

Neo-Evangelical Identity within  
American Religious Society of Friends (Quakers):  
Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1919 - 1947.

BY TIMOTHY JAMES BURDICK

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion  
College of Arts and Law  
University of Birmingham  
4 January 2013

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

**University of Birmingham Research Archive**

**e-theses repository**

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

## **ABSTRACT**

This thesis is an historical case-study using archival written data to analyse the formation of a neo-evangelical identity within Oregon Yearly Meeting (OYM) of the Religious Society of Friends, with emphasis on the years 1919-1947. The argument of this thesis is that by 1919 there were fundamentalist thinking patterns developing within the corporate religious identity of the Yearly Meeting (YM) marked by ecumenical separatism, world-rejecting views, biblical literalism and decreasing social action. The values of this fundamentalist identity became dominant by 1926, pervading the mindset of the YM until the late 1940s when it was replaced with a more socially-concerned, world-engaging expression of evangelicalism. This neo-evangelicalism attempted to highlight positive Christianity, while maintaining the supernatural orthodox theology of its fundamentalist predecessors. The pattern that unfolded in OYM shares similarities with a larger pattern taking place throughout Protestant Christianity in America over the same period.

This research makes original contributions to scholarship in three ways. Firstly, it analyses a particularly influential group among evangelical American Quakers during the twentieth-century. Secondly, it starts to redress the dearth of scholarship specific to evangelical Quakerism, and, thirdly it adds to the scholarship on twentieth-century American Protestantism by focusing on an understudied region and denomination.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, thank you to my wife Heather and daughter Sierra. The countless hours you allowed me to escape and commit to this project made the task a shared sacrifice. I only hope that now I can give back some of those hours to you.

Thank you to the many archivists and librarians who entrusted me with their cherished resources: Zoie Clark at George Fox University, Thomas Hamm at Earlham College, Adrienne Meier at Seattle Pacific University, Don Davis at the American Friends Service Committee, Scott Daniels at the Oregon Historical Society and Ian Jackson at Woodbrooke Quaker Study Centre. Thank you also to Colin Saxton, past Superintendent of Northwest Yearly Meeting, for opening the door to the Yearly Meeting community to me as a researcher.

Clifford Geertz in his 1973 work, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, suggests that while we may start our efforts at interpreting social/cultural phenomena from a ‘state of general bewilderment as to what the devil is going on’, we do not start completely ‘intellectually empty handed’.<sup>1</sup> For that, I am eternally grateful to those who have gone before me in my specific area of study. Most noteworthy is the historical narrative work Ralph Beebe conducted on Quakers in Oregon Yearly Meeting and published in 1968. Ralph and I chatted about this project a few times over the course of my writing and Ralph’s friendly countenance was a constant source of inspiration. Before his health worsened, he was scheduled to read through the finished draft, but sadly that was not to be. This work is lessened without Ralph’s final thoughts on the matter, but it is to him

---

<sup>1</sup> Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers, 1973), 27.

that I give credit for laying the intellectual foundation to understanding Oregon Yearly Meeting.

Several scholars took time away from busy academic loads to read through this work and for that I am genuinely thankful. Thomas Hamm, Stephan Angell and Mark Ankeny all provided feedback that was both astute and tender. That you would read through a 400 page dissertation while yet working full-time yourselves is beyond words of gratitude. Your comments and follow up emails made this work so much better in the end. Arthur Roberts, long retired from a wonderful academic career, was amazing in his deep insight into this era of Quaker history. Your comments helped me see the work in the larger scope and to make sure my analysis was credible to someone who experienced first-hand many of changes studied herein.

Fellow student Jon Kershner sacrificially gave time away from writing his own dissertation and provided feedback on an early draft copy. Your keen insight was much appreciated. Rosemarie Kossov copy edited the final draft version for conventions of language, spelling and grammar. Thank you for your wonderful expertise.

And last, but definitely not least, is the acknowledgement of the tireless efforts of my two academic advisors Ben Pink Dandelion and Edwina Newman. Although you two were each half-a-world away from me, the regular communications sent over the Atlantic pond kept the dialogue going without missing a beat. If not for both of you providing ongoing encouragement, my energies would have drained long before the finish; and if not for your commitments on high academic standards, the work would have suffered. Thanks to both of you for pushing me along when I needed a boost and thanks for pushing against the work when it needed improvement.

# LIST OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF CONTENTS</b>	1
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	3
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	4
<b>CHAPTER ONE - Introduction</b>	
Introduction	6
Terminology and Historical Context	11
The Religious Society of Friends: A Brief History	49
History of Oregon Yearly Meeting	57
Relationship to Previous Scholarship	72
Methods and Sources	89
Thesis Outline	98
Chapter Summary	101
<b>CHAPTER TWO – The Rise of Fundamentalist Friends</b>	
Introduction	102
Five-Years Meeting: A Brief History	104
The Quaker Bible School Movement	117
Initial Conflict between Oregon Yearly Meeting and Five-Years Meeting	130
Similar Trends in Other Yearly Meetings	142
A Pause in the Acrimony	146
Edward Mott	148
Withdrawal of Oregon Yearly Meeting from Five-Years Meeting	160
Chapter Analysis	171
Chapter Summary	177
<b>CHAPTER THREE – The Altered Ethos of Quaker Holiness</b>	
Introduction	179
American Friends Service Committee: A Brief History	182
Social Service vs. Christian Service	192
Oregon Yearly Meeting Disbands its Service Committee	202
A Change in Christian Ethics	210
No Peace among Friends	227
Chapter Analysis	241
Chapter Summary	245
<b>CHAPTER FOUR – The Establishment Neo-Evangelical Quakerism</b>	
Introduction	246
The Beginning of the End for Portland Bible Institute	248
Scourging Modernism from Pacific College	252
The Renewal of World Engagement and Humanitarianism	270

Gathering Evangelical Friends Together	286
A Settled Division	298
Institutes of Evangelical Academia	306
Chapter Analysis	314
Chapter Summary	325
<b>CHAPTER FIVE – Conclusions and Findings</b>	
Introduction	327
Findings of Chapter Summaries	329
Similarities and Differences to Broader Protestantism	332
Original Contribution	356
Implications for Scholarship	357
Chapter Summary	361
<b>APPENDIX – Formation of the Evangelical Friends Church International</b>	362
<b>GLOSSARY – Peculiar Terminology of the Religious Society of Friends</b>	376
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	
Primary Sources – Unpublished Archives	383
Primary Sources – Published	394
Primary Sources – Published with no Author Noted	400
Websites Accessed	402
Secondary Sources	403

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1.1, The Process of Sanctification	19
Table 1.2, Differentiating Fundamentalism and Neo-Evangelicalism	47
Table 3.1, Comparing OYM 1893-1919 to OYM 1919-1940	244



## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

ACC – American Council of Churches

AEF – Association of Evangelical Friends

AFMB – American Friends Mission Board

AFSC – American Friends Service Committee

CO – Conscientious Objector

CPS – Civilian Public Service

EFA – Evangelical Friends Alliance (currently Evangelical Friends Church International)

EFCI – Evangelical Friends Church International (formerly EFA)

FCC – Federal Council of Churches

FM – Forward Movement

FUM – Friends United Meeting (formerly FYM)

FYM – Five-Years Meeting (currently Friends United Meeting)

FWCC – Friend’s World Committee for Consultation

IWM – Interchurch World Movement

MM – Monthly Meeting

NAE – National Association of Evangelicals

NCC – National Council of Churches

NFSC – Northwest Friends Service Committee

NPEI – North Pacific Evangelistic Institute

OYM – Oregon Yearly Meeting (currently Northwest Yearly Meeting)

PBI – Portland Bible Institute

PC – Pacific College (currently George Fox University)

QM – Quarterly Meeting

RDF – Richmond Declaration of Faith

WWI – World War One or The Great War

WWII – World War Two

YM – Yearly Meeting

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### Introduction

This work is an historical case-study detailing the formation of neo-evangelical corporate religious identity within Oregon Yearly Meeting (OYM) of the American Religious Society of Friends[g]<sup>1</sup>, with particular emphasis on the years 1919 – 1947.<sup>2</sup> From the inception of the Society[g] in the middle of the seventeenth-century until the 1820s, Quakers[g] could be conceived of as a single body, with numerical strongholds in Britain and the United States forming a transatlantic community.<sup>3</sup> During the nineteenth-century the Religious Society of Friends in America fractured into three primary theological and ecclesiological positions, each claiming to be the true version of

---

<sup>1</sup> Words in the Glossary are indicated with a [g] upon first use throughout the text.

<sup>2</sup> In this work ‘religious identity’ is defined by the author as a corporate persona developing from the importance of particular religious beliefs agreed to by the membership. More than simply a statement of agreed beliefs, the corporate religious identity describes the value each group places on any particular doctrines, which collectively in turn provide that group with identity forming constructs about their particular religious personality. Religious identity then is formed out of the constant ebb and flow of community conversation within the group, and equally important, confirmed by others outside the group. Religious corporations frequently reveal aspects of their identity through official communications to other religious bodies, in affiliation to larger macro-systems such as religious coalitions or associations, via approved minutes and printed doctrinal statements, in published newsletters and curriculae, in the election of leaders and by sanctioning certain speakers and events. The milieu where corporate religious identity is formed is often found in approved committees and business meetings comprised of representative members; but corporate religious identity is also shaped by long-standing patterns of group behaviour, dynamic leaders, historical accounts, influential minority groups, periods of renewal/revival and or perceived divine intervention. Corporate religious identity is seldom entirely consistent with the positions of all the individual members of that group, and there are often members/sub-groups who/which hold radically different values yet still belong to the whole. The required adherence to, or malleability of, corporate religious identity varies greatly from one group to the next.

<sup>3</sup> Frederick B. Tolles has argued that, after the Society’s inception in England, it quickly (and intentionally) spread to the British colonies in North America forming a transatlantic identity. This macro-identity bond, he contends, remained strong through the American Revolution, but was in decline by the nineteenth century – particularly after various schisms within the American branch of the Society. See Frederick B. Tolles, *The Atlantic Community of the Early Friends* (London: Friends Historical Society, 1952). See also, Frederick B. Tolles, *Quakers and the Atlantic Culture* (NY: The Macmillan Company, 1947).

American Quakerism.<sup>4</sup> This three-way organisational schism existed until the twentieth-century when OYM, in particular, took the lead to become an independent Yearly Meeting[g] (YM) of conservative evangelical Friends. The argument of this thesis is that, starting as early as 1919, there was already evidence of fundamentalist thinking patterns developing in the corporate religious identity of the Yearly Meeting, marked by ecumenical separatism, a world-rejecting viewpoint, biblical literalism and decreasing levels of social action. These patterns of fundamentalist thinking eventually came to create an influential hegemony in the identity of the YM and, in 1926 OYM became the first full Yearly Meeting to leave Five-Years Meeting.<sup>5</sup>

This same fundamentalist thinking pattern pervaded the identity of the YM until the 1940s, when a more socially-concerned world-engaging expression of evangelicalism developed alongside fundamentalism, and eventually by the end of that decade became corporately normative within the YM. By the middle of the twentieth-century, OYM was joined by other like-minded evangelical Quakers throughout America who united under a neo-evangelical alliance umbrella (the Association of Evangelical Friends<sup>6</sup>), creating the

---

<sup>4</sup> For a complete overview of nineteenth-century developments within the Religious Society of Friends see Thomas Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907* (IN: Indiana University Press, 1988). See also, Thomas Hamm, *The Quakers in America*, The Columbia Contemporary American Religious Series (NY: Columbia University Press, 2003), 37-60. Although the vast majority of Friends in America at this time claimed attachment in some form or another to one of these three main groupings, there were other independent groups of Quakers claiming no affiliation or membership in any larger macro-structure. Most notable is Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, which in 1857, in a decision designed more for the preservation of internal unity than theological clarity, cut off all correspondence and official relationships with all other bodies of Friends. See Rufus M. Jones, *The Later Periods of Quakerism*, vol. 1 (London: Macmillan and Co, 1921), 535-537.

<sup>5</sup> A national association of evangelical Friends formed in 1902, meeting for business every five years. See section entitled, 'Five-Year Meeting: A Brief History' in Chapter Two.

<sup>6</sup> See Arthur Roberts, *The Association of Evangelical Friends: A Story of Quaker Renewal in the Twentieth Century* (OR: The Barclays Press, 1975).

beginning of a new and distinct ‘fourth strain’ of American Quakerism.<sup>7</sup> This new evangelicalism attempted to highlight a positive Christianity while yet maintaining the supernatural orthodox theology shared by its fundamentalist predecessors. By 1947, OYM had embraced into its own corporate religious identity the same values of the larger neo-evangelical movement which was gaining acceptance throughout Protestant Christianity in America.<sup>8</sup> By the end of the twentieth-century, evangelical values characterised the majority of Quakers worldwide.<sup>9</sup>

The main body of primary data researched for this study starts in the year 1919. This is partly because 1919 represents the first year the Yearly Meeting showed a major manifestation of fundamentalism as it debated formal separation from Five-Years Meeting.<sup>10</sup> That year was also the first full year of operations for a new Bible School formed by Oregon Friends primarily in reaction to the perception of modernist apostasy in the YM’s academic institution.<sup>11</sup> Looking more widely, 1919 marks the beginning of the World’s Christian Fundamentals Association, a group often associated with the

---

<sup>7</sup> Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 60.

<sup>8</sup> See section on Neo-Evangelicalism below.

<sup>9</sup> John Punshon claims that evangelicalism is today ‘the official persuasion of at least half the Quakers in the world, notably in the United States and in the Third World countries.’ See John Punshon, *Portrait in Grey: A Short History of the Quakers* (London, Quaker Books, 1984), 187. Pink Dandelion contends that liberal unprogrammed Quakerism comprises only about 15% of worldwide Quakerism. See Pink Dandelion, *An Introduction to Quakerism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 171. Both sources combine evangelicals from both Friends United Meeting and Evangelical Friends Church International.

<sup>10</sup> *Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Official Minutes-1919* (Newberg, OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1919), minute 89, page 3. Hereafter, ‘OYM Minutes’ followed by respective year, minute and page number.

<sup>11</sup> See Chapter Two – North Pacific Evangelistic Institute officially held its first class in October 1918 with four students.

official beginning, and later decline, of fundamentalism within American evangelical Protestantism.<sup>12</sup>

This work ends in 1947, which marks a symbolic water-shed for two groups of Friends. That was the year American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), heavily associated with a liberal-modernist social-gospel tradition in the Society by that point, was honoured as a co-recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize;<sup>13</sup> a banner achievement for those Friends who emphasised social action as a primary means of evangelism. For evangelical Friends from nearly every YM in America, 1947 marked the initial attempts at unification under an evangelical Quaker umbrella towards what became known as the Association of Evangelical Friends.<sup>14</sup>

In many ways, OYM became the epicentre for the debates within the Religious Society as a whole during the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. Oregon was the first full Yearly Meeting to officially break away from Five-Years Meeting because they deemed FYM to be insufficiently evangelical.<sup>15</sup> OYM was the first Yearly Meeting to officially sever ties

---

<sup>12</sup> George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1980), 152.

<sup>13</sup> The British Friends Service Committee was the other co-recipient. See Irwin Abrams, *The Nobel Peace Prize and the Laureates: An Illustrated Biographical History, 1901-2001* (Nantucket Massachusetts, Science History Publications, 2001), 159. See Chapter Three of this work for a more detailed discussion of this.

<sup>14</sup> See Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends* and Appendix.

<sup>15</sup> Although Oregon Yearly Meeting was the first full YM to leave Five-Years Meeting, there were two other notable partial separations (for different reasons) from FYM before Oregon left. Immediately after FYM adopted a Uniform Discipline in 1902, an alternative YM was set up in North Carolina in protest against the perceived pastoral emphasis of the Uniform Discipline as opposed to an emphasis on the plain life. See Seth B. Hinshaw, *The Carolina Quaker Experience: 1665-1985* (NC: North Carolina Friends Historical Society, 1984), 217 – 226. Two decades later in 1924, a two year exodus started from Indiana Yearly Meeting and Western Yearly Meeting because some Friends perceived FYM (and its leaders) to be unsound on issues of orthodoxy and they left to form Central Yearly Meeting. See Thomas D. Hamm, 'Friends United Meeting and its Identity: An Interpretative History', *Quaker Life* (January/February 2009): 4.

with AFSC because it was perceived that AFSC emphasised humanitarianism over conversion.<sup>16</sup> OYM was a leader in attempting to dispel modernist teachings from Pacific College, which was controlled by the YM.<sup>17</sup> It is in OYM that the Association of Evangelical Friends had its first headquarters and its first official publishing house and many of its leaders hailed from there.<sup>18</sup> While similar developments occurred around the USA in other like-minded Yearly Meetings, and in much of American Protestantism of the time, the story of the fracturing of Friends in America in the first half of the twentieth-century cannot be told without a strong focus on Oregon Yearly Meeting.

Studying the shifting corporate religious identity of evangelical Quakerism in America between 1919 and 1947 is crucial to a better understanding of the recent history of the Religious Society of Friends in America. The change undergone by many elements of the Society during this early to mid twentieth-century era has had a lasting impact on how the Friends denomination understands its status and purpose in the world today. There has been little academic research on evangelical Quakers of this era and most of the research conducted has neglected the fundamentalist tradition to which much of evangelical Quakerism is heir. This case study fills this vital gap in scholarship.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, this research makes original contributions to scholarship in three ways. Firstly, it analyses a particularly illustrative group of evangelical Quakers in America

---

In addition to these two partial separations, Ohio Yearly Meeting never officially joined FYM because a strong holiness wing dominated Ohio YM keeping it out of FYM, primarily over the refusal of FYM to endorse water baptism as an acceptable practice. See, Hamm, *Transformation*, 130-137, 168.

<sup>16</sup> Discussed in more detail in Chapter Three.

<sup>17</sup> Discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.

<sup>18</sup> Discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.

<sup>19</sup> Existing scholarship on this matter is discussed further in the 'Relationship to Previous Scholarship' section of Chapter One.

during the first half of the twentieth-century. Secondly, it starts to redress the dearth of scholarship specific to evangelical Quakerism as a whole, and, thirdly, it adds to the scholarship on twentieth-century American Protestantism by focusing on an understudied region and denomination. While many scholarly works exist today in which the impact of the fundamentalist/modernist controversy on other denominations has been examined, none, to date, has focused on the same phenomenon among Friends. To start with, a brief overview of the key terms used is offered along with a picture of the relevant historical context within Protestant Christianity in America.

### **Terminology and Historical Context**

In this section a working description is established for each of the six primary categorical movements used herein (evangelicalism, holiness, social gospel, modernism, fundamentalism and neo-evangelicalism). Each of these movements is historically contextualised in its American milieu.

