venezuela. He returned to the US and married Christina Schwager Kopittke in 1918. They came to Venezuela in 1918 and went to Barquisimeto. This time Bender did not have the support of his friends at the Christian and Missionary Alliance, but he felt that God was going to direct the way into Barquisimeto.⁹

Federico Cardoze was the first person to assist Bender. He was a Jewish tailor and freemason who publicly attacked the Catholic hierarchy and became the first convert to Pentecostalism in Venezuela. The second convert was a distinguished district judge, Rafael Alvarado. On September 21, 1922 Bender, his wife Christina and these first converts, along with another group of sympathizers inaugurated the first chapel, Bethel in Barquisimeto.¹⁰

Gottfried Bender was very interested in educating the people and caring for their needs. In 1924 he inaugurated the “Instituto Evangélico,” an elementary school during the day, a Bible Institute to prepare pastors and leaders in the evenings.¹¹ He was still waiting for a revival in Barquisimeto.

On August 9, 1924, a revival started and became the initial impulse for the expansion of Pentecostalism in Venezuela. From Lara to Falcón and other parts of Venezuela the Pentecostal experience reached many lives. By 1926 Bender was convinced that this expansive movement was the missionary initiative of the Holy Spirit to bless the Venezuelan people.¹² The next two decades were a complete success both in establishing educational institutions, orphanages and establishing new congregations.¹³

Gottfried Bender was a visionary leader with creative and very personal initiatives. He relied on his friends and followers, and trusted them to the end.¹⁴ The Pentecostal movement in Venezuela was growing very fast. A desperate need for financial resources and missionary personnel was felt. Bender and the “Barquisimeto movement”¹⁵ decided to join the Assemblies of God.¹⁶ When the Assemblies of God in Venezuela was constituted in 1947, Rafael Alvarado, Juan Bautista Alfaro, Segundo Gil, Prisciliano Rodríguez, Martín Chirinos, Sacramento Cobos and Edmundo Jordán,¹⁷ an Assemblies of God missionary from Puerto Rico, were the key leaders in the different states of Venezuela.¹⁸ Exeario Sosa was the second Superintendent of the Assemblies of God (1952) in Venezuela and the first national to be named for the position. A missionary, Ingve Olson, was the first Superintendent.¹⁹

The “Institute Bíblico Central” was established in 1948 in Barquisimeto.²⁰ This

Institute became the center for missionaries and a good number came from the US. Exeario Sosa, the "rebel spirit" from Dividive, Zulia, was very attentive to these developments. A "paternalistic and controlling attitude" was building up.²¹ By 1956 it was evident that a confrontation was inevitable. National pastors and missionaries had different criteria about the work in Venezuela. The missionaries were interested in the development of an "exclusive Assemblies of God" organization. The national pastors envisioned the church that Bender had envisioned: A Simple Gospel, interdenominational cooperation and tolerance.²²

According to Exeario Sosa, in reality the missionaries were more flexible in ethical, doctrinal and biblical matters than the national pastors, but less committed to the poor, interdenominational cooperation and social service.²³

On January 12, 1957, eleven pastors decided to leave the Assemblies of God and founded the Unión Evangélica Pentecostal Venezolana. The first Convention was held in Santa Bárbara del Zulia, August 6-11, 1957.²⁴

EL INFORMADOR PENTECOSTAL, the national journal of the UEPV, in its first edition referred to the initial "Barquisimeto movement" and its strategy. It published an open letter by Federico Bender that had first been issued on June 14, 1946. There the idea of constituting a General Assembly is expressed. The desire to invite other churches to this effort of unity is also stressed. It was clear that the founders of the UEPV were not satisfied with the situation within the Assemblies of God. Publishing Bender's open letter of 1946 confirmed an almost defiant attitude.²⁵

The open letter published by Bender in 1946 was subscribed in 1957 by Exearia Sosa, as newly elected national president of the UEPV. By signing Bender's open letter, Exearia Sosa identified the UEPV as based on the Gospel and the Bible, as "a movement, not an organization" (translation mine) that respects local autonomy of the congregations. Endorsement of Bender's letter showed that UEPV accepted the responsibility of sharing "the Powerful Message" to humble people in their own situation, trying to promote cooperation among different denominations, proclaiming God's kingdom for all of Venezuela. UEPV was to seek to fulfill Bender's dreams of a national, genuine, ecumenical, Pentecostal church.²⁶

The first Convention of the UEPV was also a time to organize the work of women and youth. These two organizations became pillars of the UEPV: "Unión Misionera Femenil" (Women Fellowship) and "Unión Juvenil Imitadores de Cristo" (Youth Fellowship).²⁷ They continue the radical social commitment of the Benders and the incessant ecumenical spirit of Exeario Sosa.