#### *Evangelicalism*

The term evangelical at its most basic linguistic level stems from the Greek noun ‘euangelion’, meaning ‘gospel’, ‘good news’ or ‘glad tidings’. The term is employed by New Testament authors to reflect the good news of ‘Jesus who appeared on earth as the Son of God to accomplish God’s plan of salvation for needy humans.’<sup>20</sup> Despite the potential broadness with which such a definition could be applied, this work limits use of

---

<sup>20</sup> Mark A. Noll, *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield, and the Wesleys* (IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 16.



the term ‘evangelicalism’ to describing the broad interdenominational ideals, leaders and movements among orthodox Protestants primarily resulting from the Great Awakening at the beginning of the eighteenth-century.<sup>21</sup>

One of the more widely used and respected academic definitions of evangelicalism comes from David W. Bebbington. He defines evangelical theology in terms of four characteristics which have remained fairly stable over the aforementioned timeframe:<sup>22</sup> ‘conversionism’, ‘activism’, ‘biblicism’ and ‘crucicentrism’. Each of these four characteristics, known together as ‘Bebbington’s quadrilateral’, represents common priorities unifying a broad Protestant coalition.

Conversionism refers to sinners accepting that they are saved (justified) by faith alone.<sup>23</sup> This is the essence of Reformation theology handed down to evangelicals. Out of conversion comes assurance that one is converted, and out of this assurance comes an

---

<sup>21</sup> In support of this general timeline, David W. Bebbington says, ‘The decade beginning in 1734 witnessed in the English-speaking world a more important development than any other, before or after, in the history of Protestant Christianity: the emergence of a movement that became Evangelicalism.’ Likewise Randall Balmer claims: ‘North American evangelicalism derives from the fusion of two strains of Protestantism, Puritanism and Pietism. These two traditions met on the Atlantic seaboard in the eighteenth century, and their coming together provided the spark that ignited the revivalist fires of the Great Awakening in the 1730s and 1740s.’ See David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1989), 20. See Randall Balmer, *Blessed Assurance: A History of Evangelicalism in America* (MA: Beacon Press, 1999), 14.

In addition to Bebbington and Balmer, the general timeframe is agreed upon by many scholars of evangelicalism including: Mark Noll, Adrio König, Timothy Larsen, George Marsden and Douglas Sweeney. See, Noll, *Rise of Evangelicalism*, Chapter 2; Adrio König, ‘Evangelical Theology’, in *Initiation into Theology*, ed. Simon Maimela and Adrio König (Pretoria, JL van Schaik Publisher, 1998): 85; Timothy Larsen, ‘Defining and Locating Evangelicalism’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology*, ed. Timothy Larsen and Daniel J. Treir (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 5; George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1991), 2; and Douglas A. Sweeney, *The American Evangelical Story: A History of the Movement* (MI: Baker Academic, 2005), 25.

<sup>22</sup> ‘From the first half of the eighteenth century to the second half of the twentieth century’, writes Bebbington, in 1989. See, Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 2.

<sup>23</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 5-6.

implicit response of moral behaviour.<sup>24</sup> Activism then flows from conversion (‘gratitude was the strongest motive for moral behavior’).<sup>25</sup> While the ‘activism’ of a typical evangelical is often focused on missionary endeavours, evangelism, preaching and soul-saving, there have been, at various points in evangelical history, examples of attempts to bring to bear upon the world the ethics of the gospel.<sup>26</sup> Biblicism is utter devotion to the Bible and the belief that God’s truth is found in its pages.<sup>27</sup> While there is agreement among evangelicals that the Bible is generally inspired and a source of God’s truth, there is notable difference in determining the implications of inspirations, and most evangelicals are wary of strict literalism.<sup>28</sup> Rather, typical evangelical thinking espouses a more broad consideration for historical context, genre and literary style.<sup>29</sup> Crucicentrism is a central focus on the doctrine of Atonement and the idea that humanity is reconciled to God through Jesus’ act on the cross,<sup>30</sup> ‘To make any theme other than the cross the fulcrum of a theological system was to take a step away from Evangelicalism.’<sup>31</sup> Bebbington’s work provides a useful framework for understanding evangelical theology and helps to delineate it from other Christian movements that, while they may value the

---

<sup>24</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 6-7.

<sup>25</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 6.

<sup>26</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 10-12.

<sup>27</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 12.

<sup>28</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 13-14.

<sup>29</sup> Gerald R. McDermott, ‘Introduction’ to *The Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, ed. Gerald R. McDermott, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010), 6.

<sup>30</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 14.

<sup>31</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 15.

above characteristics, do not make all four of them primary focal points of an interdependent whole.<sup>32</sup>

Bebbington's definition is generally considered the standard. Larson writes, 'The real story of Bebbington's quadrilateral, however, comes not with reviewers, but when others have needed a working definition of evangelicalism in order to delineate the scope of their own studies. In this area, Bebbington has developed a near monopoly position.'<sup>33</sup> Likewise, Noll, in writing about North American evangelicalism, argues that Bebbington's work is still 'the most serviceable general definition of evangelical.'<sup>34</sup> This study uses Bebbington's evangelical quadrilateral (conversionism, activism, biblicism and crucicentrism) to define 'evangelicalism'.

### *Evangelical Holiness*

While the Reformation brought to evangelical theology a belief that one is brought into fellowship with Christ by faith alone (justification),<sup>35</sup> later generations of Protestants, such as Pietists and Wesleyans, stressed equally, that after conversion, one is made (or, is being made) holy through God's transformative work (sanctification).<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> For a more in depth description of Bebbington's quadrilateral, see David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1989), 2-17. See also, David W. Bebbington, *The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody* (IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 23-40.

<sup>33</sup> Timothy Larsen, 'The reception given *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* since its publication in 1989', in *The Emergence of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*, Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J Stewart, ed. (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2008), 26.

<sup>34</sup> Mark A Noll, *American Evangelical Christianity: An Introduction* (MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 185.

<sup>35</sup> Donald G. Bloesch, 'Justification and Atonement', in *The Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 223.

Holiness then, within the evangelical tradition, includes this second transformative work of God. Although Protestants have never agreed on methods or timelines for sanctification,<sup>37</sup> the expectation that God will perfect the justified results in a closer union with God and is evidenced by obedience to God's commands. Carole Spencer, in her work on Quaker Holiness says that, 'Holiness is defined as a spiritual quality in which human life is ordered and lived out as to be consciously centered on God.'<sup>38</sup> Holiness spirituality in this sense is about how the evangelical doctrine shapes the evangelical experience. According to James M. Gordon, holiness theory has this dual emphasis: first the 'renewal of the mind and transforming of the moral life by the spirit of Christ'<sup>39</sup> followed by 'external expression in lifestyle and behavior.'<sup>40</sup> The witness to holiness for an evangelical is a realised gospel life in the sanctified individual.

Throughout the history of evangelicalism in America, there have been several sub-movements that have emphasised holiness in their orthopraxy. In relation to this work, the one movement that best provides historical context for the study herein is the

---

<sup>36</sup> Bloesch, 'Justification and Atonement', 224.

<sup>37</sup> In the book *Five Views on Sanctification*, the evangelical understanding of holiness is divided into the following types: the Wesleyan Perspective, the Reformed Perspective, the Pentecostal Perspective, the Keswick Perspective and Augustinian-Dispensational Perspective. While the methods and timelines differ for each perspective, the book's editor (Stanley N. Gundry) argues that they all share three commonalities: 1) all agree that the Bible teaches a sanctification that is past, present and future, 2) all agree that the process of sanctification requires believers to strive to express God's love in their experience, and, 3) all agree that the Bible promises success in this process of struggling against personal sin through the power of the holy spirit. See Stanley N. Gundry, ed., *Five Views on Sanctification* (MI: Zondervan, 1987), 7.

<sup>38</sup> Carole Dale Spencer, *Holiness: The Soul of Quakerism* (CO: Paternoster, 2007), 3. Spencer's work is discussed in more detail below in the 'Relationship to Previous Scholarship' section.

<sup>39</sup> James M. Gordon, *Evangelical Spirituality: From the Wesleys to John Stott* (London: SPCK, 1991), 6.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

late nineteenth-century Holiness Movement,<sup>41</sup> synthesising in America in the era following the American Civil War.<sup>42</sup> The Holiness Movement can be seen largely as an extension of John Wesley's theory of entire sanctification or Christian Perfection, which argued for an achievable sanctification through a life-long process of radical points of decision coupled with infusions of grace (known as justification and sanctification).<sup>43</sup> Following the second great revival, Methodist holiness doctrine prevailed upon all Christians to receive entire sanctification as a work of grace subsequent to justification.<sup>44</sup> By the middle of the nineteenth-century, leading Methodist holiness teachings coupled with the zeal of revivalism focused sanctification more on a single wholehearted point of commitment than on a gradual process.<sup>45</sup> This later nineteenth-century idea of sanctification was central to the Holiness Movement, which stressed the critical moment

---

<sup>41</sup> Although the 'Holiness' Movement shares its name with the much broader 'holiness' concept within evangelical Protestantism, the former is not to be thought of as representative of all holiness movements or the entirety of the evangelical holiness concept. Holiness is a broad construct related to the act, process and consequences of sanctification stretching across the entirety of evangelical history, whereas, as will be discussed, the Holiness Movement is specifically a late nineteenth and early twentieth-century movement that highlighted instant sanctification as part of its holiness construct. See discussion that follows.

<sup>42</sup> Melvin Easterday Dieter stresses that the post American Civil War milieu provided 'fertile soil' for the Holiness Movement, especially when coupled with revivalism. See Melvin E. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century* (NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1980), 96-98. Charles Edwin Jones dates the Holiness Movement specifically to 1867-1936. See Charles Edwin Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936* (NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974). The year 1867 is also the first year of the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness, which became a major late nineteenth century force in the Holiness Movement. See William C. Kostlevy, 'Introduction', in *Historical Dictionary of the Holiness Movement*, ed. William C. Kostlevy (ML: The Scarecrow Press, 2001), 3.

<sup>43</sup> Melvin E. Dieter, 'The Wesleyan Perspective', in *Five Views of Sanctification*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry, (MI, Zondervan, 1987), 38. See also, William C. Kostlevy, 'Introduction', in *Historical Dictionary of the Holiness Movement*, ed. William C. Kostlevy (ML: The Scarecrow Press, 2001), 1.

<sup>44</sup> Dieter, 'The Wesleyan Perspective', 39-40.

<sup>45</sup> Dieter, 'The Wesleyan Perspective', 41.

of instant sanctification and the compulsory obligation to seek the same experience for others.

For the purposes of this work, then, there were three shared beliefs with respect to holiness in the evangelical Holiness Movement at the turn of the century which are used in turn herein to provide a definitional framework for holiness.

1. Holiness was perceived to be centred on the transformative acts of God's grace.

Evangelicals believed that it is only first in regeneration (justification), and then in a subsequent gift of being made into God's image (sanctification), that one can discover holiness and acquire a Godly nature. Thus, conversion was deemed to be a prerequisite to the start of the holiness process. In the latter half of the nineteenth-century, both individualistic-leaning revivalists and more social-orientated Christians, regardless of their differing techniques, shared a common belief in the impetus of salvation towards holiness.

2. Although the speed of sanctification differed within the evangelical community, evangelicals believed the process of holiness brought the believer into closer unity with God (being made holy). Thus, in the evangelical mindset, being sanctified means one is being set apart, made special and chosen by God. When one's life was being shaped into the image of God, Christian perfection was believed to ensue.

3. The implications of holiness resulted in specific consequences upon the individual, whom evangelicals believed was then compelled (out of gratitude) towards obedience to God's commands. Gordon confirms that for evangelicals, '[t]he love of God requires active response, a serious pursuit of holiness and obedience.'<sup>46</sup> Likewise, Oliver

---

Davies claims, '[f]or many Christians today the concept of holiness combines elements which derive from a commitment both to personal piety and to an active concern for others.'<sup>47</sup> Such 'holiness and obedience' are frequently evident amongst evangelicals in their behaviour, including active concern for others, personal piety, social actions and evangelism.

For evangelicals, the process only worked in one direction. Being socially responsible, pious or morally attentive outside of the impetus of Christ's regenerative work failed to fulfill the expectations of an evangelical's perception of holiness. Moral action was to proceed from right doctrine. Table 1.1 (page 19) shows typical evangelical thinking on the process of sanctification.

### *Social Gospel*

As the Holiness Movement grew in America during the last half of the nineteenth-century, stressing instant sanctification, personal piety and evangelism, the Social Gospel Movement grew alongside it and in relationship to it.<sup>48</sup> While the larger conservative Protestant community occupied itself with the reformation of the individual, more liberal

---

<sup>46</sup> James M. Gordon, *Evangelical Spirituality: From the Wesleys to John Stott* (London: SPCK, 1991) 4.

<sup>47</sup> Oliver Davies, 'Holiness', in *The New SCM Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, Philip Sheldrake, ed. (London, SCM Press, 2005), 342.

<sup>48</sup> Donald Gorrell dates the social gospel epoch specifically to 1900-1920. See Donald K. Gorrell, *The Age of Social Responsibility: The Social Gospel in the Progressive Era 1900-1920* (GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 2. Robert Handy gives the social gospel movement the dates 1879-1920. See Robert T. Handy, *The Social Gospel in America 1870-1920* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1966), 3-16. Charles Howard Hopkins gives the social gospel era the dates 1865-1915, and Hopkins and Ronald White say, 'By 1920 the momentum of both the progressive movement and social gospel was on the wane.' See Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism: 1865-1915* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940). See also, Ronald C White, Jr & C. Howard Hopkins, *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America* (PA: Temple University Press, 1976), 243.

**Table 1.1, The Process of Sanctification**

<b>Impetus of Sanctification</b>	<b>Process of Sanctification</b>	<b>Consequence of Sanctification</b>
God's gift of grace only to the justified whereby the believer is purged of impure thoughts and behaviours and is made, or is being made, perfect and free from a life of sin.	Evangelicals differ on the speed of this process, but share an understanding that sanctification brings the believer into closer union with God as they are transformed into God's image.	Out of gratitude, the believer is compelled towards a holy life and obedience to God's commands; including a concern for others, personal piety, social action and evangelism.



Protestant leaders began to see sin as a systemic social issue and much broader than just individual depravity.<sup>49</sup> For them, sin could be found in larger systemic enterprises; the byproduct of unchecked capitalism, a corrupt government or limited vocational and educational opportunities.<sup>50</sup> In 1912, leading social gospel proponent Walter Rauschenbush said:

Christianity must offer every man a full salvation. The individualistic gospel never did this. Its evangelism never recognized more than a fractional part of the saving forces at work in God's world. Salvation was often whittled down to a mere doctrinal position; assent to that, and you were saved. Social Christianity holds to all the real values of the old methods, but rounds them out to meet all the needs of human life... Sin is a social force. It runs from man to man along the lines of a social contact. Its impact on the individual becomes most overwhelming when sin is most completely socialized. Salvation too is a social force. It is exerted by groups that are charged with divine will and love. It becomes durable and complete in the measure in which the individual is built into a social organism that is ruled by justice, cleanness, and love. A full salvation demands a Christian social order which will serve as the spiritual environment of the individual.<sup>51</sup>

This new Social Christianity<sup>52</sup> pushed evangelicalism toward a construct of salvation that was far more social and political than the more individual and private emphasis of the Holiness Movement. Christopher H. Evans argues, 'The social gospel injected into Western theology an insistence that theological questions pertaining to sin and salvation were inseparable from one's struggle to work for social justice.'<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 14-16.

<sup>50</sup> Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 11-13.

<sup>51</sup> Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Order*, 1912. As printed in Winthrop S. Hudson Ed, *Selected Writings of Walter Rauschenbusch* (NY: Paulist Press, 1984), 176, 177-178.

<sup>52</sup> The term 'social gospel' did not really come into use until after 1900, Before then, the designation 'social Christianity' was more widely used. Handy, *Social Gospel in America*, 5.

Although the two groups (the Holiness Movement and the Social Gospel Movement) often debated methodological differences in terms of how best to go about the work of regeneration, they were both part of the same broad evangelical coalition, at least until the twentieth-century, when both currents became radically impacted by growing trends in theologically liberal modernism and fundamentalism (these terms are discussed in more detail below).<sup>54</sup> Rather, in generalising the two movements, at least in the nineteenth-century, they can best be seen as developing side by side within the same evangelical rubric, with both movements emphasising the spiritual experience of evangelical theology. Handy argues that, for the most part, social gospelism ‘stroved to center its renovated theological system around the person and work of Jesus Christ... During the ascendancy of the social gospel, its theology was largely evangelical liberal.’<sup>55</sup> White and Hopkins argue that the historic impetus for Social Christianity can be found in, ‘the quest for perfection joined with compassion for poor and needy sinners.’<sup>56</sup> Thus, the early Social Gospel Movement can be seen as a partner with the Holiness Movement, while evangelical theology provided a broad umbrella for both. The sanctification process outlined in Table 1.1 for the concept of evangelical holiness applies to early Social Christianity as well. What differed, initially at least, between the two movements was the emphasis each group gave to one particular consequence of

---

<sup>53</sup> Christopher H. Evans, ‘Historical Integrity and Theological Recovery: A Re-Introduction of the Social Gospel,’ in *The Social Gospel Today*, ed. Christopher H. Evans (KT: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001): 5.

<sup>54</sup> Marsden argues that the rejection by evangelicals of a socially progressive orthopraxy did not really commence until around 1900. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 91.

<sup>55</sup> Handy, *Social Gospel in America*, 6-7.

<sup>56</sup> White & Hopkins, *The Social Gospel*, 7.

sanctification over another, particularly as it related to how best to bring redemption to humanity. Thus, an appropriate conceptual definition of the Social Gospel movement, at least pre-WWI, is that it was an attempt by evangelicals to apply the redemptive teachings of Christianity to social structures rather than to primarily individuals.<sup>57</sup>

One particularly important tangible result of the Social Gospel Movement was the formation of the Federal Council of Churches (FCC) in 1908; an ecumenical council representing thirty denominations in America.<sup>58</sup> The formation of the Council was important for two reasons. Firstly, it represented the culmination of the social gospel forces towards establishing a recognised organisational headship.<sup>59</sup> Although the Council had several commissions, the Commission on Social Service was its first and was clearly defined around a progressive social gospel type of ideology, which gave the group its unifying energy.<sup>60</sup> Secondly, the Council's widespread representational nature made the social gospel a central issue within Protestant American Christianity at the turn of the century.<sup>61</sup>

Initially, the FCC had broad support within America's evangelical mindset, but as the Holiness Movement and the Social Gospel Movement moved into the early decades of the twentieth-century, differences of opinion over appropriate redemptive

---

<sup>57</sup> Chapter Three addresses changes in social gospel theology after WWI.

<sup>58</sup> Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 306.

<sup>59</sup> White and Hopkins argue that it was the tendency within social gospelism to emphasise action rather than belief that led to the founding of the FCC, and that the Council's most unifying element was its 'Social Creed of the Churches' rather than any specific theological statement. See White & Hopkins, *The Social Gospel*, xvi-xvii. See also, Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 302.

<sup>60</sup> Worth Tippy, 'The Church and Social Service: Social Work and the Federal Council of Churches', *The Journal of Social Forces*, vol. 1 no. 1 (November 1922): 36-38.

<sup>61</sup> Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 306-317.

methodologies turned into schism, particularly as modernism and fundamentalism became more normative of each respective group's thinking. Once more theological liberalism became more associated with the Social Gospel Movement and the FCC after WWI,<sup>62</sup> particularly as the movement became more shaped by a radical humanistic liberalism,<sup>63</sup> concerns arose among the adherents of the Holiness Movement that the evangelical emphasis on conversion in Christ was being disregarded.<sup>64</sup> In defence of a perceived orthodox position, increasingly militant patterns of thinking among conservative evangelicals further polarised already inherent tendencies within the Holiness Movement leading to a nearly wholesale rejection of socially-responsible programming by the movement in favour of evangelistic campaigns aimed at re-centralising the conversion experience.<sup>65</sup>

### *Modernism*

Starting in the mid nineteenth-century there was a marked shift in the development of the construction of knowledge. Evangelicals (who had dominated not just religious life up to this point, but also the social-political life of American society) had historically been mainly influenced by Scottish 'Common Sense Realism'.<sup>66</sup> This

---

<sup>62</sup> White and Hopkins, *The Social Gospel*, 248.

<sup>63</sup> Handy, *Social Gospel in America*, 7.

<sup>64</sup> The concerns expressed by evangelical Quakers regarding social gospel theology and the FCC will be discussed further in Chapter Three, as it relates to the case study herein.

<sup>65</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 86.

<sup>66</sup> Harriet A. Harris argues that the effect of Common Sense philosophy on Evangelical thinking is 'general rather than precise', but that it is frequently associated with evangelicalism. See Harriet A. Harris, *Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 95.

philosophical approach stressed the reliability of the principles of common sense, which were believed to be inherent in one's constitution, and which acted as the first principles of knowledge,<sup>67</sup> allowing humanity to know the real world directly.<sup>68</sup> Armed with this type of reasoning, an evangelical's method of constructing truth, which was not at all incongruent with that of the general population of America,<sup>69</sup> was, therefore, more rational and empirical, yet it was entirely based on the premise of a divine ordering of the natural world, an ordering that could be explicitly known by humanity.

In contrast, a different way to consider truth emerged in the nineteenth-century which emphasised that all perceived facts were based entirely on context and observer bias. Thus, for these new modern philosophers, truth was provisional, because once an event had past, there could be no direct access to it and any account, arrived at from a collection of the perceived facts, never coincided exactly with the actual event.<sup>70</sup> Nowhere did this new way of thinking come to impact evangelical thought more than in relation to biblical scholarship. These modern methods became epitomised by the German model of higher criticism, which sought to validate scriptures with external evidence, contextualise truths in first-century Judaism and willingly used modern philosophies not based on traditional doctrines.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Harris, *Fundamentalism*, 99.

<sup>68</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism*, 14.

<sup>69</sup> Marsden argues that Common Sense philosophy dominated the type of philosophy taught in American colleges during the first half of the nineteenth-century and was marvelously well suited to the prevailing ideas in American society of the time. See Marsden, *Fundamentalism*, 14.

<sup>70</sup> Dennis Nineham, 'Higher Criticism', in *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*, Alan Richardson and John Bowden, ed. (London, SCM Press, 1983): 255-256.

<sup>71</sup> J.W. Rogerson, 'Higher Criticism', in *The Oxford Companion to Christian Thought*, Adrian Hastings, Alistair Mason and Hugh Pyper, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2000): 297-298.

Eventually, this phenomenological approach to scriptural analysis became understood within the church as one of the main components of modernism.<sup>72</sup> Absolute dogmas and supernatural causes failed to satisfy the questions modernists asked of the Bible and, instead, the modernist's mind sought answers from a mix of experience and ideas rather than scriptural truths. Adherents of social gospelism found in modernism an intellectual construct consistent with their progressive theology, freed from the forms and individualistic tendencies of some conservative evangelical revivalists.<sup>73</sup> Bebbington points out that modernism within evangelicalism was primarily an attempt to 'translate traditional doctrines into a contemporary idiom'<sup>74</sup> and that the 'importance of German critical views by more advanced scholars did much to foster liberal Evangelicalism.'<sup>75</sup>

For the purposes of this work, the biblical scholarship of modernists is defined in this study as an intellectual approach rather than as a specific movement. Rather than establishing a new theology, creed or dogma more common of movements; modernism is better characterised as a way of thinking that classified truth as provisional, facts as predominantly shaped by the context of their natural setting and conclusions as conditioned by the perspective of the researcher. This concept of modernism as a means of truth construction is supported by Edwin Aubrey, who claimed, '[m]odernism is a

---

<sup>72</sup> Although the term modernism has been generally adopted across religious traditions, it was first used in the Roman Catholic church to 'refer to a school of Roman Catholic theologians operating towards the end of the nineteenth century, which adopted a critical and skeptical attitude towards traditional Christian dogmas, fostered a positive attitude towards radical biblical criticism, and stressed the ethical, rather than the more theological, dimensions of faith.' See Alister E. McGrath, 'Modernism,' in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Modern Christian Thought*, Alister E. McGrath, ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1993): 383.

<sup>73</sup> Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 18, 63-64.

<sup>74</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 182.

<sup>75</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 184.

method, not a creed.’<sup>76</sup> Aubrey clarified that the method of the modernist is primarily ‘historical’ and ‘constructive’<sup>77</sup> attempting to recapture ‘the human experience out of which the classic doctrines of Christian thought arose.’<sup>78</sup> Modernists do not seek theological absolutes, but rather, according to Aubrey, the modernist ‘reserves the right to reformulate his position as new knowledge comes within his ken.’<sup>79</sup>

Although modernism threatened much of traditional evangelical thought and practice towards the end of the nineteenth-century, modernist intellectual methods in themselves did not automatically preclude evangelical theology. Since Bebbington’s definition of biblicism is not tied to literalism or inerrancy, but is about various allowances of scriptural inspirations within the evangelical continuum,<sup>80</sup> some Christian modernists could still be entirely consistent within the quadrilateral and use the philosophical methods of criticism. Rather than either/or, we can classify those religious individuals who held modernist leanings into two distinct categories: evangelical modernists and theologically liberal modernists. Evangelical modernists embraced the classic tenets of orthodox Christianity, but recognised the value of the new sciences and aspects of the historical-critical methods of biblical analysis. James Orr’s article ‘Science and Christian Faith’ (published in *The Fundamentals*) is a good example of an evangelical embracing modernity:

---

<sup>76</sup> Edwin Ewart Aubrey, ‘What is Modernism?’, *The Journal of Religion*, vol. 15, no. 4 (October 1935): 427.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>79</sup> Aubrey, ‘What is Modernism?’, 429.

<sup>80</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 13-14.

What is the general relation of the Bible to science? How does it claim to relate itself to the advances of general knowledge? Here, it is feared, mistakes are often made on both sides – on the side of science in affirming contrariety of the Bible with scientific results where none really exists; on the side of believers in demanding that the Bible be taken as a textbook of the newest scientific discoveries... The Bible clearly does not profess to anticipate the scientific discoveries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Its design is very different; namely, to reveal God and His will and His purpose of grace to men.<sup>81</sup>

On the other hand, theologically liberal modernists held more pluralistic views of religion and valued a range of source material alongside scripture.<sup>82</sup> Harry Emerson Fosdick's famous sermon 'Shall the Fundamentalists Win?' provides a good example of this form of modernism:

To believe in virgin birth as an explanation of great personality is one of the familiar ways in which the ancient world was accustomed to account for unusual superiority. Many people suppose that only once in history do we run across a record of supernatural birth. Upon the contrary, stories of miraculous generation are among the common traditions in antiquity. According to the records of their faiths, Buddha and Zoroaster and Lao-Tzu and Mahavira were all supernaturally born... that is to say, when a personality arose so high that men adored him, the ancient world attributed his superiority to some special divine influence in his generation, and they commonly phrased their faith in terms of miraculous birth.<sup>83</sup>

This study does not include this second group (theologically liberal modernists) within the evangelical umbrella because they generally fail to fit at least one of the standards in Bebbington's Quadrilateral.

---

<sup>81</sup> James Orr, 'Science and Christian Faith', in *The Fundamentals: The Famous Sourcebook of Foundational Christian Truth*, ed. R. A. Torrey, updated by Charles L. Feinberg (MI: Kregel Publications, 1990): 130.

<sup>82</sup> Although not so much part of this research, a third group called secular modernists could also be added to describe those non-religious individuals who embraced modernist ideology.

<sup>83</sup> Harry Emerson Fosdick, 'Shall the Fundamentalists Win?' A sermon originally delivered June 10, 1922. Reprinted in part in *Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism: A Documentary Reader*, ed. Barry Hankin (NY: New York University Press, 2008): 53.



At the beginning of the twentieth-century, neither category of modernism was considered doctrinally sound by a budding faction of conservative evangelical traditionalists (many of whom came from Holiness Movements) who rejected modernism, in any form, as apostate and instead embraced both orthodoxy and Biblical literalism.<sup>84</sup> The eventual schism between modernism and what became known as fundamentalism within the Religious Society of Friends is highlighted in this case study.

### *Fundamentalism*

At the turn of the twentieth-century a conservative group of evangelical Protestants both in the church and in academia sought to renew the ways of looking at the Bible that existed before the perceived growing modernist apostasy.<sup>85</sup> This group was already a component of the broad evangelical coalition, but with changing social factors and an increase in theological liberalisation due to theologically liberal modernists, this conservative evangelical wing grew stronger at the beginning of the twentieth-century. Between 1910 and 1915 a series of twelve volumes, called *The Fundamentals*, was published attempting to revive traditional orthodoxy in Christianity.<sup>86</sup> The series was

---

<sup>84</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 102-103.

<sup>85</sup> While there is no consensus among scholars as to the inception or conclusion of fundamentalism as a force within evangelicalism, most concur that during the first two decades of the twentieth-century and even more so immediately following the Great War, the reactionary defence of fundamentalism against modernism became far more militant and aggressive. See George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1980), 141; See also, Stewart Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism* (CT: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1931), 52-53; Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (MI: Baker Book House, 1970, reprinted 1978), xiii – xvii.

<sup>86</sup> Harris, *Fundamentalism*, 26.

more pastoral than academic<sup>87</sup> and contained little of the future belligerence of fundamentalism in the 1920s, but offered a basic framework in which to understand Christianity through traditional evangelical positions and in contrast to modernism, particularly higher-criticism.<sup>88</sup> The formal organisation of anti-modernist crusades followed soon thereafter. In 1918, fundamentalist leader William B. Riley (1861-1947) founded the paper *Christian Fundamentals in School and Church*.<sup>89</sup> In 1919, the World's Christian Fundamentals Association was formed<sup>90</sup> and is credited, by Harriet A. Harris, with being the first organisation with fundamental in its name, albeit not entirely representative of the movement.<sup>91</sup> In 1920, at the Northern Baptist Convention, several conservative evangelicals formed the General Conference on Fundamentals.<sup>92</sup>

Although modernism and what was now calling itself fundamentalism experienced extreme animosity at times prior to WWI, the two groups generally embraced a sort of tolerant discord with respect to each other in order to maintain evangelical and denominational unity. After the First World War, this changed. George Marsden claims:

Between 1917 and the early 1920s American conservative evangelicals underwent a dramatic transformation. In 1917 they were still part of the evangelical coalition that had been dominant in America for a century.

---

<sup>87</sup> Harris, *Fundamentalism*, 27.

<sup>88</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 118-123.

<sup>89</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 160.

<sup>90</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 152.

<sup>91</sup> Harris, *Fundamentalism*, 28-29. Marsden also confirms that, while pre-millennialists played a significant role in shaping some of the fundamentalist worldview, particularly in relation to the movement's cultural pessimism, the dispensational movement was only a 'small group' within the larger fundamentalist sphere. See Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 125.

<sup>92</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 159.

Some theological conservatives, premillennialists, and revivalists were often warning against the modern tendencies of their liberal, post-millennial, or Social Gospel opponents; but all of these groups operated within the same denomination and interdenominational agencies, and at times still cooperated... After 1920 conservative evangelical councils were dominated by ‘fundamentalists’ engaged in holy warfare to drive the scourge of modernism out of church and culture.<sup>93</sup>

Bebbington adds:

The unity of Evangelicalism was broken during the 1920s. The movement had always been marked by variety in doctrine, attitude and social composition, but in the years after the First World War it became so sharply divided that some members of one party did not recognise the other party as Evangelical – or even, sometimes, as Christian.<sup>94</sup>

Marsden claims that it was this push against what this study identifies as theologically liberal modernism that gave impetus to a militant fundamentalist attitude in the 1920s and that, if there was any one theme that tied together all the diverse fundamentalist threads in America, it would be that it was an anti-modernism movement at its core.<sup>95</sup>

However, Marsden also argues that a second influence in the development of fundamentalism as a social and political factor was the societal upheaval following the Great War. Marsden writes:

An overwhelming atmosphere of crisis gripped America during the immediate postwar period. The year 1919 especially was characterized by a series of real as well as imagined terrors. The disruption caused by massive demobilization and post-war economic adjustments was compounded by a number of acrimonious labor disputes and strikes and by a series of terrorist bombings. There was alarm over rapidly deteriorating moral standards and a deep suspicion of foreign influences... Premillennialists shared with many conservative Americans the conviction that the moral foundations of the nation were rapidly crumbling.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 141.

<sup>94</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, 181.

<sup>95</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 4.

<sup>96</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 153.

Thus, in addition to anti-modernism, there is also a strong anti-world element to fundamentalism. From strict behavioural mores against the backdrop of the roaring twenties<sup>97</sup> to a steady decline in socially-responsible programmes,<sup>98</sup> fundamentalists set themselves apart from the norms of the society.

Fundamentalism became a common expression of evangelical Protestantism, juxtaposed against modernism, during the 1920s – a time now regarded by historians as the era of the fundamentalist-modernist controversies.<sup>99</sup> At no point, however, does one see the fundamentalists really alter the basic theological points emphasised by Bebbington. Fundamentalism, then, is best described in terms of its emphasis on evangelical protectionism, attempting to harbor their perceived truth against both the perceived growing threat of modernism and the perceived moral decline of society. Rather than seen fundamentalists as trying to push a new evangelical theology, according to Bebbington, fundamentalists are best seen as ‘the champions of fundamental Christian orthodoxies’.<sup>100</sup> Bebbington sees the fundamentalists of the 1920s, in particular, as ‘a group so fanatically committed to its religion that it lashes out against opponents in

---

<sup>97</sup> Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1997), 58.

<sup>98</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 91.

<sup>99</sup> Harris, *Fundamentalism*, 29-32; Barry Hanks, *Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism: A Documentary Reader* (NY: New York University Press, 2008), 39; Joel A. Carpenter, ‘Editor’s Note’, in *Fundamentalist versus Modernist*, ed. Joel A. Carpenter (NY: Garland Publishing Inc. 1988), not paginated. Sandeen has argued effectively, though, that it is important to be mindful of the distinction between the fundamentalist movement as whole, and the fundamentalist controversies of the 1920s, see Sandeen, *Roots of Fundamentalism*, xiii.

<sup>100</sup> Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 276.

mindless denunciation.’<sup>101</sup> Or, as Marsden says of this same era, ‘A fundamentalist is an evangelical who is angry about something.’<sup>102</sup>

Rather than seeing fundamentalism as a unique theological approach, Gerald R. McDermott has identified eight key components of evangelical fundamentalist thinking:<sup>103</sup>

1. Interpretation of Scripture. Fundamentalists tended to read Scripture more literally.<sup>104</sup> They held the Bible in high reverence and as utterly factual and they believed that all doctrinal truth could be garnered from this source, as opposed to any idea that Scripture needed to be interpreted and contextualised. Although literalism could be portrayed as a theological trait of fundamentalism, it is more helpful to see it as a hermeneutical tool used by fundamentalists to establish an inerrant source of truth to wield in opposition to modernist thinking. In agreement with this, James Barr says:

In other words, fundamentalism is based on a particular kind of religious tradition, and uses the form, rather than reality, of biblical authority to provide a shield for its tradition.<sup>105</sup>

Fundamentalists, then, can be seen as using biblical literalism as a means of protection against the inroads made by higher criticism.

---

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>102</sup> Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism*, 1.

<sup>103</sup> Gerald R. McDermott, ‘Introduction’, to *The Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, ed. Gerald R. McDermott, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010), 6-7.

<sup>104</sup> McDermott, *Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, 6.

<sup>105</sup> James Barr, *Fundamentalism* (London, SCM Press Ltd, 1977), 15. James Barr and Harriet Harris have argued that literalism in some form is such an integrated part of an evangelical biblical hermeneutic that there can be no separation between evangelicals and fundamentalists. While the argument has merit worth discussing further in terms of Bebbington’s biblicism, it fails to address the fundamentalist worldview of separatism and lack of social responsibility, which were not necessarily indicative of all evangelicals. See Barr, *Fundamentalism*, 1-10 and Harris, *Fundamentalism*, 7-9.

2. World-Rejecting.<sup>106</sup> Fundamentalists questioned the value of human activity not initiated by Christians.<sup>107</sup> Generally, the world was viewed with pessimism, with emphasis on the pervasive effects of the Fall on human nature.<sup>108</sup> Bradley J. Longfield points out that, in the 1920s in particular, fundamentalists were responding to a heightened perception of widespread moral degeneracy in the world at that time:

In the wake of World War I growing labor tensions, bombings, and the Russian Revolution spurred a fanatical fear of Bolshevism. Moreover, the war accelerated the secularization of America and precipitated a ‘revolution in morals.’ Jazz became popular, women smoked, sex was openly discussed, the Charleston dominated the dance floor, and the divorce rate skyrocketed.<sup>109</sup>

The Bible School Movement among Protestants, then, became an important shelter for fundamentalists to flock to as they increasingly came to reject the modern intellectual pursuits of mainstream civilization, which fundamentalists perceived was increasingly a part of what Noll describes as the secularisation of higher education in the latter half of the nineteenth-century.<sup>110</sup> Thus, the world-

---

<sup>106</sup> McDermott uses culture-rejecting here rather than world-rejecting. I have altered it to world-rejecting to more aptly describe the idea that fundamentalists were not anti-culture per se, in that they did not reject the sociological concept of culture – those traditions, practices and heritage that give meaning to a given group of people – but that fundamentalists were anti-world, in the broad theological sense. They rejected the current realm as fallen and clearly separated from God’s intended designs. Although McDermott uses a different phrase, his description is consistent with the idea of world-rejecting present herein. World-Rejecting is further defined below. See Chapter One, footnote 111.

<sup>107</sup> McDermott, *Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, 6.

<sup>108</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 136.

<sup>109</sup> Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy, Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1991), 5.

<sup>110</sup> Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1994), 111-112.

rejecting position of fundamentalism,<sup>111</sup> particularly in those post-War years, is tied to fundamentalists' perception of widespread moral decline and the increase of secularism – of both of which they accused modernism of being a source.