When the UEPV was founded in 1957, a new perspective was introduced in Venezuelan Pentecostalism. For the first time an ecumenical option was combined with a Pentecostal faith. A process of ecumenical partnership, encounters, public solidarity in favor of peace and justice, and an option for the poor and a real concern for the Venezuelan people was shared.²⁸ To this process the UEPV invested all its efforts, energy and resources in the next four decades. From 1957 in Santa Bárbara to 1987 in Valencia the UEPV made significant progress trying to combine a liberating spirit with an ecumenical commitment and praxis of mission and evangelism. They developed a strategy of mission in a series of documents, letters and statements. An examination of these will help in understanding the life and ministry of the UEPV.

Freddy Briceño, a pastor and leader in the state of Zulia, wrote a short statement in 1963 to help the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the US and Puerto Rico to understand the identity and ministry of UEPV. The main point raised in the statement is twofold: The UEPV is a tolerant and open movement, willing to work in cooperation with other denominations in Christian unity.²⁹

He explains that between 1947 and 1953 a group of pastors belonging to the Assemblies of God wanted to explore a more flexible organization. Under the leadership of Exeario Sosa they established a "Convention" within the Assemblies of God. This provoked a conflict and finally a division. Briceño stresses the fact that until 1940 Pentecostal churches, established within the "Bender movement," were open to dialogue with other denominations in the country and participated in the "United Convention," a council of independent churches.³⁰

When the Venezuelan Evangelical Pentecostal Union was founded in 1957, they agreed in three fundamental objectives: Promote a fellowship between congregations and pastors, respect the local autonomy of each congregation and mutual support in Christian service. These objectives distanced these leaders from the Assemblies of God. They joined again the "United Convention" and expressed no hard feelings or regrets toward the Assemblies of God in Venezuela. The Assemblies of God, particularly the US missionaries, were negative about a close relationship with this new movement. The only exception was Rev. Edmundo Jordán, Puerto Rican missionary who supported the movement in many ways from the very beginning and became a counselor and confidant to all of them.³¹

Briceño insists: The UEPV maintains the same doctrinal principles they observed as members of the Assemblies of God. The relevant principles in the UEPV are a practical sense of tolerance, local autonomy and a fellowship with denominations.³²

Briceño enumerates some basic doctrinal principles of the UEPV:

Baptism by immersion, tithing, the gifts and baptism in the Holy Spirit, divine healing, open communion, fellowship with other churches, the veil for women in worship service, strict ethical principles (no movies, no dance, etc.), freedom to express political diverse ideologies, official abstention from party politics, unity not uniformity among the congregations.³³

Briceño was very influential in developing a close relationship with the Disciples of Christ in the US and Puerto Rico. He maintained a close friendship with Edmundo Jordán and later his collaboration with the first Disciples of Christ missionary, Juan Marcos Rivera. Freddie Briceño was part of the official delegation of UEPV leaders to the World Convention of the Churches of Christ in San Juan, Puerto Rico, August 1965.³⁴

Briceño was a pastor for many years at Peña de Horeb congregation in La Pomona, Maracaibo.

The document that summarizes the strategy and mission of the UEPV is the "Consulta-Encuentro, Escuela Granja G. F. Bender, Barquisimeto, Venezuela, Junio 5-16, 1972." The background for that Consultation was a decade of discussion and reflection between 1957 and 1967. Exeario Sosa was dreaming about this project because he felt an urgent need to help the poor, marginalized children, many of them orphan boys and girls.³⁵ He remembered that G. F. Bender was an orphan in his early childhood. Amelia Rodríguez, Exeario's wife, was an orphan raised and educated by Pentecostal missionaries in "Hogar de Paz" in

Caracas.³⁶ Amelia suffered a lot because she was the daughter of a single mother and that was a “sinful condition” for the missionaries. She developed an inferiority complex because of this attitude, but could overcome over the years those dramatic experiences.³⁷ Exeario himself had a difficult childhood moving from one place to another in the Venezuelan territory.³⁸