3. Social Action. Fundamentalists often considered social action to be a sign of liberal theology.<sup>112</sup> As theologically liberal modernism became more associated with the Social Gospel Movement in the early decades of the twentieth-century, fundamentalism shifted almost completely away from social engagement.<sup>113</sup> Marsden argues that, 'The "Great Reversal" took place from about 1900 to about 1930, when all progressive social concern, whether political or private, became suspect among revivalist evangelicals and was relegated to a very minor role.'<sup>114</sup> While nothing inherent in social programming was threatening to fundamentalists, it was crucial to them that social gospel Christianity be understood as complementary to, and a compulsory outgrowth of, the

---

<sup>111</sup> Roy Wallis first used this term in his 1984 work *The Elementary Forms of the New Religious Life*. Wallis describes 'world-rejecting' religious movements as having a 'clear concept of God as at the same time a personal entity but yet radically distinct from man and prescribing a clear and uncompromising set of moral demands... The world-rejecting movement views the prevailing social order as having departed substantially from God's prescriptions and plan. Mankind has lost touch with God and spiritual things, and, in the pursuit of purely material interests, has succeeded in creating a polluted environment; a vice-ridden society in which individuals treat each other purely as means rather than as ends; a world filled with conflict, greed, insincerity and despair.' With the exception of his suggestion that world-rejecting movements also encourage a 'return to a more rural way of life', Wallis' description of world-rejecting religion aptly applies to 1920s fundamentalists' perception of the world. See Roy Wallis, *The Elementary Forms of the New Religious Life* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul plc, 1984), 9-10.

<sup>112</sup> McDermott, *Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, 6.

<sup>113</sup> Joel A. Carpenter argues that fundamentalists had criticised the Social Gospel Movement early on as being comprised of possibly altruistic, but mistaken, ministers who were trying to institute God's kingdom on earth through Christian socialism. By the 1930s, fundamentalists viewed the State (primarily the Roosevelt Administration) as complicit in the reincarnation of a social gospel and trying to end religious freedom. As a whole, Carpenter argues that the fundamentalist movement almost totally abandoned social and political reform efforts. See Joel Carpenter, 'Introduction' to *Fighting Fundamentalism: Polemic Thrusts of the 1930s and 1940s*, ed. Joel A. Carpenter (NY: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1988), not paginated.

<sup>114</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 86.

regenerating work of Christ.<sup>115</sup> The primary (if not only) expression of social engagement within the fundamentalist movement during that period was evangelism – rescuing the perishing from a liberal world.

4. Separatism. Fundamentalists preached that Christians should separate themselves from liberal Christians and even from conservatives who fellowshiped with liberals.<sup>116</sup> The formation of fundamentalist organisations became a means by which they excluded others from fellowship, including those who shared evangelical convictions, but were not separatists. Such separatism took place between conservative evangelicals and theologically liberal modernists, but equally so, intra-denominationally, between evangelical separatists (fundamentalists) and evangelical-modernists who refused to separate from perceived apostate churches. Adrio König refers to this fundamentalist tendency as ‘double-separation’;<sup>117</sup> a phenomenon revealed in this particular case study.

5. Dialogue with liberals. Fundamentalists tended to believe that liberal Christians had nothing to teach them and there was no point in trying to talk to them.<sup>118</sup> Marsden argues that, part of the reason for the birth of what he calls the ‘militant fundamentalist’ after 1920, was that a far more aggressive and radical form of theological liberalism had developed<sup>119</sup> and fundamentalism was a

---

<sup>115</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 91.

<sup>116</sup> McDermott, *Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, 7.

<sup>117</sup> König, ‘Evangelical Theology’, 105.

<sup>118</sup> McDermott, *Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, 7.



response to the spread of this perceived false doctrine.<sup>120</sup> Thus, belligerent anti-modernism campaigns became a hallmark of the fundamentalist movement as they rejected association both with theologically liberal modernists and with evangelical modernists. Fundamentalists, however, perceived their methods to be justified in light of the perceived disregard, particularly toward Biblical authority, modernists as a whole seemed to show.

6. The ethos of Christian faith. While most fundamentalists preached salvation by grace, they also tended to focus on rules and restrictions.<sup>121</sup> Moral standards like chastity, abstinence and avoiding the theatre were worn like a badge of orthodoxy by fundamentalists.<sup>122</sup> Sumptuary laws became a means to legislate outward moral conformity. Carpenter argues that fundamentalists viewed themselves as a people set apart for a greater cause.<sup>123</sup> In keeping themselves pure of cultural evils, fundamentalists saw in themselves the embodiment of a holy remnant.<sup>124</sup> As heirs of the Holiness Movement, fundamentalists were inherently susceptible to this line of thinking. With an elevated emphasis on a personal conversion experience, a precise moment of instant sanctification, a demonstrable life of holiness and Christian perfection, there was already a strain of separatism

---

<sup>119</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 141.

<sup>120</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 159.

<sup>121</sup> McDermott, *Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, 7.

<sup>122</sup> Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1997), 57-58.

<sup>123</sup> Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 57.

<sup>124</sup> George Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicals* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 6.

and a loose system of religious codification within the evangelical holiness faction prior to 1920.

7. Fissiparousness. For fundamentalists, differences in doctrine, even on rather minor issues, were considered important enough to warrant starting a new congregation or new denomination.<sup>125</sup> Fundamentalists held that they served an important role in witnessing against the growing liberalisation of mainstream Protestant churches and that their witness could only be heard as a ‘voice of one calling in the wilderness’<sup>126</sup> and only if they separated from the perceived apostasy.<sup>127</sup> Thus, one of the consequences of fundamentalist thinking on evangelicalism, which will be revealed in this case study, is that intra-denominational schism among Friends was often the result of a quick decision to separate and a refusal to engage in dialogue with those who held what were perceived to be differing viewpoints. This pattern parallels that which other scholars have already established as being consistent within other denominations.<sup>128</sup>

8. Support of Israel. Fundamentalists tended to see the modern state of Israel as the direct fulfilment of biblical prophecy. Since McDermott ties this trait (Support for Israel) directly to fundamentalists’ view regarding the ‘modern state of Israel’ and it is really more a characteristic of post mid-twentieth-century

---

<sup>125</sup> McDermott, *Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, 7.

<sup>126</sup> Matthew 3:3. Usually understood as referring to John the Baptist and his role to ‘prepare the way’ for the coming of Jesus.

<sup>127</sup> Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, 6.

<sup>128</sup> Discussed more in Chapter Five.

fundamentalism, following the move of Israel to statehood in 1948 (a time following the period of this study), this attribute will not be discussed further as part of this work. Also, no evidence of Zionism is found in the case-study in the 1920s and 1930s.

Since McDermott's model emphasises the content and practice of fundamentalism, it allows for researchers to unravel the unique thread of fundamentalist thought, while simultaneously keeping fundamentalists located within the larger evangelical theology. This study, then, uses McDermott's first seven categories to establish within the case study the existence of fundamentalism as a normative corporate way of thinking, which came to dominance within a squarely theologically evangelical Yearly Meeting.

### *Neo-evangelicalism*

The dominance of fundamentalism as a definitive force within the American popular and religious life was short lived. By the end of the 1920s, fundamentalism was already being marginalised in the popular press as an extreme wing of theologically militant conservatives and obscurantists, particularly after the national media embarrassed William Jennings Bryan and the fundamentalists' role in defending creationism in the Scopes Trials of 1925.<sup>129</sup> By the 1930s, the WCFA's membership was

---

<sup>129</sup> In 1925, public school biology teacher John Scopes taught Darwinism in his classroom, in clear (and intentional) violation of Tennessee's anti-evolution state law of the time. The trial was much ballyhooed around the nation as a battle between rural small town conservative values and modern science of the day. Although Scopes lost the trial, the fundamentalist defence of creationism was so caricatured and marginalised in the popular press as obscurant and backward, that many scholars mark this single event as the beginning of the end for fundamentalism's ability to be a normative force in Protestant America. See Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 184-195.

declining significantly.<sup>130</sup> What was left of fundamentalism in the 1930s and 1940s became far more sectarian.<sup>131</sup> Usage of the term fell from favour.<sup>132</sup> In 1929, Pulitzer Prize winning American journalist, Walter Lippman, published a scathing review of what he perceived to be the fundamentalist attitude by that time:

In actual practice, this movement [fundamentalism] has become entangled with all sorts of bizarre and barbarous agitations with the Ku Klux Klan, with the fanatical prohibition, with the 'anti-evolution laws' and with much persecution and intolerance..... [This] shows that the central truth, which the fundamentalists have grasped, no longer appeals to the best brains and the good sense of the modern community, and that the movement is recruited largely from the isolated, the inexperienced, and the uneducated.<sup>133</sup>

Marsden points out:

Before 1925 the movement had commanded much respect, though no outstanding support, but after the summer of 1925 the voices of ridicule were raised so loudly that many moderate Protestant conservatives quietly dropped support of the cause rather than be embarrassed by association.<sup>134</sup>

This is not to say that fundamentalist thinking within evangelicalism completely disappeared. In 1941, the American Council of Churches was set up by exclusivist fundamentalists as a 'militantly pro-Gospel and anti-modernist' agency to counteract the Federal (now National) Council of Churches, but it never experienced much broad scale

---

<sup>130</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 193.

<sup>131</sup> Joel Carpenter argues that, particularly in the 1930s, as 'fundamentalism became increasingly discredited as a public voice to be taken seriously' it was also 'becoming more of an independent, sectarian movement.' Joel A. Carpenter, 'Introduction', in *Fighting Fundamentalism: Polemic Thrusts of the 1930s and 1940s*, ed. Joel A. Carpenter (NY: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1988), not paginated.

<sup>132</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 191.

<sup>133</sup> Walter Lippman, *A Preface to Morals* (New York: The McMillan Company, 1929), 31.

<sup>134</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 191.

success in a way that captured the evangelical mindset as before.<sup>135</sup> Evangelicals were leaning toward an inclusive and positive Christian message compared to their fundamentalist predecessors.<sup>136</sup> By the 1940s, after a long season of internal evangelical identity-uncertainty and continuing conflict between evangelical separatists and evangelical non-separatists, a group of new evangelicals (neo-evangelicals) distanced themselves from fundamentalist thinking.<sup>137</sup> Marsden argues that:

Within this movement [fundamentalism] there grew a mood of self-criticism, at first referred to as 'neo-evangelicalism,' which in the middle decades of the [twentieth] century made possible some distancing of this branch of the evangelical movement from hard-line fundamentalism.<sup>138</sup>

In 1942, the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) was formed in America by a group of less militant evangelical conservatives who sought to distance themselves from the perceived embarrassment of fundamentalism and to discontinue the tendency of fundamentalists towards insularity and separatism. From the 1950s onwards, neo-evangelicals in America stopped identifying themselves in terms of their protest to fundamentalism and, instead, found internal identity-forming constructs. Unofficially, Billy Graham became their national spokesman. New schools of evangelical thought, like Fuller Theological Seminary (whose first President, Harold Ockenga, had also founded the NAE), became their centres for academia<sup>139</sup> and new periodicals like *Christianity Today* became their organs.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (Paris: Mouton and Co. 1963), 23-26.

<sup>136</sup> Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement*, 26.

<sup>137</sup> König, 'Evangelical Theology,' 91.

<sup>138</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 228.

Although the social views of these new evangelicals remained staunchly conservative, they ‘desired to bring the gospel they preached into creative contact with American society.’<sup>141</sup> They did not, however, differ theologically from the standard tenets of evangelicalism, as defined by Bebbington, and can, therefore, be defined theologically in terms of the quadrilateral (activism, crucicentrism, conversionism, biblicism). In fact, neo-evangelical leaders, sometimes calling themselves ‘neo-fundamentalist’, often praised the conservative supernatural theology, which they perceived fundamentalism had preserved against the inroads of theologically liberal modernism, and they made pointed efforts to align themselves clearly with this same supernatural evangelical theology.<sup>142</sup> Harold Ockenga announced proudly that, ‘Evangelical theology is synonymous with fundamentalism or orthodoxy. In doctrine, evangelicals and the fundamentalists are one.’<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Fuller Theological Seminary was founded in 1947 by Charles Fuller, with Harold Ockenga serving as the first President. The impetus for the founding of the seminary can be found primarily in two impulses. The first was the desire by a growing group of evangelicals to transform the world into a Christian civilisation through intellectual reform. Towards this end, the institution sought to hire the brightest evangelical minds of the day as staff. And the second was to discontinue the fundamentalist world rejecting separatist tendency and, instead, to provide a means for orthodox faith and modern intellect to interact. For a more detailed history of the founding of Fuller Theological Seminary see George Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicals* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987).

<sup>140</sup> König, ‘Evangelical Theology,’ 91.

<sup>141</sup> König, ‘Evangelical Theology,’ 91.

<sup>142</sup> Rolland D. McCune, ‘The Formation of the New Evangelicalism (Part Two): Historical Beginnings,’ *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* vol. 4 (Fall, 1999), 110.

<sup>143</sup> Harold John Ockenga, ‘Resurgent Evangelical Leadership,’ in *Christianity Today Reader*, ed Frank E. Gaebelstein (NY: Meredith Press, 1966), 136.

In providing a broad definition of neo-evangelicalism, then, this author has identified five key attributes in order to differentiate neo-evangelical thinking from fundamentalist thinking within the larger evangelical umbrella. They are as follows:

1. Engagement without accommodation. Although the neo-evangelicals sought to maintain a similar supernatural theology as fundamentalists, they also sought answers as to how better to engage the world with a positive message of Christianity, rather than needing to separate from it. Harold Ockenga argued:

It is impossible to shut the Jesus of pity, healing, service, and human interest from a Biblical theology. The higher morality of redemption does not invalidate moral consistency... A Christian world- and life-view embracing world questions, societal needs, personal education ought to arise out of Matt. 28:18-21 as much as evangelism does. Culture depends on such a view, and Fundamentalism is prodigally dissipating the Christian culture accretion of centuries, a serious sin.<sup>144</sup>

This said, neo-evangelicals continued to claim that theological liberals and secularists had lost the core of their message, which was perceived by neo-evangelicals as still needing to be rooted in a ‘higher morality’. Thus, neo-evangelicals attempted to engage with the world without affirming it or accommodating it, as they perceived liberal theologians had done.<sup>145</sup> They tried to balance themselves between the perceived secularism of liberalism

---

<sup>144</sup> Harold Ockenga, ‘Introduction’, in Carl Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* (MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), 13-14.

<sup>145</sup> In addition to ‘world-rejecting’, Wallis describes two other categories of religious movements: ‘world-affirming’ and ‘world- accommodating’. Neither category, as Wallis defines them, encapsulates, however, the way neo-evangelicals related to the world. Wallis sees ‘world-affirming’ as those religious movements that view the ‘prevailing social order less contemptuously, seeing it as possessing many highly desirable characteristics. Mankind, too, is not so much reprobate as needlessly restricted, containing within itself enormous potential power... Movements of this kind tend to possess a more secularized and individual conception of the divine.’ Wallis then sees the ‘world-accommodating’ religious movements as those movements which construe religion primarily as a place for ‘solace or stimulation to personal, interior life’, and the religious activities of these movements are more ‘leisure-time commitments’. Since neither category describes the way neo-evangelicals were willing to engage with the world, but neither accommodate nor affirm it, I have elected not to use Wallis’ academic classification system for religious

and the perceived separatism of fundamentalism, as they sought to be in-the-world, but not of-the world. Engagement, then, was not in itself the goal for neo-evangelicals. Rather, they sought engagement in the hope that, in risking contamination by contact with society, they might have better success in changing the world into a Christian civilisation than separatist fundamentalists did.<sup>146</sup>

2. Decreased emphasis on biblical literalism. Neo-evangelicalism brought a corrective to fundamentalist biblicism. While fundamentalism embraced literalism and inerrancy, resting firmly on the claim that the Bible was a reliable source of all truth, neo-evangelicalism maintained a high reverence for the study of Scripture and emphasised its spiritual truth over that of its historical or scientific reliability. Although neo-evangelicalism did not embrace the modernist methods of higher criticism, it did open the door to questions concerning the interpretation of inerrancy and inspiration in fundamentalism, which then opened the door to larger questions concerning biblical authority.<sup>147</sup> A development related to this shift in thinking was a far greater tolerance by neo-evangelicals of evangelical modernists, as long as they still held orthodox views. Theologically liberal modernists were still a rejected group among neo-evangelicals though,<sup>148</sup> and perceptions of orthodoxy proved an important ongoing dividing line long after the mid-twentieth-century within the evangelical umbrella.

---

movements with the exception of using his 'world-rejecting' ideology to describe one aspect of fundamentalism. For above quotes, see Wallis, *The Elementary Forms*, 20-39.

<sup>146</sup> Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, 7. See also McCune, 'Formation of New Evangelicals', 109-150.

<sup>147</sup> Robert M. Price, 'Neo-evangelicals and Scripture: A Forgotten Period of Ferment,' *Christian Scholars Review* vol. 15 no. 4 (1986): 318.



3. Gospel answers for the social issues of the day. Neo-evangelicals attacked the failure of fundamentalists to provide adequate solutions to any of the social problems of its day, short of expounding evangelism. Leading Fuller theologian and founding editor of *Christianity Today*, Carl Ferdinand Howard Henry, published two books in the 1940s (*The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* and *Remaking the Modern Mind*), which contained a withering attack on the lack of social responsibility among fundamentalists and calling fundamentalism the ‘modern priest and Levite, by-passing suffering humanity.’<sup>149</sup> Henry also wrote:

Today, Protestant Fundamentalism although heir-apparent to the supernaturalist gospel of the Biblical and Reformation minds, is a stranger, in its predominant spirit, to the vigorous social interest of its ideological forebears. Modern Fundamentalism does not explicitly sketch the social implications of its message for the non-Christian world; it does not challenge the injustices of the totalitarianisms, the secularisms of modern education, the evils of racial hatred, the wrongs of current labor-management relations, the inadequate bases of international dealings. It has ceased to challenge Caesar and Rome.<sup>150</sup>

Neo-evangelicals were not, however, revolutionary in practice when it came to their own social action. Robert Price accurately points out that neo-evangelicals were, ‘always very cautious, seldom taking costly or controversial positions.’<sup>151</sup> It is evident throughout this

---

<sup>148</sup> This is not to say that neo-evangelical leaders did not have increased dialogue and collaboration with theological liberals over and above that of their fundamentalist predecessors. Billy Graham outraged fundamentalists by including liberal theologians to assist with his crusades. But when it came to theological doctrine, neo-evangelicals, just like fundamentalists, still held essential Christian orthodoxy as a minimum standard for acceptable belief systems. Price points out that many neo-evangelicals made ‘little secret of the fact that dialogue [with liberal theologians] was a primary device for obtaining a more effective platform for apologetics.’ See Price, ‘Neo-evangelicals and Scripture’, 316.

<sup>149</sup> Carl F. H. Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), 17. For other listed title, see Carl F. H. Henry, *Remaking the Modern Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1946).