The “Consulta-Encuentro” in 1972 was designed as a Consultation with ecumenical agencies from Latin America, Europe and the United States. A group of leaders from Presbyterian churches in Venezuela, youth groups from the community in Barquisimeto and community educators were active participants. The main topic was the formation of agents for rural promotion. The process of the Consultation itself revealed that there was an urgent need to change the strategy of the school.³⁹ The analysis of the social and economic reality of Venezuela made clear that a community center with multiple services was the alternative for an effective ministry in the country.⁴⁰ The theological reflection revealed that an incarnational principle of a Church that is “salt and light” in the world was pertinent.⁴¹

The other important factor was education. An effort was made to develop initial ideas to create a curriculum for an integrated Christian education.⁴² An open dialogue with youth leaders from the Barquisimeto community provided a larger frame work for an effective dialogue with secular sectors.⁴³

The “Consulta-Encuentro” drafted and recommended a project, originally conceived by the Administrative Board of UEPV. The following general objectives and specific programs are recommended:

1. A project to serve the whole community, and primarily the rural areas, with the liberating news of the gospel of Jesus Christ.
2. A center for community education, primarily for children and youth.
3. The main programs are, a primary school, community development, a house for the needy, particularly orphans and rural development.
4. The project was integrated as an evangelistic effort of the UEPV.⁴⁴

The “Curso Bíblico Intensivo” (CBI), which started in 1958, was housed in the Community Center until 1980. This program of Intensive Biblical Studies for lay pastors was transformed into CEPAS, a program originally designed by the Biblical Seminary of Costa Rica.

Exeario Sosa was interviewed by Juan Marcos Rivera on March 12, 1979. Juan Marcos asks initially about some pictures in the door of his office. One of them is G. F. Bender. Sosa expresses deep appreciation for Bender and his ministry in Lara.⁴⁵ The other picture is Rómulo Gallegos, the famous Venezuelan novelist and former president of Venezuela. “He represents or is a literary symbol; politically he was my comrade because he was president of the party I militated. But he is not there for politics, but for his condition as man of letters.”⁴⁶

Sosa had in mind for many years the idea of a school to train leaders for the rural areas of Venezuela. He had the original vision in 1947 and later bought a piece of land in Barquisimeto, with offerings from the Disciples of Christ churches in Puerto Rico. The first unit of the project was a joint effort between national leaders of the UEPV, and a delegation of Disciples of Christ leaders from the US. In 1967 they dedicated the first unit of the project.

The “Escuela-Granja” was initially intended as a home for poor children and training center for peasants to work in rural areas. By 1972 a series of consultations,

theological reflections and analysis with other ecumenical agencies, including the World Council of Churches, ISAL (Church and Society in Latin America), CELADEC (Latin American Evangelical Commission on Christian Education), Christian Aid, and Disciples of Christ in Puerto Rico and the US, opened new possibilities for a more ambitious project. The initial project was transformed into a Community Center.⁴⁷ The Center had three main programs, a primary school for poor children, a house for orphan children and a center for intensive biblical studies.⁴⁸

Juan Marcos makes a crucial reference to the ethical and theological implications of the project. Is it social service or a different way to evangelize? “How do you relate these two?” he asks Sosa. For Exeario Sosa it is a matter of integrating both in the “proclamation of the Gospel.” “Christ came to liberate the whole human person.”⁴⁹ Sosa affirmed these convictions over the years, responding to many criticisms about his social and political involvements. He was an avid reader of progressive theological thinkers, including Liberation theologians. He demonstrates a capacity to integrate social action, theological reflection and ecumenical options in a nationalistic and Pentecostal project.

Elida Quevedo makes some important observations about the pastoral and educational ministry of UEPV. Firstly, from the very beginning there was an openness to explore new educational experiences. G. F. Bender was the initial inspiration of this perspective. His ministry had a deep educational component, with an evangelical commitment and a dimension of solidarity and cooperation. Bender developed a strategy in which the founding of schools, Bible institutes and orphanages were integrated in a pastoral model.

Bender was very sensitive to the need for qualified and trained national leadership.⁵⁰

Exeario Sosa assumed the idea and the vision. The UEPV developed a strategy for education which included intensive biblical studies, education for poor children and orphans and a process toward popular and liberating education. The UEPV could integrate a transforming education from the perspective of the Christian faith.⁵¹ Many local congregations implemented this strategy. The congregation in Acarigua, Portuguesa, “Cristo la Peña de Horeb,” started a school for its community. The school made an impact in the public school system and was shown as a model to be followed. In Mesa Alta, a primary school was established and became a model for the community and a public witness of proclamation of the Good News.⁵²

The UEPV confronted many internal conflicts and tensions, like any church or institution. The crucial issues were related to the ecumenical and theological options taken in the first two decades of its existence. Exeario Sosa was convinced that a new leadership was desperately needed, but it was very difficult for him to allow for that leadership to emerge. He knew that education was a key component.

During February 1977 Carmelo Álvarez and Raquel Rodríguez, Disciples Associate Overseas Staff teaching at the Biblical Seminary in Costa Rica came to teach at the CBI. The main purpose was to reorganize the program, design a curriculum for lay pastors, coordinate the new courses and provide the books.⁵³

The effort was sponsored by the Men’s Department of the Division of Homeland Ministries Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Division of Overseas

Ministries, and UNELAM (Movement for Latin American Evangelical Unity). The UEPV provided local transportation, room and board. The Latin American Biblical Seminary and DOM supported Carmelo and Raquel. Carmelo Álvarez led intensive courses in 1977-78 on Pastoral Theology, Preaching, Christian Worship, I and II Peter. A reading program was designed in 1978 with guidelines provided by PRODIADIS, the theological education at a distance program established in 1977 by the Latin American Biblical Seminary.

José Erazo, a fraternal worker and for many years a Disciples pastor in Puerto Rico was sponsored by the DOM to work as a collaborator to Exeario Sosa. Samuel Soliván, a teacher from New York, was sponsored by the Reform Church in America and dedicated his time to teaching. Soliván was a Puerto Rican working for his Ph. D at Union Seminary in New York. He grew up in an Assemblies of God congregation in New York.⁵⁴

The year 1978 was a transitional time for the UEPV. Exeario Sosa was feeling the burden of the presidency of UEPV. His heart condition was limiting his activities. He was concerned about the future. Sosa tried in the past to train new leaders, but the project failed.⁵⁵ By the end of 1978 a decision was made. A group of students will be sent to the Latin American Seminary of Costa Rica, under the guidance and supervision of Carmelo Álvarez and Raquel Rodríguez. The main purpose was to train the leaders to come back to the UEPV and not “lose their Pentecostal identity.”⁵⁶

The emphasis was to develop a strategy so that these students will come back as teachers and mentors to lay pastors and younger candidates for ministry. Between 1978 and 1985 Gamaliel Lugo, Elida Quevedo Lugo, his wife, Ingrid González, José Amesty, and Melech Escalante graduated from the Latin American Biblical Seminary. All of them are actively involved in the UEPV and directing the theological education of the organization at all levels.

The next important step was the convocation of the I Pentecostal Bolivarian Congress, Bogotá, March 14-18, 1979. An open letter was sent from San Cristóbal on July 28, 1978. A joint effort of Venezuelan and Colombian Pentecostal leaders was made to promote the unity among Pentecostals in both countries. The Bolivarian ideal of a Great Colombia was behind the project. The letter stated that in times of crisis and there is a need to respond with “Christian solutions” to the economic, social and political conditions of the “marginal classes.”⁵⁷

The main objectives of the *Congreso* were, to establish a dialogue with the Pentecostal people, develop an integral approach to mission and respond to the present crisis in Venezuela and Colombia.⁵⁸

The official document summarized the themes and issues discussed during the *Congreso* as follows. Evangelization is an effective tool to confront the reality and crisis in Latin America. The Pentecostal churches are growing, but they are indifferent to the crisis. A call to unity and concrete action to confront the injustice is demanded from God. The Pentecostal churches have a unique opportunity; it is the “Church of the poor” and needs to be prophetic to the rich and powerful. They need to realize their own spiritual poverty that generates so many crises. An integral evangelism is the answer to these crises.⁵⁹ Among the speakers was Disciple Carmelo Alvarez, who delivered an urgent call to unity.⁶⁰

Between 1979 and 1983 the UEPV suffered a crisis. Many congregations were reacting to the progressive positions taken by Exeario Sosa and the Executive

Committee. These were years of confrontation at many levels in Latin America. Liberation Theology was more influential and CLAI (Latin American Council of Churches) was a viable ecumenical body for Protestants in Latin America. The violation of human rights, so rampant during those years, along with the economic and political crisis was affecting the leadership in all the churches, including the Catholic Church.