<sup>150</sup> Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience*, 44-45.

<sup>151</sup> Price, ‘Neo-evangelicals and Scripture’, 317.

study that examining the rhetoric regarding evangelical social responsibility, as much as observing the actual behaviours, is an effective barometer for differentiating fundamentalists from neo-evangelicals.

4. Intellectual consistency between faith and science. Neo-evangelicals no longer saw intellectual pursuits as exclusively limited to biblical staples. Rather, it became more important to neo-evangelicals to reconcile emerging science with their orthodox faith.<sup>152</sup> And, also, to recognise that in their search for truth, the Bible itself may not hold complete answers. At the same time, however, even the most moderate evangelical leaders, while not trying to sound fundamentalist, were increasingly alarmed at the secularisation of higher education in America in the early twentieth-century.<sup>153</sup> Thus, the founding of new institutions, such as Fuller, became an important enterprise for neo-evangelical attempts to bring a corrective both to the fundamentalist tendency towards biblical exclusivity and the growing control of academia by secularists.

5. Ecumenical collaboration across religious traditions. Unlike the rejection of non-separatist denominations by fundamentalists, neo-evangelicals worked within and across various religious traditions outside of evangelicalism and outside of Protestantism. While most fundamentalist organisations made separation a mandate for membership, the NAE did not, allowing for a broad spectrum of participants. Louis Gasper says:

---

<sup>152</sup> Fundamentalists were not anti-science per se. In fact they adopted a rather Baconian idea of inquiry, seeing science as needing to be grounded in facts. What was unique for fundamentalists then is that they embraced a viewpoint that the Bible was utterly factual, i.e., the basic unit from which all other scientific truth emerged. In contrast, according to fundamentalists, other ideas (such as evolution) were theories only grounded on a hypothesis. For a larger discussion of fundamentalism and science see Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 55-62.

<sup>153</sup> George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1994), 332.

The National Association of Evangelicals proposed to follow an inclusivist policy wherein its constituent members were not required to separate from denominations or churches affiliated with the Federal Council – a policy the American Council adamantly opposed. Furthermore, the National Association of Evangelicals was opposed to the American Council's vitriolic attack upon the Federal Council, because they thought it might be more harmful than beneficial. The two fundamentalist groups agreed doctrinally, but they were divided in method.<sup>154</sup>

Similarly, leading neo-evangelical spokesman, Billy Graham, showed willingness to dialogue with mainline Protestant and Catholic churches and to send new converts back to such churches for ongoing nurturing.<sup>155</sup> Thus, an increase in ecumenical collaboration was evident in neo-evangelical thinking.

This five-point typology for neo-evangelicalism is used throughout this work to differentiate the neo-evangelical impulses from the fundamentalist impulses within the case study. Once again, by focusing on the content and practice of a given evangelical sub-set (neo-evangelicals), the group's emphasis and thinking pattern within the evangelical umbrella can be identified effectively as compared to the emphasis and thinking patterns of fundamentalism. In analysing fundamentalists and neo-evangelicals using Bebbington's quadrilateral, the most marked difference between the two groups is found in how they express biblicism and activism respectively. On basic issues of orthodoxy, however, such as Christ's death and resurrection (crucicentrism) and the central role of salvation (conversionism), the two groups shared a common supernatural theology. Table 1.2 (page 47) portrays the aforementioned differences and similarities between the two groups.

---

<sup>154</sup> Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement*, 26.

<sup>155</sup> McDermott, *Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, 7.

**Table 1.2, Differentiating Fundamentalism and Neo-Evangelicalism**

<b>Evangelicalism</b>	<b>Fundamentalism</b>	<b>Neo-Evangelicalism</b>
<b>Biblicism</b>	The Bible is the complete source of God's inspired and inerrant truth and is understood without contextualisation or historical analysis. The Bible's claims are accurate in matters of historical, scientific and spiritual truths.	A high reverence for Scripture as God's truth for spiritual guidance. The Bible may not be entirely accurate in all matters related to science and history. Literary genre and context need to be examined.
<b>Activism</b>	Questioned the value of human activity not created by God. Behavioural mores used to protect the saved from contamination with the world. Activism limited to evangelism, saving the unregenerate from a corrupt world.	Made pointed attempts to bring a perceived Christ-like witness to bear on social and political issues, while maintaining orthodox beliefs. Activism seen as a means to create a Christian civilisation.
<b>Crucicentrism</b>	A strong supernatural atonement and reconciliation system based on Christ's death and resurrection	
<b>Conversionism</b>	An elevated emphasis on the need for personal conversion and God's gift of justification as a core principle in regeneration.	

While historians have generally applied the term ‘neo-evangelical’ to this mid twentieth-century group,<sup>156</sup> the new evangelicals did not think of themselves as having a new theology. Rather, the concept of a perceived evangelical re-birth – coupled with the rejection of fundamentalist thinking, particularly on issues of world engagement, biblical authority, social action, intellectual pursuits and ecumenical collaboration – is a more helpful way of understanding the thinking of this group in the context of the larger evangelical umbrella.

In conclusion, scholarship addressing other mainline denominations in America has already established a broad academic pattern for understanding the shift through holiness – fundamentalism – to neo-evangelicalism that occurred within American evangelicalism during the first half of the twentieth-century. This work does not attempt to alter this established pattern, only to use the same pattern as a helpful means to show a parallel process unfolding in the case study herein, a denominational sub-group not similarly analysed before. The similarities between this case study (Oregon Yearly Meeting 1919-1947) and the larger fundamentalist/neo-evangelical trends on a national level are clear.<sup>157</sup>

This work suggests that, prior to 1919, although Friends in Oregon were heavily influenced by the individualistic tendencies of the Holiness Movement and revivalism, they were also concerned with social-betterment, world-engagement, intellectual advancement and ecumenicalism. Yet by 1919, OYM (as a corporate whole, but not

---

<sup>156</sup> Marsden suggests that the term itself was not in use within the movement until Ockenga popularised it in 1957, although he had been using the term in connection to Fuller as much as a decade earlier. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, 3.

<sup>157</sup> See section entitled ‘Similarities and Differences to Broader Protestantism’ in Chapter Five.

unanimously) started to show traits evident of a systematic embrace of the fundamentalist attitude, as they separated themselves from both evangelical modernists and perceived theologically liberal modernists. During this time, there was a marked decline in social engagement outside of evangelism and an increase in insularity, anti-modernism campaigns and a pattern of denominational fissiparousness. After two decades of fundamentalist hegemony within OYM, by the 1940s, the Yearly Meeting was in the process of reshaping its identity along the lines of the emerging American Protestant neo-evangelicalism, including a correlative renewal of humanitarian behaviour, ecumenicalism and intra-denominational dialogue with evangelical modernists. This work concludes around the mid-twentieth-century point. To contextualise these shifts within broader Quaker history, a brief history of the Religious Society of Friends follows.

### **The Religious Society of Friends: A Brief History**

The Religious Society of Friends began in the middle of the seventeenth-century in England with George Fox (1624-1691) credited as its most influential early leader.<sup>158</sup> In 1647, Fox was a wandering twenty-three year old earnestly searching for spiritual truth from friends, family and various religious priests and others who espoused religious doctrine. After being given all sorts of advice which Fox deemed unhelpful,<sup>159</sup> he finally found the answer he was looking for from a perceived direct encounter with the divine.

---

<sup>158</sup> Wilmer A. Cooper, *A Living Faith: An Historical and Comparative Study of Quaker Beliefs* (IN, Friends United Press, 1990), 1; Pink Dandelion, *An Introduction to Quakerism* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007), 13-14; Hugh Barbour and William J. Frost. *The Quakers: Denominations in America* (CA, Greenwood Publishing Group, 1988), 25-27; Elbert Russell, *The History of Quakerism* (NY: The Macmillan Company, 1943), Chapter 2.

<sup>159</sup> Including blood-letting, getting married, smoking tobacco and singing Psalms. Fox, *Journal* 1643-1646 Chapter, p 6-9.

And when all my hope in them, and in all men was gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what to do; Then O! then, I heard a voice, which said, ‘There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition’: and when I heard it, my heart did leap for joy.<sup>160</sup>

Thus began the impetus for the Society’s inception, shaped by Fox’s initial transformative experience of direct divine revelation.<sup>161</sup>

The orthopraxy of the early Friends flowed from their belief in this inward life of faith. Rather than seeing the visible church as divine institution (‘temples made with hands’),<sup>162</sup> they met in simple meeting houses (or simply met in someone’s house). Services were unprogrammed[g], marked by expectant listening and inspired speaking;<sup>163</sup> Friends practiced spiritual realism – experiencing direct communion with God stripped of outward elements or third-party intermediates,<sup>164</sup> and they had local meetings[g] supported by itinerant preachers and local elders, rather than ministers ‘bred at Oxford or

---

<sup>160</sup> Fox, *Journal*, 13.

<sup>161</sup> For the next years Fox (and others) traveled through England on an itinerant public ministry primarily to Baptists, Separatists and Seekers. In 1652 Fox felt led to ‘go atop of’ Pendle Hill where he claimed he had a vision, ‘And the Lord let me see atop the hill in what places he had a great people.’ By 1654, Fox had gathered a sufficient following of convinced men and women that they traveled the country with the message of primitive Christianity revived. By 1655, ‘there was some fifty thousand Quaker converts to Christ’. See Fox, *Journal*, Chapters 1648, 1649, 1650 and 1651. On 1655 numerical reference see Arthur O. Roberts, *Through Flaming Sword: The Life and Legacy of George Fox* (OR: Barclay Press, 2008), 32.

The Friends then quickly began to spread their message of this inward return of Christ beyond England. From London to Ireland to Germany to the British colonies, Fox and other Friends traveled widely. In North America, Rhode Island and Barbados became two early strongholds by the mid-late 1650s. In 1681 Quaker convert William Penn (1644-1718) became the proprietor of Pennsylvania, with Penn attempting to establish the colony based on his perception of the Society’s benevolent and tolerant principles (*that of God in everyone*) as a ‘Holy Experiment’. By 1700, Quakers were the third largest denomination in the British colonies. See Dandelion, *Introduction*, 49; Jones, *Quakers in the American Colonies*, 418-422; and Thomas Hamm, ‘North America: United States,’ in *Historical Dictionary of the Friends (Quakers)* Margery Post Abott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion & John William Oliver Jr, ed. (MD: The Scarecrow Press Inc. 2003), 199.

<sup>162</sup> Fox, *Journal*, 11.

<sup>163</sup> Barbour and Frost. *The Quakers*, 39-40.

<sup>164</sup> Barbour and Frost. *The Quakers*, 63.

Cambridge'.<sup>165</sup> Early Quakers valued the Bible highly, but also embraced the idea that each person could receive their own direct and ongoing revelation from God. This 'Inward Light of Christ'[g] was considered by Friends to be a primary source of authority, though not contradictory in any way to Scripture.<sup>166</sup>

Throughout the eighteenth-century, a new generation of Friends embraced a more rigid orthopraxy as they institutionalised a Quaker dress code, took on unique idioms in their vocabulary, incorporated near mandatory silence in Meetings, practiced endogamy<sup>167</sup> and disowned members for military involvement.<sup>168</sup> Instead, Quakers strengthened Fox's idea of a 'hedge'<sup>169</sup> as a means to protect both the denomination and the individual from the world and from private evils. For the most part, Quaker life

---

<sup>165</sup> Fox, *Journal*, 10.

<sup>166</sup> Two statements from 1666 Quaker convert Robert Barclay (1648-1690), who wrote the first systematic theology for the Society, capture early Quaker thought on the relationship of Scripture to that of immediate revelation: 'Nevertheless, because they [Scriptures] are only a declaration of the fountain, and not the fountain itself, therefore they are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge. Nor yet the adequate primary rule of faith and manners.' And, 'because the Spirit of God is the fountain of all truth and sound reason, therefore we have well said, That *it* [immediate revelation] *cannot contradict either the testimony of the scripture, or right reason.*' For first quote see Robert Barclay, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity: Being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People Called Quakers*, Ninth edition (London: Printed for Thomas Tegg, 1825), 65. For second quote see same reference, page 60.

<sup>167</sup> Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 112-115.

<sup>168</sup> In 1756, Quakers in Philadelphia resigned en masse from their elected leadership positions in the Assembly. The primary motivation behind the Pennsylvania Assembly shift was that many elected Friends felt they could not honour the Society's Anti-War Testimony while serving as perceived agents of the crown gathering war taxes. As the colonies marched towards revolutionary war, hypocrisy on this issue became more difficult to reconcile and the few Friends left serving in local politics, ceased. See Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*, & Jones, *Quakers in American Colonies*, Chapter V – 475-494.

<sup>169</sup> This is a belief that religious practices, if followed in earnest and without fail, would help keep the Society protected from the evils of the world outside and from the evils within one's self. While for many the idea of a 'hedge' was sacrosanct, there was also an unavoidable element of religious codification within the society. Jack D. Marietta, in his work on eighteenth-century American Quakerism, has commented, 'Because of the reinvigoration of discipline, Friends who did not adhere to distinctive Quaker behavior were in trouble with the Society'. Jack D. Marietta, *The Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783* (PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), 56.



during the eighteenth-century became standardised and the Discipline[g] was tightly monitored by the elders: 'A Friend's life from birth until death took place under a maze of regulations.'<sup>170</sup> By the time the Friends approached 1800, 'the Society of Friends, not only in America but throughout the world, was remarkably compact in its population patterns and seemingly united on questions of theology.'<sup>171</sup>

In the nineteenth-century, particularly as many Friends in America emerged from the hedge and sought identification with the larger evangelical Protestant community, the intra-group fidelity within the Society failed. In the 1820s, Friends in the U.S. experienced a series of schisms. The first of these was over the teachings of American Friend, Elias Hicks (1748-1830), a prosperous farmer and traveling minister from New York. Hicks began to emphasise the personal workings of the Inward Light of Christ over the importance of the Holy Scriptures. Certainly, this was not foreign theology to Friends, who historically valued ongoing immediate revelation and direct communion, but Friends had increasingly made the Bible far more central in doctrinal development during the previous century. Hicks' most contentious teaching was his treatment of the supernatural tenets of the Christian narrative. He still valued and respected the historic Jesus Christ and the Bible as good models for living and believed in the virgin birth and the trinity.<sup>172</sup> However, he also, 'implicitly dismissed.... the Atonement, Original Sin, the existence of

---

<sup>170</sup> Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 95.

<sup>171</sup> Thomas Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 12. During the first two centuries of Quakerism only a few schisms took place and these were never significant in influencing the larger group of Friends. For example, the 'Free-Friends' elected to forego the Anti-War Testimony of the Quakers and fight during the American Revolutionary War, 1775-1783. See Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*, 153.

<sup>172</sup> Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 329. While Hicks believed in the virgin birth, he did not necessarily claim it to be an essential doctrinal belief, see Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 15-17.

the devil, and hell as a place rather than a condition.’<sup>173</sup> Hicks and his followers became known as Hicksite Friends.

The other body of Quakers in America and British Friends tried to silence Hicks<sup>174</sup> and accused him of Deism and Rationalism.<sup>175</sup> Hicks’ emphasis on Inward Light theology troubled the rising evangelical tide of Friends, who valued scriptural truth.<sup>176</sup> In response to the Hicksite branch, the main body of Quakers (Orthodox Friends, as they called themselves) focused more on a Bible-based Christianity. For them, the central emphasis of their religion was ‘Christ and his atoning sacrifice’.<sup>177</sup> They became theologically more similar to the form of evangelical Protestant Christianity seen in the rest of America, as they adopted evangelical tendencies.<sup>178</sup> At that time, however, there was still a sense among these Orthodox Friends of retaining Quaker peculiarities, such as unprogrammed (or silent) meetings for worship, plain dress and speech, the ministry of women and pacifism.<sup>179</sup> In the 1820s, it was left to each different Yearly Meeting in

---

<sup>173</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 16.

<sup>174</sup> Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 41.

<sup>175</sup> Dandelion, *Introduction*, 85.

<sup>176</sup> Rufus Jones says the Hicksite separation was the result of three events, each probably having to be in place to reach the confluence of crisis: 1) the Society never having established a clear theology on the relationship between the Inward Light and Scripture, 2) a time of evangelical renewal within the Society in which many members were leaning more toward embracing Biblical authority, and 3) the strong convictions with which Hicks presented his ideas particularly in contradiction to a strengthening Eldership group. See Jones, *Later Periods*, 456.

<sup>177</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 17.

<sup>178</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 20.

<sup>179</sup> Thomas Hamm, ‘Theoretical Reflections of a Skeptic about Theory’, in *The Creation of Quaker Theory; Insider Perspective*, ed. Pink Dandelion (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), 180.

America to decide how to handle the Hicksite/Orthodox controversy,<sup>180</sup> but, all told, the separations left Friends in America deeply divided, with probably 60% Orthodox and 40% Hicksite.<sup>181</sup>

While the Orthodox Friends were united in their indictment of the Hicksites, over the following two decades they underwent another schism. This tension was again over the relationship of Scripture to the Light, but also over the process of conviction[g]. Those Orthodox Friends, who continued to make Light theology paramount and who stressed steady conviction over quick conversion, became known as Conservative Friends.<sup>182</sup> Although the issues sound similar to the Hicksite separation, both groups perceived Hicksism to be Deist and/or Rationalist.

The larger group of Orthodox Friends began to further emphasise the role of Scripture for discerning God's will over that of the Inward Light of Christ; they preached instant justification by faith and thought of sanctification as a gradual process.<sup>183</sup> This new group of Friends became known as Gurneyite Friends, named after English Friend

---

<sup>180</sup> Philadelphia was first in 1827 when probably two thirds of the Hicksite membership set up an alternate Yearly Meeting within the same geographical confines and with the same name. In New York (where Hicks was a member) and in Baltimore, Hicksites were in the majority. In Ohio about half followed each option. In New England the majority was Orthodox. In Virginia and North Carolina they completely sided with the Orthodox. In Indiana there was an overwhelming Orthodox majority. See Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 42-43. Dandelion appears to have misread the data available on Indiana, claiming that it was 'a small division... with the Hicksites in the majority.' Dandelion, *Introduction*, 92.

<sup>181</sup> Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 43.

<sup>182</sup> Conservative Friends are sometimes also referred to as *plain Friends* for continuing to retain Quaker peculiarities in dress and speech long after they were discontinued by most of the rest of the Society. Also referred to as 'Wilburite Friends', named after New England Quaker minister, John Wilbur, 1774-1856. See Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 28-35.

<sup>183</sup> Although Hamm marks the teachings of this new group as the official beginning of evangelical Quakerism, (see Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 20), it is clear that earlier Quakers would still fall into Bebbington's definition of evangelical for their high view of Scripture, their emphasis on conviction, their social activism and for their Orthodox views on Jesus and the Atonement.

and evangelical, Joseph John Gurney (1788-1847).<sup>184</sup> Despite the theological disagreements, Gurneyite Friends retained unprogrammed meetings for worship. Similarly, we find no real decline among Gurneyite Friends in the historically high social ethics within the Society.<sup>185</sup> Like most of the rest of the evangelical community in America during the antebellum period, Gurneyites displayed progressive social agendas as the implicit expression of their faith in the world around them.

By the end of the 1840s, there was a tripartite division in the Religious Society of Friends in America: 'In some areas of North America there would be as many as three Yearly Meetings each claiming to be the inheritors of the Quaker tradition'.<sup>186</sup> Over the course of the remainder of the nineteenth-century, Gurneyite Friends experienced phenomenal growth (somewhat thanks to revivalism) and, overwhelmingly, came to

---

<sup>184</sup> Joseph John Gurney was born in Norwich to a Quaker banking dynasty (which later became Barclays Bank). Gurney, and his family, espoused a form of Quakerism that was far more in touch with the world and Protestant community around them than had been the situation among Friends prior to 1830. Gurney studied for two years with a dissenting tutor at Oxford and cultivated broad ecumenical relationships with the larger protestant community. After dedicating his life to service at the age of twenty-one, he became a powerful and dynamic preacher and thinker within the Society. In 1824, he published the first systematic theology of Friends since Barclay's *Apology*. In 1837, Gurney came to America for a three year tour and visit, which included meeting with the U.S. congress and president. See Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 20-22; Dandelion, *Introduction*, 95-99.

<sup>185</sup> Temperance, prison reform, pacifism and abolitionism were major social agendas within the Society during the nineteenth-century among Gurneyite Friends. See Dandelion, *Introduction*, 97, 102-104 and Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 161-162.

<sup>186</sup> Dandelion, *Introduction*, 80.

represent numerical hegemony within American Quakerism<sup>187</sup> (up to about 80,000 by the end of the nineteenth-century).<sup>188</sup>

This work focuses on the Gurneyite tradition of Friends. In the period immediately following the American Civil War, with revivalist teachings and practices growing in influence throughout Gurneyite Friends, a group of revivalist Quaker ministers, lead most notably by such Friends as David Updegraff (1830-1894), John Henry Douglas (1832-1919) and Dougan Clark (1828-1896), pushed the Society towards instant sanctification teachings and towards altering some of the traditionally viewed Quaker ecclesiastical methods.<sup>189</sup> According to Thomas Hamm, in the late nineteenth-century the, ‘Holiness movement among Friends fueled the revival, obliterated the plain life, revolutionized the basis of Quaker worship, and gave Gurneyite Friends a new understanding of the nature of religious experience.’<sup>190</sup> Some Yearly Meetings started to adopt statements against Light theology and in favour of a strong atonement based justification/sanctification system available only to those who demonstrated faith.<sup>191</sup> A strong push by moderate Gurneyites held the factions together until the end of the

---

<sup>187</sup> The Hicksites experienced another series of splits and lost half their number (probably about 40,000 in 1820 down to 20,000 in 1900). The Wilburites were a small minority, and at the time many other Gurneyite Yearly Meetings did not recognise them. See Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 46, 49 & 110. See also, Hamm, ‘Theoretical Reflections’, 180.

<sup>188</sup> Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 54. This trend has continued through to the end of the twentieth-century, too. Hamm claims about 1/3 of the Quakers in America today are unprogrammed, while pastoral or programmed Friends comprise about 2/3 of the Quakers of America. See Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 200-201.

<sup>189</sup> Such as starting to implement a pastoral system, using the elements, and rejecting the peculiarities of the plain life as obstacles to true holiness. See Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 77-85.

<sup>190</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 74.

<sup>191</sup> Most notably, in 1878, Ohio Yearly Meeting issued a minute that ‘repudiated the so-called doctrine of the inner light, or the gift of a portion of the Holy Spirit in the soul of every man, as dangerous, unsound, and unscriptural.’ As quoted in Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 123.

nineteenth-century and was successful in unifying almost all Gurneyite Friends in America under one national conglomerate: the Five-Years Meeting. This process is reviewed in more detail in Chapter Two. Before we can start that discussion, however, a brief history of Oregon Yearly Meeting is in order.

### **History of Oregon Yearly Meeting**

William Hobson (1820-1891) is generally credited with being the founder of the Oregon Yearly Meeting.<sup>192</sup> In 1870, Hobson received permission from his Monthly Meeting, Honey Creek in Iowa YM<sup>193</sup> to go to ‘visit in the love of the Gospel some of the people West of the Rocky Mountains.’<sup>194</sup> Hobson visited the Oregon Territory twice before finally creating a permanent Friends settlement near the present day town of Newberg in Oregon (about 25 miles southwest of Portland, Oregon).<sup>195</sup> Newberg quickly

---

<sup>192</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 28. See also, Errol T. Elliott, *Quakers on the American Frontier* (IN: Friends United Press, 1969), 165-166.

<sup>193</sup> In 1863, Iowa Yearly Meeting was officially set-off by Indiana Yearly Meeting as the first YM west of the Mississippi. For a more thorough description of Friends’ migration across the United States, see Errol T. Elliott, *Quakers on the American Frontier* (IN: Friends United Press, 1969).

<sup>194</sup> As referenced in Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 28.

<sup>195</sup> Errol Elliott claims there were two great motivations for American Friends to move westward across the United States. In the eighteenth-century as continental Friends began to find slavery irreconcilable with their beliefs, the practical consequences of abolitionism were borne most by Quakers in the South. When the Northwest Territory (present day Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin) was created in 1787 these states were all deemed to be Free-States. Quakers, predominantly from the South, moved there en masse leaving behind, in some cases, mere remnants of themselves. In the ‘New West’, Ohio and Indiana became new strongholds for the Society. By 1845, Indiana was the largest YM in the world. As powerful as abolitionism, though, was the ‘Westward Ho’ spirit of the continent at the time. With the promise of affordable land and a better tomorrow, people headed off by foot, on horseback and by wagon train. When the railway began to monopolise the American consciousness, the full westward tide was released. See Errol T. Elliott, *Quakers on the American Frontier* (IN: Friends United Press, 1969). For the claim that Indiana was the largest YM in the world, see Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 175. Hamm puts the total number of Orthodox/Gurneyite Friends in Indiana YM in 1845 at

30,000 – almost 3 times as big as the second largest U.S. Yearly Meeting, which was New York with 11,000.

became a Quaker town where Friends owned both the local educational academy and the town newspaper. After the settlement was established, Friends started arriving regularly with most foregoing their wagons for the newly christened transcontinental railway into California (finished in 1869),<sup>196</sup> followed by an arduous trip north by stagecoach or ocean steamer. Like Hobson, those who arrived were from an evangelical Gurneyite tradition, with strong revivalist tendencies. By 1893, the year they were officially set-off by Iowa YM, there were 1,363 members<sup>197</sup> comprising two Quarterly Meetings[g] (Newberg and Salem).<sup>198</sup> Over the twenty year period following the inception of OYM, the general population in the states of Oregon and Idaho (the two initial stronghold settlement areas for the Yearly Meeting) more than doubled. The number of Friends in OYM grew proportionally.<sup>199</sup>

The early Quakers in Oregon retained many of the traditions of the Gurneyite Quakers of the time. The first Discipline they adopted was that of Iowa Yearly Meeting.<sup>200</sup> By 1895, the YM had crafted their own Discipline, emphasising the trinity of an ‘everlasting God’;<sup>201</sup> the supernatural birth, life and resurrection of Jesus Christ as the

---

<sup>196</sup> Elliott, *Quakers on the American Frontier*, 164.

<sup>197</sup> *OYM Minutes – 1893*, m. 7, p. 8.

<sup>198</sup> *OYM Minutes – 1893*, m. 1, p. 3.

<sup>199</sup> According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the combined population of the states of Oregon and Idaho in 1890 was 406,252 (317,704 in Oregon and 88,548 in Idaho). By 1910 the combined population was 998,359 (672,765 in Oregon and 325,594 in Idaho). According to Beebe, the number of Quakers in OYM in 1890 was around 1,000. By the time the YM formed, in 1893, there were 1,363 members. By 1910 there were 2,338 members. See Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 35-36 & Appendix I.

<sup>200</sup> *OYM Minutes – 1893*, m. 5, p. 4.

‘son of God’;<sup>202</sup> and the role of the Holy Spirit, who ‘convinces the world of sin’.<sup>203</sup> The Scriptures were said to be, ‘the only Divinely authorized statement of doctrines or moral principles we are bound to accept.’<sup>204</sup> It was deemed that ‘man was created in the image and likeness of God’,<sup>205</sup> who ‘fell through disobedience’,<sup>206</sup> but was ‘saved through the infinite mercy of God through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus’.<sup>207</sup> Justification was ‘God’s free grace’,<sup>208</sup> offered to those who showed ‘repentance toward God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ’.<sup>209</sup> Sanctification was also of ‘God’s free grace’<sup>210</sup> and referred to ‘the setting apart for the service of God’,<sup>211</sup> and the ‘deliverance from pollution’.<sup>212</sup> The rest of the Declaration of Faith within the Discipline generally supported standard Quaker practice for issues of baptism,<sup>213</sup> communion,<sup>214</sup> women in the

---

<sup>201</sup> *The Discipline of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church-1895* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1895), 14. Hereafter, *Discipline of OYM*, followed by respective year and page number.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>203</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 15.

<sup>204</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 16.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>207</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 17.

<sup>208</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>209</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>210</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 18.

<sup>211</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>212</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>213</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 19.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*



ministry,<sup>215</sup> oath taking<sup>216</sup> and pacifism.<sup>217</sup> For the most part, this foundational document of faith (unchanged until 1902) represented standard evangelical Gurneyite Quaker (and evangelical holiness) theology of the time (Light theology is noticeably absent).

This evangelical pattern holds true for the YM's orthopraxy as well. OYM quickly formed committees for the work of 'Pastoral and Church Extension' within each local Quarterly Meeting, which, as early as the opening 1893 YM sessions, were giving statistical reports on the numbers of people converted, renewed and sanctified.<sup>218</sup> Quaker revivalist holiness leader John Henry Douglas, who had already held a series of revival meetings in the 1890s,<sup>219</sup> was named as the first President of the Executive Board of the Pastoral and Church Extension Committee.<sup>220</sup> During that first year the YM also nominated persons to serve on the standing committees of Foreign Missions, Temperance, Sabbath Schools, Christian Endeavor, Books & Tracts, and Peace Arbitration.<sup>221</sup> The basic evangelical tenets remained an unwavering priority for these Friends during the pre-1919 years. Friends in OYM during this era could be characterised as adopting an evangelical theology consistent with Bebbington's quadrilateral. The centrality of Scripture and the atonement in their first Discipline can be viewed as characteristic of biblicism and crucicentrism. Their calls for repentance and justification

---

<sup>215</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 20.

<sup>216</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 22.

<sup>217</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 23.

<sup>218</sup> *OYM Minutes-1893*, m. 19, p. 6-7.

<sup>219</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 33.

<sup>220</sup> *OYM Minutes-1893*, m. 43, p. 18. Essentially, this was considered a General Superintendent position for the YM.

<sup>221</sup> *OYM Minutes-1893*, m. 8, p. 5.

are consistent with conversionism. Their passion for evangelism and revivalism is evidence of activism.

During this era there was, however, also a trend within OYM showing a pattern of concern for social betterment, world engagement, social action, ecumenicalism and intellectual advancement, as part of their orthodox faith. There are five main ways in which this trend can be shown: the attitude in OYM with respect to mission work, peace initiatives, temperance goals, educational purpose and in intra-denominational ecumenism. These are considered in turn.

### *Mission Work*

During the first sessions of the 1893 Yearly Meeting, Alaska was chosen as the YM's official missionary site.<sup>222</sup> A missionary committee was formed and that first year they financially supported three children in a mission home already established by the Women's Foreign Missionary Society on Douglas Island, Alaska.<sup>223</sup> The following year, OYM supported a missionary couple (Silas and Anna Moon<sup>224</sup>) in starting a new mission on Kake Island.<sup>225</sup> While the 'great commission' was always at the forefront of motivations for missionary work, Arthur Roberts suggests that the missionaries also understood the importance of improving the quality of life of the indigenous inhabitants and not being overzealous in their emphasis on evangelism. Rather, they sought to join the community by running a school for the children, establishing a mercantile where

---

<sup>222</sup> *OYM Minutes-1893*, m. 27, p. 10.

<sup>223</sup> *OYM Minutes-1893*, m. 28, p. 10.

<sup>224</sup> They had already spent five years as missionaries in Alaska.

<sup>225</sup> *OYM Minutes – 1894*, m. 26, p. 10.

locals could get the provisional supplies they needed and building a saw mill to help the local industry. According to Roberts, the Moons saw themselves as interdependent with the Kake community, routinely trading goods and services back and forth as they lived and worked alongside one another.<sup>226</sup> From the very early years of his ministry, Silas supported himself by working at the local cannery,<sup>227</sup> while Anna was a school teacher and practical nurse.<sup>228</sup> Not every idea for social renewal came to fruition quickly (and conversions came less quickly), but all the activity was done with the YM's understanding that 'corrupt whites' had already taken advantage of the indigenous Alaskans in the past.<sup>229</sup> The Moons, however, saw their role more as to, 'adapt themselves to the rhythm of life of the Kake Indians' and to demonstrate 'their love for the people they served before they proclaimed the Gospel with words.'<sup>230</sup> Thus a degree of social ethic is evident within their missionary efforts. By 1898, Oregon Yearly Meeting was covering the missionaries' full salary, with a clothing allowance and numerous gifts in-kind (including a boat and other property).<sup>231</sup> Up until 1911, when the mission was transferred to the American Friends Board of Missions,<sup>232</sup> the Kake Alaska site received a host of Oregon missionaries, services, financing and donated goods. The

---

<sup>226</sup> Arthur O. Roberts, *Tomorrow is Growing Old: Stories of the Quakers in Alaska* (OR: The Barclay Press, 1978), 56.

<sup>227</sup> Roberts, *Tomorrow is Growing Old*, 57.

<sup>228</sup> Roberts, *Tomorrow is Growing Old*, 25.

<sup>229</sup> *OYM Minutes-1895*, m. 48, p. 12.

<sup>230</sup> Roberts, *Tomorrow is Growing Old*, 56, 60.

<sup>231</sup> Roberts, *Tomorrow is Growing Old*, 60.

<sup>232</sup> *Foreign Mission Work of American Friends* (published by the American Friends Mission Board, 1912), 138.

importance of this project, as it relates to this study, is in seeing that these missionaries understood their great commission testimony to be about social renewal and that they shared a moral responsibility towards the community they served. These documented efforts went far beyond the soul-harvesting aims of future missionary ventures by OYM<sup>233</sup> and suggest a mutual vulnerability between the missionary and the people served by the missionary.

### *Peace Initiatives*

In addition to the missionary work in Alaska, the peace work done by OYM was another example of its social concerns reaching beyond conversion. In 1893, the YM formed a committee for Peace and Arbitration and named a Superintendent as head of that department. The first Discipline, adopted in 1895, shows a strong commitment to pacifism:

We believe all war is utterly incompatible with the teaching of Jesus, and contrary to the spirit of His Gospel; and that no plea of necessity or policy, however urgent or peculiar, will justify the followers of the 'Prince of Peace' in engaging in a business confessedly for the destruction of human life.<sup>234</sup>

In the following years, OYM routinely supported peace legislation. In 1896, they supported the Lake Mohonk Conference<sup>235</sup> declaration calling for 'a permanent tribunal

---

<sup>233</sup> In particular, see initial efforts of OYM during the 1930s mission to Bolivia, covered in more detail in Chapter Three.

<sup>234</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, p 23.

<sup>235</sup> 'The Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration was founded in 1895 for the purpose of creating and directing public sentiment in favor of international arbitration, arbitration treaties, and an international court. The first Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration was held in June 1895, at Lake Mohonk in Ulster County, New York. Fifty eminent American men were convened by Albert K. Smiley, a Quaker and the owner of the Lake Mohonk Mountain House.' Information taken from

to which all nations may appeal' and furthermore for 'disarmament of the nations'.<sup>236</sup> In 1908, they supported the resolution of the Hague commission calling for 'compulsory arbitration'<sup>237</sup> of international conflicts. In 1914, they endorsed a resolution to say they were opposed to the manufacturing or sale of toys that represented implements of war and called for the 'formation of a Supreme Court of Nations'.<sup>238</sup> Throughout these years, the Peace Superintendent of the Yearly Meeting regularly reported widespread support from the Yearly Meeting, with pastors giving like-minded sermons on the topic. During the Great War, OYM actively supported the practices of the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC).<sup>239</sup> Although, by the 1930s, support for the AFSC from OYM was on the wane, during the war and the years immediately following it, the YM sent personnel, resources and financial contributions to the agency, along with forming its own localised Oregon Service Committee to better coordinate with the larger organisation.<sup>240</sup> The steadfastness with which Friends from OYM supported peace initiatives as a whole during its first thirty years of existence is further evidence of the way they viewed their role in society as one that centred on working towards the social betterment of humanity

---

Swarthmore College Online Peace Collection – Lake Mohonk Collection. See, <http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/peace/DG051-099/DG054LakeMohonk.htm>, accessed December 6, 2011.

<sup>236</sup> *OYM Minutes-1896*, m. 45, p 15.

<sup>237</sup> *OYM Minutes-1908*, m. 63, p 24-25.

<sup>238</sup> *OYM Minutes-1914*, m. 32, p 20.

<sup>239</sup> This is discussed further in Chapter Three: suffice to say for now that AFSC was formed (1917) specifically to help Quaker conscientious objectors during the compulsory draft and to provide humanitarian relief work to war-torn Europe. Rufus M Jones, *A Service of Love in War Time: American Friends Relief Work in Europe, 1917-1919* (NY, The Macmillan Company, 1920), 8; Mary Hoxie Jones, *Swords Into Ploughshares: An Account of The American Friends Service Committee 1917-1937* (CT, Greenwood Press Publishers, 1937), 13.

<sup>240</sup> *OYM Minutes-1918*, m. 101, p. 39. *OYM Minutes-1919*, m. 48, p. 19.

through peace initiatives. During the first quarter of a century of its existence, there was little display within OYM of the tendency towards requiring the benefactor(s) of the YM's goodwill to be saved prior to receiving such assistance, which eventually came to define the YM's peace efforts during the 1930s.<sup>241</sup>

### *Temperance Goals*

In addition to mission work and peace work, like all 'good revivalist Christians' of the time, these early Friends in Oregon also fought hard to keep the county and state dry.

Friends in the Northwest brought with them the traditional Quaker concern regarding the use of alcoholic beverages... One Sunday each month was designated temperance Sunday and the congregation would take baskets to the church and spend the whole day with an afternoon temperance meeting the primary entertainment.<sup>242</sup>

Attempts were made to influence legislation with petitions, a Temperance Superintendent position was created within the Yearly meeting and Quakers joined forces with the Prohibition Party and the Anti-Saloon League.<sup>243</sup> However, there is more to this movement than just simply legislated morality, as it is evident there was some vision for the restoration of society and moral renewal. The first officially adopted statement by the YM on temperance shows a clear idea that creating a good social order and moral reform were motivating factors for this movement – even with Friends from OYM seeing their efforts as an extension of the larger historical Quaker social justice testimony[g]:

---

<sup>241</sup> For example, see the response of OYM to the relief work of the American Friends Service Committee in the 1930s – covered in more detail in Chapter Three.