Exeario Sosa passed away on June 18, 1981. It was a deep loss for the UEPV and its leadership.⁶¹ Rev. Angel Bravo was the Vice-president and he assumed the presidency for two years. Many local congregations felt the void of leadership. Others left because of theological and political discrepancies. The UEPV was left with eighteen local congregations as it convened for its XXVII Convention, August 25-28, 1983. Gamaliel Lugo, a pastor from Maracaibo and graduate from the Latin American Biblical Seminary in 1980 was elected president. Lugo demonstrated immediately the capacity to shepherd the flock and the administrative skills to reorganize the UEPV.⁶²

Gamaliel Lugo and the Executive Committee of the UEPV decided that a process of discernment on ecumenism was desperately needed in the UEPV. The process started as a joint effort between the Caribbean Regional office of CLAI and UEPV in 1984. Juan Marcos Rivera and Carmelo Álvarez were invited to lead workshops on Christian Unity in different parts of Venezuela. They preached and lectured during the Convention in Las Marías, “Dios con nosotros” Church, August 1984.

The next two years were planned as an educational process on ecumenism. The XXIX Convention was held in “Los Efesios” Church in San Juan de Menegrande, August 1985. The main theme chosen was: “Misión, Crecimiento y Unidad.” (Mission, Growth and Unity) The three lectures delivered by Carmelo Álvarez emphasized church growth as a multifaceted process, which calls the Church to be a witness of unity in the world.⁶³ The XXX Convention was held in “Hosanna” Church in Guanare, 1986. The main theme was “La vocación ecuménica de la Iglesia” (The Ecumenical Vocation of the Church). Carmelo Álvarez delivered three Bible studies on “Ecumenical Vocation” and a Symposium was organized with guests from the Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran and Disciples of Christ Protestant traditions.⁶⁴

The UEPV was ready to move toward the next step. At the next Convention in “Comunidad Cristiana El Triunfo,” Valencia, the emphasis was on “Evangelism in Today’s World.” The debate was focused in a document presented by the Executive Committee.

Two important issues are stressed in the document, the ecumenical vocation of the UEPV and the option for the poor. The document itself is a testimony of the quality and depth of theological reflection within the UEPV. It shows a mature theological stance.⁶⁵

The first of the statements addresses the defamation of UEPV newspapers, seminars, lectures, conferences, Bible institutes and others. The open letter is an attempt to express the official position of the UEPV in these matters:

Today more than ever we want to affirm, and with the same force as in the past, in our unbreakable faith in Jesus Christ and our commitment with the Gospel and life.⁶⁶

The document makes clear the “reaffirmation of our Pentecostal identity.”⁶⁷

The UEPV maintains an ecumenical partnership with Disciples of Christ, The Presbyterian Church, The Methodist Church and other Christian confessions. The UEPV is affirming its Pentecostal roots while discovering an ecumenical vocation. The relationship is based on a mutual respect and recognition.

The UEPV believes in the "Ecumenical spirit," the "inter confessional dialog" and "mutual cooperation." They affirm the fundamental tenets of the Christian faith based in the Trinity, with an emphasis on the gifts of the Spirit. These gifts are given to the community of faith to fulfill Christ's command for the establishment of God's kingdom. The Holy Spirit is calling the Church to unity.

The UEPV has been open to an "ecclesial praxis" combined with an "ecumenical pastoral praxis." They underline the fact that for more than twenty years this praxis has taken place. When a fraternal relationship was started with the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) they opened a process to an ongoing relationship with different churches in and outside Venezuela.⁶⁸ This praxis is visibly expressed in the active membership of UEPV in numerous ecumenical projects and associations.⁶⁹

The document concludes acknowledging that the UEPV is "a believing and poor people." It analyzes the crisis in Venezuela, naming violence, repressions, suffering, hunger, death, misery as signs of the whole situation. The situation of the Goajiro Indians, the peasants of Caño Caimán and the miseries in the slums are mentioned as examples of the violation of human rights in Venezuela.⁷⁰ The defense of life in all its manifestations is a fundamental right proclaimed by the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The option for the poor is based on Luke 4:18-19 and is a challenge to the Church Universal and the UEPV in particular.⁷¹

The UEPV has developed in its forty-three years of existence a strategy for mission based in the power of the liberating spirit. They articulated a pertinent theology of mission based on the following principles:⁷²

1. A Christian education that is both character forming and socially transforming.⁷³
2. An ecumenical vocation that is both a commitment to Christian unity and solidarity with the people.⁷⁴
3. An integral mission that is personal, communal and structural.⁷⁵
4. A spirituality that is for the healing of the body, the Church, the nation and the world.⁷⁶
5. The conviction that the Holy Spirit is both sign and power of the coming of God's reign in its entire fulfillment.⁷⁷

For almost four decades the Disciples and UEPV, two very different denominations, have maintained an ecumenical partnership, sharing in God's mission. The result of this unique experience is manifested in the deep conviction that they belong together in mission. They have tried to learn from each other. The liberating power of the Spirit made it possible.

NOTES

¹Ramón Castillo, "Breve reseña histórica de la Unión Evangélica Pentecostal Venezolana," in Gamaliel Lugo (ed.) PRESENCIA PENTECOSTAL EN VENEZUELA: IDENTIDAD, COMPROMISO Y MISIÓN DE LA UEPV, 1957-1997 (Maracaibo: EDICIONES UEPV, 1997), 12.

²Carmelo Álvarez, Interview to Exeario Sosa, December, 1978, Santa Bárbara del Zulia.

³IDEM., Exeario Sosa Luján, the leading figure of this new movement always refers to Federico Bender (their translation into Spanish of his name) as the “most decent, honest and humble Christian and missionary, I knew in all my life.”

⁴Luisa Jeter de Walker, SIEMBRA Y COSECHA, Reseña de las Asambleas de Dios en Argentina, Brasil, Venezuela, Ecuador, República Dominicana y Cuba, vol. 3 (Deerfield, FL: EDITORIAL VIDA, 1996), 86.

⁵Ramón Castillo, “Breve reseña histórica de la Unión Evangélica Pentecostal Venezolana,” 1.

⁶IBID. 2.

⁷Ramón Castillo, “Elementos para una historia del pentecostalismo en Venezuela,” in Carmelo Álvarez (ed.) PENTECOSTALISMO Y LIBERACIÓN: UNA EXPERIENCIA LATINOAMEICANA (San José: DEI-CEPLA, 1992), 59-66.

⁸Roberto Domínguez, PIONEROS DE PENTECOSTES, Venezuela y Colombia, vol 3, (Barcelona: CLIE, 1990), 23.

⁹Carmelo Álvarez, Interview to Exeario Sosa, Campamento Nino Suárez, Uveral, Holy Week, 1977. During those days in Uveral I preached a series of sermons on who is Jesus Christ Today? and led a Bible Study each morning on I and II Peter. During the afternoons I led a workshop on Pastoral Theology for UEPV pastors. Samuel Soliván, a Puerto Rican Pentecostal missionary from New York City, sponsored by the Reformed Church in America in Venezuela (1977-1980) presented the first attempt to write the history of Pentecostalism in Venezuela, in three lectures. Cf. G. F. Bender, “Revival in Venezuela,” THE CHRISTIANEVANGEL (April 19, 1919), 10.

¹⁰Ramón Castillo, “Breve reseña histórica de la Unión Evangélica Pentecostal Venezolana,” 3-4.

¹¹IDEM.

¹²Roberto Domínguez, PIONEROS DE PENTECOSTÉS, 48-84.

¹³Ramón Castillo, “Breve reseña histórica de la Unión Evangelica Pentecostal Venezolana,” 5-6. Cf. G. F. Bender, “Incidents during the Venezuela Revival,” THE PENTECOSTAL EVANGEL (July 10, 1926), 2-3, 8.

¹⁴Carmelo Álvarez, Interview to Exeario Sosa, campamento Nino Suárez, Uveral, Holy Week, 1977.

¹⁵IDEM., Exeario Sosa always used this phrase to describe the group that Bender led in Barquisimeto. But for Sosa it was like the heritage of the “initial vision” and “genuine missionary fervor”.

¹⁶Luis Jeter de Walker, SIEMBRA Y COSECHA, vol 3, 85. Gottfried Bender and his wife Christina joined the Assemblies of God as missionaries in 1937. They retired and went back to the US in 1947. According to Exeario Sosa he wanted for the Venezuelan Pentecostal to have an “organization to give you support”. Cf. Carmelo Álvarez, Interview to Exeario Sosa, Campamento Nino Suárez, Uveral, Holy Week, 1977.