<sup>242</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 34.

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid.*

We declare it to be our solemn conviction that the liquor traffic is wholly pernicious, repugnant to the moral sense, destructive to the peace and good order of society, the home, the church, and the body politic; and utterly antagonistic to all that is precious in life.... The Friends Church in times past has always stood in the front of every moral reform, therefore in laying the foundation of Oregon Yearly Meeting, we cannot take a backward step, but must go forward.<sup>244</sup>

The resolution went on to withdraw support from political candidates who were not aggressive toward the elimination of intoxicating drinks, and called for a prayerful investigation into the hops industry and its aid to the beer brewing interests. Although OYM admitted this approach was perhaps a bit ‘negative’, they also called for members to ‘take the positive side and support all practical measures that have for their purposes the accomplishment of this end if we would be Christ-like.’<sup>245</sup> By 1914, the temperance movement in Oregon was strong enough for the entire state to go dry.<sup>246</sup> It is clear that Oregon Friends saw their actions regarding temperance not just as part of a larger evangelistic campaign to bring Christ’s salvation to the wicked (though that certainly was a critical component), but they also understood the social implication of their efforts. With regard to their temperance campaigns, OYM ultimately seemed focused on the betterment of humanity:

The mission of the Church is to minister to the sick and afflicted, and the liquor traffic spreads disease and destroys more people than tuberculosis; the mission of the Church is to help the poor and needy, and the liquor traffic is the chief cause of poverty – it steals the food from the mouths of babes and children; the mission of the Church is to evangelize the world; the liquor is the greatest hindrance to missions; the liquor traffic confronts the church as its colossal enemy; obstructing its every line of work; it is

---

<sup>244</sup> *OYM Minutes-1894*, m. 49, p. 19.

<sup>245</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>246</sup> *OYM Minutes-1914*, m. 28, p. 12. See also, Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 41-43.

the greatest foe to education and the home and destroys more men in a day than the church saves in a month.<sup>247</sup>

It is easy to question the Christian exclusivity within which the larger temperance movement sought to reshape society, but also evident was an impetus that went far beyond mere evangelism and individual salvation, as the movement during these years was also equally focused on both social structures in need of change and practical measures to accomplish that change.

### *Educational Purpose*

Friends in Oregon also had a conviction that their youth should have a proper Quaker education. With existing Friends' colleges mostly far way to the east (Penn College in Iowa, Earlham in Indiana and Haverford, Swarthmore and Bryn Mawr in Philadelphia), the Quakers in Oregon founded Pacific Academy in Newberg in 1885. Future U.S. President Herbert Hoover is listed as the first student enrollee.<sup>248</sup> In 1891, the academy became a college. In 1893, the YM agreed to take control of Pacific College.<sup>249</sup> Not just for the sake of promulgating Quaker ideas, but in a mood far more progressive

---

<sup>247</sup> *OYM Minutes-1913*, m. 57, p. 51.

<sup>248</sup> Herbert Clark Hoover was born in West Branch, Iowa on August 10, 1874. His parents (Jesse and Huldah) were both Quakers, with his mother serving as a minister within the denomination. Before he turned ten years of age both his parents died and Herbert went to live with his uncle (Dr. John Minthorn) in Newberg, Oregon. Minthorn was Principal of the newly formed Pacific Academy, where Hoover was quickly enrolled and finished his high school education. In 1891, Hoover entered college as part of the charter class of the newly formed Stanford University. After a successful business career in mining, he was selected in 1921 to the position of Secretary of Commerce under President Warren G. Harding and then continued as such under President John Calvin Coolidge. 1928, Hoover was elected as the thirty-first President of the United States. See David Hinshaw, *Herbert Hoover: American Quaker* (NY: Farrar, Straus and Company, 1950), 3-10, 121-145, 161-166.

<sup>249</sup> *OYM Minutes-1893*, m. 34, p. 11. The Yearly Meeting technically just agreed to take control of the 'trust' of Pacific College and name the trustees.



and world engaging than would be displayed corporately in the future, OYM saw the importance of a membership educated according to modern methods and believed that trained minds were the ones that would carry on the intellectual and spiritual development of the church.<sup>250</sup> The willingness of the YM to engage with the modern intellectual ideas of the world is markedly different from the insular tendencies of fundamentalism, which relied exclusively on biblical staples in education and which would become far more prominent in the YM during the 1920s.<sup>251</sup>

In 1910, the college offered a thirty-five year old widower the position of President. Levi T. Pennington (1875-1975), who had just completed his undergraduate degree at Earlham College, was a birthright Quaker from a Gurneyite tradition. He started his life working at times as a journalist, a teacher and a pastor. Although Pennington did not move to Oregon until 1911, he held the Presidency of Pacific College for the next thirty years and lived in Oregon until his death in 1975.<sup>252</sup> According to Mark Ankeny, he was a person who ‘consistently put his beliefs into action’<sup>253</sup> and he was a leading voice in the peace, temperance and women’s rights movements and other humanitarian concerns of the early twentieth-century.<sup>254</sup> Pennington saw such actions as compulsory extensions of his core Orthodox beliefs and his work as both pastor and evangelist place

---

<sup>250</sup> *OYM Minutes-1893*, m. 38, p. 17.

<sup>251</sup> This is discussed in more detail in Chapter Two.

<sup>252</sup> Donald McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker: Levi T. Pennington* (OR: Barclay Press, 1980), Chapter 1.

<sup>253</sup> Mark Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington, Quaker Leader and Educator: Pacific College Presidential Years 1911-1941* (Dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Oregon), 15. See also, pages 20-23.

<sup>254</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 24-49.

him squarely within the evangelical rubric, as defined herein. Pennington, as an individual, then, thought and acted strikingly similarly to the corporate evangelical identity of the YM at the time, reflecting a commitment to both orthodoxy and social engagement, and his appointment reflects the larger evangelical ethos within the Oregon Friends during those early years.<sup>255</sup> Although, ‘by 1918, many people within Oregon Yearly Meeting believed that liberal arts ideals moved people away from the church’,<sup>256</sup> Pennington’s first decade of leadership at Pacific College can be seen as part of the larger world-engaging practices and socially responsible corporate evangelical identity of the YM. Pennington was seen by many as a moderate evangelical Quaker with a post-millennial worldview that led him to work actively to improve the world as well as to bring people to Christ.<sup>257</sup> However, even more important to OYM, Pennington was seen by the College Board as a unifying force at a time when both moderate and revivalist Friends were emerging into more polarised factions during the first two decades of the

---

<sup>255</sup> In addition to Pennington, the first President of Pacific College, Thomas Newlin, can also be classified as an emerging evangelical modernist and again reflective of the larger corporate identity of the YM in terms of his views on social Christianity. Newlin, a strong social gospel proponent, argued, ‘While it can truly be said that Jesus gave no system of sociology, it can just as truly be said that Jesus gave no system of theology or ethics. The seed of the kingdom was planted in social soil, and the leaven of the kingdom is quite as much social as personal... Theology deals with God as manifested in the rational and moral nature of man, while sociology shows us God and man united in the institutional life, in which the love and will of God are worked out through human instrumentality.’ Thomas Newlin, ‘Christian Sociology’, paper presented at the 1897 Conference of All Friends. See *Proceedings of the Conference of Friends of America*, p. 150. Archive held at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana. Although Thomas Hamm has argued that Newlin was ousted from Pacific College by a strong revivalist faction that controlled the YM claiming he was an atheist and infidel, Mark Ankeny has provided a moderate correction to that idea. Ankeny claims Newlin was certainly attacked from revivalist Friends who, though not a majority force by that point, were increasingly challenging the worthiness of higher education and secularisation of ideas, but that the public records and Board minutes reveal little of the Newlin controversy being primarily over orthodoxy. Rather, Newlin’s ousting was perhaps about his inability to raise the necessary substantial financial support expected of a President of a college. See Hamm, *Transformations of American Quakerism*, 166. See Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 250-253.

<sup>256</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 13.

<sup>257</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 246-247, 260.

twentieth-century.<sup>258</sup> By 1915, in addition to serving as Pacific College President, he was also appointed by the YM into the role of Presiding Clerk[g] for the YM business sessions.<sup>259</sup>

### *Intra-denominational Ecumenism*

In addition to the aforementioned categories of mission work, peace initiatives, temperance goals and educational purpose, during this first quarter of a century, the YM demonstrated a strong intra-denominational ecumenism. While this part of the history will be discussed in more detail at the beginning of Chapter Two, by 1902 most Gurneyite Friends in America had united together under a unified headship (Five-Years Meeting) and had agreed on a Uniform Discipline and a common Statement of Faith. OYM was one of the FYM's charter members and adopted the FYM Uniform Discipline. By 1909, the YM agreed to transfer all its mission work to the American Friends' Board of Foreign Missions (missionary board of FYM) and to work in collaboration with the larger organisation.<sup>260</sup> While OYM was also the first full YM to leave the FYM, when fundamentalism became a more dominant way of thinking within the YM during the 1920s, during the first two decades of the FYM's existence, there is no evidence of OYM discussing separation from the larger organisation. Rather, they joined, alongside other evangelical American YMs, and sought a common push toward Quaker unity, mission work and publications.

---

<sup>258</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 254-255.

<sup>259</sup> *OYM Minutes-1915*, m. 15, p. 4. In a practice that is not common among Friends, the first three Presidents of Pacific College also served as YM Clerk. No particular reason is noted for this action.

<sup>260</sup> *OYM Minutes-1909*, m. 60 & 67, p. 23 & 27.

During the first three decades of the existence of Oregon Yearly Meeting (1893-1919), we can define the YM as staunchly evangelical in its theology and, simultaneously, socially concerned, engaged in society and ecumenically collaborative. Noticeably missing are a denominational identity wrapped around those traits McDermott has defined as consistent with a fundamentalist way of thinking (biblical literalism, rejection of the world, diminished social action, ecumenical separation, refusal to dialogue with liberals, a heavy focus on rules and restriction and a high tendency toward schism).<sup>261</sup> Similar to the already mentioned tendencies of the broader evangelical movement across Protestant America, OYM, from its inception (1893) up to about WWI, managed to maintain both the tendencies of the Holiness Movement towards revivalism and individual sanctification, while simultaneously showing strong Christian ethics consistent with social gospel teachings. All this was done under a broad evangelical umbrella.

Alongside this generalisation, though, it is also true that there were budding factions of Quakers within the YM. By WWI, these factions became polarised both within their group as well as within the Quaker world around them. As Beebe states:

Evidence drawn from the first quarter century of Oregon Yearly Meeting shows clearly that while Orthodoxy was dominant in northwest Quakerism, a close association was still maintained with other Friends. It is true that the Oregon Quakers adopted the Richmond Declaration of Faith and joined the Five Years Meeting; they also maintained pastors, sought converts, and were generally politically conservative. However, they joined willingly with nonevangelical Friends in pursuit of peace, temperance, and the solution of other social problems. This potential

---

<sup>261</sup> See above in the section on 'Terminology and Historical Context' specific to defining fundamentalism.

ambivalence was to lead to some dissension in the 1920's, as conditions somewhat similar to those of 100 years earlier were to reappear.<sup>262</sup>

By 1919, this dissension was coming to the fore within OYM. On the national scene, as the Holiness Movement transmuted into fundamentalism, juxtaposed against a growing theologically liberal modernism, a similar pattern unfolded in Oregon.

### **Relationship to Previous Scholarship**

Despite the growth of evangelical Quakerism and the prominence of the Oregon Yearly Meeting in this development, little academic research has specifically been done on either Oregon Quakers or on evangelical Friends in the twentieth-century.<sup>263</sup> The only large scale project focused solely on evangelical Oregon Quakers is Ralph Beebe's work (*A Garden of the Lord*).<sup>264</sup> Beebe has a long history of personal involvement with the Yearly Meeting. He was born a second generation Quaker into OYM; he attended

---

<sup>262</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 48.

<sup>263</sup> While every state in the union has seen population increases over the twentieth-century, Quakerism has failed to keep up in each region proportionately. There was about the same number of Quakers in America (if not slightly fewer) in the year 2000 as in the year 1900 (Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 201). We now find Quakers in new places like California, Florida, Texas, Colorado, Arizona and the Northwest region. Despite a rampant increase in the overall general U.S. population, the number of Quakers in traditional localities, such as the Ohio Valley and the Philadelphia area, has seen a steep decline over the twentieth century (Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 151, 201). Indiana Yearly Meeting, once the largest YM in the world, lost over half its membership during the period from 1902 to 1982 (Barbour and Frost, *Quakers*, 234-235).

Today, OYM comprises more than a fifth of those Friends churches in America to have joined together under Evangelical Friend Church International - a conglomerate of Yearly Meetings, which at different stages, broke away from Five-Years Meeting (57 out of 279. Evangelical Friends Church International website, <http://www.evangelicalfriends.org/>, accessed March 12, 2009). The Friends who have joined under the EFCI umbrella represent just under half of the combined total of all persuasions of Quakers in America. EFCI states its current number of regular attendees is 41,000 (Evangelical Friends Church International website, <http://www.evangelicalfriends.org/>, accessed March 12, 2009). Thomas Hamm puts the total number of Quakers in America at 90,000 – 110,000 (Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 151).

<sup>264</sup> Ralph Beebe, *A Garden of the Lord: A History of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church* (OR: The Barclay Press, 1968).

Greenleaf Friends Academy in Idaho; he attended, worked and taught at Pacific College;<sup>265</sup> and he has been a long-standing and active member of the Yearly Meeting since.<sup>266</sup> Starting his account several years prior to the Yearly Meeting's inception in 1893 and ending in 1968,<sup>267</sup> he takes in a wide range of topics – from the presidential voting preference in the city of Newberg to the results of the local basketball team to various manifestations of the Quaker Peace Testimony[g]. Beebe's work was primarily written for the Friends in Oregon and was published by the Yearly Meeting.<sup>268</sup> Due to his access to oral histories from primary sources, his book stands as foundational to any understanding of the YM's identity.

However, Beebe's work is skewed due to his affiliation. It is argued in this work, that during the early part of the second half of the twentieth-century, there was a rising group of neo-evangelical Quakers in Oregon trying to renew the YM around this positive and progressive national Protestant neo-evangelical paradigm (much in line with the Billy Graham Christianity of the day). Oregon was not alone in this trend, as many denominations found themselves trying to recover from the perceived embarrassment of fundamentalism. In Oregon, there was a lot to be troubled about and much of it is

---

<sup>265</sup> Originally formed as Pacific Academy, in 1885, its name was changed to Pacific College, in 1891, and again to George Fox College, in 1949. As of 1996, it is called George Fox University.

<sup>266</sup> See jacket cover of: Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*; See also author's biography listed with Barclay Press, <http://www.barclaypress.com/bpauthors.php/2008/04/11/ralph-k-beebe>, accessed April 23, 2009.

<sup>267</sup> Beebe did include a concluding chapter on 'Goals for the Fourth Quarter Century' effectively attempting to take his work up to the end of the twentieth-century. See Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, Chapter 8.

<sup>268</sup> Originally called Oregon Yearly Meeting Press, was changed to Barclay Press in 1959. It was owned and operated by OYM until 2001. Since then it has been set off as its own private venture with a board comprised of evangelical Friends. See 'A Quaker Press', *Northwest Friend* vol. XXXIX no. 5 (July 1959): 28. See also Barclay Press – About page, <http://barclaypress.com/57>, accessed October 18, 2012.

contextualised in Beebe's work as part of a necessary step toward maintaining the orthodoxy which would eventually lead to the successes of his day. Beebe's constant reference to an 'evangelical reemphasis' during the 1920s and 1930s glosses over some of the exclusivity and insularity that was displayed by the YM and he struggles to articulate how marked the loss of social ethic within the YM really was. An example of this is his quick assessment of the relationship of OYM to both Five-Years Meeting and American Friends Service Committee:

A mild internal struggle occurred in Oregon Yearly Meeting, resulting in a reemphasis on the evangelical doctrine. The social gospel would have great appeal, but in the final analysis, it was the spiritual which was to remain pre-eminent.<sup>269</sup>

As is discussed in the bulk of this work, the debate was far more than a 'mild internal struggle' and, from all accounts, the 'social gospel' had very little appeal for some in that period. Beebe's acumen for the discovery of historical data generally appears competent, but his overall tone is suggestive of the neo-evangelical bias of the era in which he came of age.

Since Beebe wrote *A Garden of the Lord*, several additional sources of previously confidential records have become available to help broaden our understanding of OYM, especially in relation to the fundamentalist/modernist struggles. The first is the collection of Levi Pennington's papers: a thirty-box collection of notes, correspondence, several book manuscripts and diaries left by Pennington. As mentioned above, Pennington came to the Oregon Yearly Meeting in 1911 and lived there until his death in 1975. During Pennington's time in Oregon, he served as President of Pacific College for thirty years

---

<sup>269</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 50.

and served as Clerk of the Yearly Meeting for over ten years.<sup>270</sup> The Pennington Papers were not made public until after Levi died in 1975, well after Beebe published.

Also missing from Beebe's work is Pennington's autobiography *Rambling Recollections of Ninety Happy Years*.<sup>271</sup> It came out a year before Beebe published, but he makes no reference to it and it is unclear whether or not Beebe had access to the resource prior to submitting his own work for publication. Admittedly, the autobiography is problematic for a researcher. Parts of Pennington's book truly are 'rambling recollections'. Equally difficult is the idea that Pennington's writing suggests the author had kept score his whole life, and was now providing the offenders with a litany of their offences. There was a revolt by leaders of the Oregon Yearly Meeting at the time it was published, with one leader referring to it as 'Rambling Inconsistencies'.<sup>272</sup> Even so, the book is valuable for its insights into Pennington's thinking.

Also coming after Beebe's work is the autobiographical book by Emmett Gulley, *Tall Tales by a Tall Quaker*.<sup>273</sup> Gulley grew up in the Oregon Yearly Meeting, was a student and professor at Pacific College and later sat as President, following Pennington's retirement.<sup>274</sup> He, too, took exception to much of the fundamentalism within his Yearly Meeting and he also opposed the separatist tendencies within the YM.

---

<sup>270</sup> *OYM Minutes-1912-1922*.

<sup>271</sup> Levi Pennington, *Rambling Recollections of Ninety Happy Years* (OR: Metropolitan Press, 1967).

<sup>272</sup> Still to this day the official George Fox University library copy of Levi's book has an insert written by OYM leaders that supposedly corrects some items in Pennington's book.

<sup>273</sup> Emmett W. Gulley, *Tall Tales by a Tall Quaker* (privately published 1973).

<sup>274</sup> Gulley, *Tall Tales*, Chapters 4, 5 & 7.