¹⁷Edmundo Jordán became a Disciples of Christ pastor in Puerto Rico. He was my pastor in Candelaria Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) 1960-63. He was very instrumental on the initial contacts between the UEPV and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in Puerto Rico and the US.

¹⁸IBID., 87.

¹⁹IDEM.

²⁰Many pastors of the UEPV were graduated from that Institute. In my conversations over the years with Domingo Lugo, Raimundo Arrieche+ and Braudelina Canelón+ they expressed mixed feelings about the theological education at the Instituto. It was very “fundamentalist” and very formal and rigid, both in content and style. They received many skills and a good discipline to study and read. All of them became founding members of the UEPV

²¹Carmelo Álvarez, Interview to Exeario Sosa, Campamento Nino Suárez, Uveral, Holy Week, 1977.

²²Ramón Castillo, “Breve reseña histórica de la Unión Evangélica Pentecostal Venezolana,” 11.

²³Carmelo Álvarez, Interview to Exeario Sosa, Campamento Nino Suárez, Uveral, Holy Week, 1977.

²⁴Ramón Castillo, “Breve reseña histórica de la Unión Evangélica Pentecostal Venezolana,” 11-12.

²⁵EL INFORMADOR PENTECOSTAL, 1 (1): 1; 3, March 1957.

²⁶IDEM.

²⁷EL INFORMADOR PENTECOSTAL, 1 (5): 1; 3 septiembre, 1957.

²⁸Ramón Castillo, “Breve reseña histórica de la Unión Evangélica Pentecostal Venezolana,” 13.

²⁹Freddie Briceño, “Mi visión de la UEPV a los primeros siete años de fundada,” in Gamaliel Lugo (ed.) PRESENCIA PENTECOSTAL EN VENEZUELA, 15.

³⁰IDEM.

³¹IDEM. Cf. Luis F. Del Pilar, LO HIZO EL: (Testimonios) (Bayamón: IMPRESAS QUINTANA, 1999), 149-153.

³²IBID.,

³³IBID. 16.

³⁴In the chapter on Partnership in Mission, in my dissertation, I make a complete analysis of this “Puerto Rican connection” with the UEPV.

³⁵Juan Marcos Rivera, “Testimonio pastoral y educativo de la UEPV,” Entrevista al Rev. Exeario Sosa Luján, 12 de marzo de 1979) (Typed Manuscript), 26. The original copy of this important document was discovered by me in the personal files of the late Rev. Juan Marcos Rivera in the summer of 1998.

³⁶For an interesting personal testimony shared by sister Amelia Rodríguez, Cf. “Amelia de Sosa,” Ier. Encuentro de Mujeres Cristianas, Colonia Tovar, (Septiembre 16-18 de 1983), 25-31.

³⁷IBID., 29.

³⁸Exeario Sosa was my very dear friend for twenty-five years. Amelia his widow is like a second mother to me, and their children are my brothers and sisters. All these years we have shared these stories, particularly in their home in Uveral. Exeario Sosa had a deep admiration for G. F. Bender and tried to emulate his dreams, visions and projects.

³⁹CONSULTA-ENCUENTRO, Escuela-Granja G.F. Bender, Barquisimeto, Venezuela, (Junio 5-16, 1972), 1-4.

⁴⁰IBID., 5-8.

⁴¹IBID., 8-9.

⁴²IBID., 9-11.

⁴³IBID., 10.

⁴⁴IBID., 13-18.

⁴⁵Juan Marcos Rivera, "Testimonio Pastoral y educativo de la UEPV,"

25.

⁴⁶IDEM.,

⁴⁷IBID. 27.

⁴⁸IBID. 28-29.

⁴⁹IDEM.

⁵⁰Elida Quevedo, "El ministerio pastoral y educativo de la UEPV," in Gamaliel Lugo, (ed.) PRESENCIA PENTECOSTAL EN VENEZUELA, 31-32.

⁵¹IBID., 33.

⁵²IBID. 34.

⁵³Domingo Lugo, "Días inolvidables," in EL INFORMADOR PENTECOSTAL XIV (Febrero de 1977), 2-3.

⁵⁴Samuel Soliván worked for three years in Venezuela, 1977-1980. He was accepted by pastors and lay leaders of the UEPV as a diligent, committed teacher and pastor.

⁵⁵In the 1960's two students were sent to the Evangelical Seminary of Puerto Rico. They were supported with scholarships from the DOM. These candidates did not fulfill the expectations and were unable to lead a theological education program. Sosa and the Executive Committee were aware of the situation and wanted to find a solution.

⁵⁶These are the exact words used by Exeario Sosa in an Executive Committee meeting in Barquisimeto, December 1978.

⁵⁷"Carta de San Cristóbal," COMISIÓN DE FRATERNIDAD EVANGÉLICA PENTECOSTAL BOLIVARIANA, (28 de julio de 1978), 1.

⁵⁸IBID. 2.

⁵⁹ICONGRESO PENTECOSTAL BOLIVARIANO, (14-18 de marzo de 1979), 1.

⁶⁰Carmelo Álvarez, EL PROTESTANTISMO LATINOAMERICANO ENTRE LA CRISI Y EL DESAFÍO (México: CUPSA, 1981), 75-92. This chapter is a revision of a lecture delivered during the *Congreso*. Two other lectures were presented during the meeting. One was on the social and economic realities in Venezuela and Colombia. The other was on the fruits of the Spirit.

⁶¹Melitón Lugo Carrasquero, UNPRESIDENTE SIN PARANGÓN (Exeario Sosa Luján) (UEPV, 1986), 45-47.

⁶²Gamaliel Lugo, "La UEPV: Identidad, compromiso y misión," in Gamaliel Lugo (ed.) PRESENCIA PENTECOSTAL EN VENEZUELA, 49-58. Lugo is able to identify the identity and roots of the UEPV and gives a solid biblical and theological analysis. For sixteen years he has provided that kind of reflection for the UEPV, CLAI and CEPLA.

⁶³The original pamphlet was published by CLAI in 1985 under the same title. A revised version of these lectures is included in Carmelo Álvarez, UNA IGLESIA EN DIÁSPORA: Apuntes para una eclesiología solidaria (San José: DEI, 1991), 31-37.

⁶⁴Recorded cassette, Simposium, "Ecumenical Vocation," 1986.

⁶⁵LA CARTA DE VALENCIA, Valencia: UEPV (29 de agosto de 1987).

⁶⁶IDEM

⁶⁷IBID., 2.

⁶⁸IBID., 3.

⁶⁹IDEM. CLAI, CELADEC, Latin American Biblical Seminary, DEI (Department of Ecumenical Research, San Jose, Costa Rica), Ecumenical Action in Venezuela, PACTO (Alternative Program on Theological Education in Venezuela), CEVEJ (Evangelical Committee for Justice of Venezuela) and others.

⁷⁰Gamaliel Lugo, "Ética social pentecostal: santidad comprometida," in Carmelo Álvarez (ed.), *PENTECOSTALISMO Y LIBERACIÓN: UNA EXPERIENCIA LATINOAMERICANA* (San José: DEI-CEPLA, 1992), 113-122.

⁷⁰Gamaliel Lugo, "Etica social pentecostal: santidad comprometida," in Carmelo Alvarez (ed.), *PENTECOSTALISMO Y LIBERACION: UNA EXPERIENCIA LATINOAMERICANA* (San Jose: DEI-CEPLA, 1992), 113-122.

⁷¹LA CARTA DE VALENCIA. 4.

⁷²"La UEPV: Principios generales y objetivos", in Gamaliel Lugo (ed.) *PRESENCIA PENTECOSTAL EN VENEZUELA*, 59-62.

⁷³Gamaliel Lugo, "La UEPV: Identidad compromiso y misión," 53.

⁷⁴Carmelo Álvarez, "La vocación ecuménica de la UEPV," in Gamaliel Lugo (ed.), *PRESENCIA PENTECOSTAL EN VENEZUELA*, 42-47.

⁷⁵"La UEPV: Principios generales y objetivos," in Gamaliel Lugo (ed.) *PRESENCIA PENTECOSTAL EN VENEZUELA*, 60.

⁷⁶IBID., 61. Cf. Gamaliel Lugo, "Ética social pentecostal: santidad comprometida," 120.

⁷⁷Gamaliel Lugo, "La UEPV: Identidad, compromiso y misión," 53-58.