Surprisingly, Beebe does not appear to highlight Edward Mott or refer to Mott's three privately published books.<sup>275</sup> Mott spent over 30 years of his life in the Oregon Yearly Meeting, twenty as its Clerk, and was President for some time of the Portland Bible Institute (PBI). He was not only of critical importance to the fundamentalist movement amongst Friends in Oregon, but also, due to Mott's time at Cleveland Bible Institute and his tenure as editor of the *Evangelical Friends*, he is often considered one of the primary fundamentalist Quaker leaders in the country during the turbulent transition among Friends in the first half of the twentieth-century. Future president of George Fox College,<sup>276</sup> Milo Ross, referred to Mott as, 'the founding father of the evangelical movement as we know it today.'<sup>277</sup> While he is often seen as a controversial figure in Quaker history even amongst evangelicals, his near absence from any scholarly work to date is disappointing. Although his books were privately published, they were available in Oregon by the time Beebe published in 1968. Mott lived in Oregon until his death in 1955 and the Yearly Meeting Board of Publication praised the books when they were released.<sup>278</sup> Beebe mentions him only twice.

Another book that touches on some similar subject matter is the biography of Levi Pennington written by Donald McNichols.<sup>279</sup> Although this work was not intended to

---

<sup>275</sup> *The Friends Church in the Light of its Recent History* (1935), *God's Plan for the Restoration of Man* (1941), and *Sixty Years of Gospel Ministry* (1948).

<sup>276</sup> Name changed from Pacific College in 1949. Since 1996, it has been known as George Fox University.

<sup>277</sup> Milo C. Ross, 'Recollections of conversations between Edward Mott and Milo Ross concerning the first evangelical conference held in Cheyenne, Wyoming, 1927', *Concern* (October 1963): 16.

<sup>278</sup> Frederick Baker and Ray Carter (president and vice president, respectively, of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Board of Publication, co-wrote an *Introduction* to Mott's *Sixty Years of Gospel Ministry*.

<sup>279</sup> McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker*.

address or study issues related to Oregon Yearly Meeting, McNichols' work is valuable to better understand this man. Throughout *Portrait of a Quaker*, however, McNichols makes conclusions about events in OYM and the changing Quaker identity, but does not spend significant time looking at the evidence or understanding what was happening behind the scenes to create these dynamics. One such example is the claim he makes about OYM when Pennington was removed as Clerk in 1922, 'This action can be interpreted as dissatisfaction with Pennington's influence in stressing the humanitarian concern of Friends...' <sup>280</sup> McNichols states this as fact, but does not offer any evidence to support it or unravel all the dynamics pertinent to the event.

More recently (1997), Mark Ankeny wrote his doctoral dissertation on Levi Pennington as a leader and educator at Pacific College. <sup>281</sup> Much like the work of McNichols, issues between OYM and Pacific College come into the discussion, but Ankeny's work is also essentially tied to the Pennington narrative. Ankeny does bring to light Pennington's role as an educator and leader during the constantly changing academic ethos in a small denominationally held liberal arts college in the first half of the twentieth-century, and is particularly helpful in seeing how many of the issues Pennington faced while he sat in the Presidency were exacerbated by the larger fundamentalist/modernist controversies as they unfolded. However, his data on OYM is of limited value mostly because macro-identity corporate shifts within the Yearly Meeting are given general discussion but lack specificity and detail. Pennington is his primary focus rather than OYM.

---

<sup>280</sup> McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker*, 94.

<sup>281</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*.

A year after Beebe published his work, Errol Elliott wrote about Friends on the frontier of America.<sup>282</sup> Of the over 350 pages of study dedicated to ‘frontier Friends’, Elliott spent 13 pages on OYM, nine of which address events prior to the YM’s inception. He largely re-covered issues Beebe had dealt with in more depth a year earlier. Elliott devoted a small section of his book to describing the issues of separation from Five-Years Meeting and American Friends Service Committee. His information is helpful for seeing some of the larger trends. He, too, however, covered a lot of ground and omitted fine detail.

There are a few works worth mentioning which address similar issues within Friends, but have differing timeframes. The first is Hamm’s *Transformation of American Quakerism*, which concludes in 1907, just prior to the onset of fundamentalism. Hamm’s goal was to introduce, ‘modernist Friends’<sup>283</sup> and to confirm that they had sufficiently established themselves within the leadership of FYM. Since his study concludes in 1907, the next phase of Quaker development and the next round of Quaker schism are not analysed effectively. Hamm’s work makes a significant contribution to nineteenth-century Quaker research and understanding, but more work is still in order on twentieth-century Friends. Hamm does broadly address the issues of twentieth-century Friends in another of his books (*The Quakers in America*, Columbia University Press, 2003). However, Hamm’s work is part of the *Columbia Contemporary American Religion Series* and is really designed to be a concise account of the whole of American Quakerism today with all its varied components.

---

<sup>282</sup> Errol Elliott, *Quakers on the American Frontier* (IN: Friends United Press, 1969).

<sup>283</sup> Hamm, ‘Theoretical Reflections’, 173.

Another work similar to Hamm's *Transformation*, is the seven-volume Braithwaite/Jones 'Rowntree History' series.<sup>284</sup> Aside from its particular liberal leanings,<sup>285</sup> this work has not been duplicated for its sheer breadth and depth of information. The last volume, however, was published in 1921, with coverage of American Quakerism essentially ending in 1902. This thesis picks up where Hamm's and Braithwaite/Jones' works left off by examining the events and actions of the first half of the twentieth-century that led to the splitting of these two Gurneyite groups.

In addition to these specific works, there are a few general historical accounts of the Society, but only a very few address issues of the twentieth-century in depth. In 1969, Edwin B. Bronner said, in the preface to Errol T. Elliott's, *Quakers on the American Frontier*, 'It is difficult to draw up a list of books on Quaker history in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century.'<sup>286</sup> To date, the dearth has not been filled adequately. Hamm's two aforementioned works, published since, are a step in the right direction. Other than Hamm, most modern textbooks on Quaker history, polity and theology generally include a chapter or a section of a chapter on twentieth-century tensions and expressions. While most authors agree on various levels of tension and conflict within the Society during this

---

<sup>284</sup> The entire Rowntree Series of Quaker Histories includes the following seven volumes: Rufus M. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 1908; Rufus M. Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies*, 1911; William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 1912; Rufus M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Centuries*, 1914; William C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, 1919; Rufus, M. Jones, *The Later Periods of Quakerism* (2 volumes), 1921.

<sup>285</sup> Alice Southern's recent Master of Philosophy Thesis claims that the Rowntree Series was primarily written by two authors with liberal leanings (Braithwaite and Jones), and was an attempt by these authors to re-calibrate historical Quakerism within the emerging modern liberalism of Friends in the twentieth-century. See Alice Southern, *The Rowntree Series and the Growth of Liberal Quakerism: 1895-1925* (Unpublished Master of Philosophy, University of Birmingham U.K., March 2010).

<sup>286</sup> Edwin B. Bonner, 'Preface', in Errol T. Elliott *Quakers on the American Frontier* (IN: Friends United Press, 1969), 14.

century, often a decidedly large portion of their twentieth-century chapter (or section) is dedicated to discussing the newly emerging liberalism and modernism within the Society. Most often these tendencies are epitomised by the personality of Rufus Jones (1863-1948).<sup>287</sup> Barbour and Frost give an entire chapter to ‘The Liberal Transformation’<sup>288</sup> of the Society in the twentieth-century, with a third of that chapter dedicated to Jones. They describe the modernist movement in American Quakerism at the turn of the twentieth-century as, the ‘elongated shadow of one man [Jones].’<sup>289</sup> Although Punshon claims that evangelicalism is the official persuasion of at least half the Quakers in the world, his *Portrait in Grey* gives Jones a full section unto himself, claiming, ‘by common consent he was one of the most influential Quakers of all time.’ Cooper’s *Living Faith*, a theological history, includes a parsimonious portion on ‘Twentieth Century Liberalism and Evangelical Reaction’. His seven paragraph section gives one paragraph to evangelical Friends in the twentieth-century, simply concluding that these Quakers, ‘disengaged themselves one by one in backlash against these liberal Quakers.’

---

<sup>287</sup> Jones was born into a moderate Gurneyite Friends’ tradition from New England YM. He rose to prominence as a teacher at the Philadelphia based Quaker institution of Haverford College and as editor of the *Friends Review*. In 1894, Jones was successfully able to merge the *Friends Review* with the far more conservative Holiness journal *Christian Worker*. For the next 15 years Jones sat as editor of the new *American Friend* and would eventually sit as chair of the powerful Business Committee of the Five-Years Meeting. Over time it became apparent that Jones’ editorial policy embraced theories of evolution, higher-criticism, progressive revelation and the authority of the inward light. Jones pushed for a renewal of Light Theology within *Gurneyism*, emphasising Quakerism as a mystical religion. Revivalist Friends quickly identified him as the primary antagonist against whom they needed to defend evangelical Quakerism. Jones’ influence on American Quakerism was both remarkable for his ability to crystalise an entire generation of Friends around liberalism and mysticism, while at the same time he galvanised an entirely different group of Friends against his version of mystical Quakerism in favour of perceived evangelical orthodoxy. Jones could be classified as a theologically liberal modernist. See Southern, *Rowntree Series*, 73-97; Hamm, *Transformation*, 147-150; Dandelion, *Introduction*, 120; and Rufus Jones, *Introduction to Braithwaite, Beginnings of Quakerism*.

<sup>288</sup> Barbour & Frost, *The Quakers*, 219-230.

<sup>289</sup> Barbour & Frost, *The Quakers*, 225.

Dandelion's *Introduction*, while acknowledging that unprogrammed Quaker Liberalism makes up less than 15% of the total body, still lists liberalism as one of the primary developments of twentieth-century Quakerism and gives them the majority of the pages in his chapter on twentieth-century Friends.<sup>290</sup> He describes Jones as 'the key architect of transforming Quakerism' in the twentieth-century.<sup>291</sup> Rufus Jones and the emerging twentieth-century liberalism within Quakerism are important scholarly subjects, but the emphasis on them as major twentieth-century developments is true for only a minority expression within the Religious Society of Friends.

One recent scholarly work, specific to Quaker holiness, is the work of Carole Spencer.<sup>292</sup> Spencer argues that holiness is in fact the *sine qua non* of Quakerism.<sup>293</sup> She establishes eight 'essential elements' she claims are found in the life and writings of early Friends and hold constant (with differing emphasis) throughout the Society's history.<sup>294</sup> In focusing on representatives of key eras, she concludes that holiness (as a broad construct and not limited to the late nineteenth-century Holiness Movement) has a 'central place' in the history of Quakerism,<sup>295</sup> and that it provides an effective 'paradigmatic theme' for mapping Quaker theology.<sup>296</sup> Thus, Spencer has been astute in

---

<sup>290</sup> Dandelion, *Introduction*, Chapter 3, section on Liberal Quakerism.

<sup>291</sup> Dandelion, *Introduction*, 122.

<sup>292</sup> Carole Dale Spencer, *Holiness: The Soul of Quakerism* (CO: Paternoster, 2007).

<sup>293</sup> Spencer, *Holiness*, 33.

<sup>294</sup> Scripture, Eschatology, Conversion, Evangelism, Charisma, Suffering, Mysticism, and Perfection. Spencer, *Holiness*, 14-33.

<sup>295</sup> Spencer, *Holiness*, 252.

<sup>296</sup> Spencer, *Holiness*, 2.

pinpointing holiness traits within the Society separate from the late nineteenth-century Holiness Movement.

There are two drawbacks in Spencer's work, however, as it relates to this study. Firstly, in her attempt to elevate holiness as the primary paradigmatic theme for understanding Quakerism academically, she makes evangelicalism a sub-category of holiness. While this method works for a broad study of 350 years of Quakerism and all its various manifestations, it is a less successful model for analysing a thirty-year period exclusively focused on a single group of evangelical Friends. Rather, making evangelical theology the primary unifying category, as is done in this study, better enables the pinpointing of micro shifts through holiness, modernism, fundamentalism and neo-evangelicalism. The second drawback in Spencer's work, as it relates to this study, is that she skirts the fundamentalist tradition within American Quakerism during the first half of the twentieth-century. In her study of American Quakerism at this time, she focuses on Jones<sup>297</sup> and Thomas Kelly,<sup>298</sup> neither of whom qualifies as fundamentalist, or probably even evangelical. Spencer also offers a study of the British Quaker J. Rendel Harris (1852-1941), whom she describes in a manner similar to this author's use of the term 'evangelical modernist',<sup>299</sup> and she also includes American Quaker Everett Cattell (1905-1981), who rose to prominence during the post-mid twentieth century neo-evangelical renewal in the Society.<sup>300</sup> However, her work lacks significant analysis of any influential

---

<sup>297</sup> Spencer, *Holiness*, 195-206.

<sup>298</sup> Spencer, *Holiness*, 228-231. Spencer refers to Kelley as an 'evangelical mystic' who, she claims, was both modernist and liberal in his theology.

<sup>299</sup> Spencer, *Holiness*, 207-221.

<sup>300</sup> Spencer, *Holiness*, 232-234.

American fundamentalist tradition during the first half of the twentieth-century.<sup>301</sup>

Spencer's work, which was inherently designed to search for a common holiness thread, suffers from this huge time gap in analysing American twentieth-century fundamentalist Quakerism. Since she makes holiness the unifying theme, she is forced to skip over a large segment of the American phenomenon as it played out in the early twentieth-century. Spencer does refer to fundamentalism as an aberration within Quakerism,<sup>302</sup> but because most of the 'fourth strain' of American Quakerism went through fundamentalism and is heir apparent to fundamentalism, this period requires the further review presented in this thesis.

Despite its numerical significance in America and around the world, evangelical Quakerism in the twentieth-century as a whole has largely been ignored by scholars. An example of this is Elbert Russell's *The History of Quakerism*,<sup>303</sup> published in 1942. After painting a glowing interpretation of the widespread reunification of Friends in that century (limited mostly to modernist, Hicksite and Conservative Wilburite Friends), he concluded: 'The real difficulty today is with the large body of Orthodox Friends in the middle and far west... where the Evangelical fear of unsoundness still operates to a

---

<sup>301</sup> Even her review of the late nineteenth-century Holiness Movement within Friends lacks significant analysis of those key American figures (David Updegraff, John Henry Douglas, Dougan Clark, J. Walter Malone and William Pinkham) who are generally deemed today to be the primary evangelical personalities during holiness revivalism among Friends and precursors to fundamentalism. Oddly, she elects instead to highlight two figures on the fringe of the evangelical holiness/revivalist movement among Friends. Joel Bean (1825-1914), who, 'represents a major shift toward modernism', and Hannah Whitall Smith (1832-1911), who, 'struggled to find a place of true leadership among Gurneyite Friends.' See Spencer, *Holiness*, 173, 192.

<sup>302</sup> Spencer, *Holiness*, 222.

<sup>303</sup> Elbert Russell, *The History of Quakerism* (NY, The Macmillan Company, 1942).



considerable extent as a barrier to reunion.<sup>304</sup> What Russell and others fail to mention, though, is that this ‘large body of Orthodox Friends’ represented, and continues to represent, the dominant trend in Quakerism today. That is not to say that evangelical Quakerism is equally spread geographically. Ever since the Manchester Conference in 1895, Great Britain has mostly embraced a more liberal theology.<sup>305</sup> Many large pockets of Quakers in the North and East of the U.S. have done so as well. This dynamic perhaps explains the dearth of scholarly work on Quaker evangelicalism to some extent. As both locations represent the historic strongholds of the Society, they have long developed the resources (academic institutions, publishing houses, scholars) needed to engage in research. Scholars from these areas continue to publish materials consistent with their own localised experiences and constituencies. Liberal modernist Quakerism and particularly its embrace of pluralism, is an important distinctive for many in the Society. It cannot, and has not, been overlooked. However, to highlight it as the main development within the Society in the twentieth-century is inaccurate. It was a significant theological shift, but represents a minority view today within the Society around the world.

---

<sup>304</sup> Russell, *History of Quakerism*, 537.

<sup>305</sup> The Manchester Conference of 1895 is often seen as the corollary of the American Richmond Conference of 1887. Both conferences were essentially called because of growing conflicts among their respective members over larger evangelical/modernist issues in the context of developments in modern thought. Whereas America adopted the Richmond Declaration of Faith- a largely evangelical statement of faith; the Manchester Conference rejected the RDF and instead began moving towards liberal theology. The conference is seen as a major turning point among British Friends. Martin Davie identifies the conferences as, ‘The point after which British Quakerism began to follow the example of other churches by coming to accept Liberal theology’, and an attempt by liberal British Friends to establish ‘a new form of Christian and Quaker theology that to their eyes was more intellectual and spiritually credible.’ For the first quote, see Martin Davie, *British Quaker Theology Since 1885* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1997), 58, and the second quote, see Martin Davie, ‘Manchester Conference (1895)’ in *The A to Z of the Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion, and John William Oliver Jr. (ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003), 165.

If the historiography puts too much emphasis on liberal Quakerism in the early twentieth-century, then there is one example of the other extreme: Walter R. Williams' attempt at a complete history of Friends seen through an evangelical lens (*The Rich History of Quakerism*).<sup>306</sup> His indictment against modernist thought in the Society is obvious in both his words and in what he elects to leave out. Of Quaker modernist education at the turn of the century, he writes, 'Thus, [a] considerable number of Friends... were drinking of the waters of knowledge, sometimes polluted with doubt, from the fountain bearing the high-sounding name: *Modern Biblical Scholarship and Progressive Religious Thought*.'<sup>307</sup> Aside from referring to Jones' material four times, Williams' *Rich History of Quakerism* mentions his name only once. While Jones certainly had his detractors, to leave him out of an historical study of Friends is an unwarranted omission. Since Williams published in 1962, no evangelical Friend has published an exhaustive history of evangelicalism in the Society.<sup>308</sup> Likewise, no scholar to date has examined in-depth what happened to these evangelical Quakers during the first half of the twentieth-century, when many of the acrimonious debates and separations occurred.

More moderate and well-balanced than Williams' work is the recent work of John Punshon (*Reason for Hope*).<sup>309</sup> The book is entirely focused on the contemporary

---

<sup>306</sup> Walter R. Williams, *The Rich History of Quakerism* (MI, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962).

<sup>307</sup> Williams, *Rich History of Quakerism*, 211.

<sup>308</sup> Although a second edition of Williams' work was published in 1987.

<sup>309</sup> John Punshon, *Reason for Hope: The Faith and Future of the Friends Church* (IN: Friends United Press, 2001).

worldwide body of the Friends Church[g],<sup>310</sup> which he argues grew out of two impulses (the beginning of Quakerism in seventeenth-century England and the Wesleyan holiness revivals sweeping the U.S. in the late nineteenth century),<sup>311</sup> and has genetic strains of Anabaptist, pietist, mainstream evangelical, holiness and fundamentalist influences.<sup>312</sup> While the book certainly includes some historical analysis, Punshon's goal is more about looking ahead to the twenty-first century, trying to develop a common understanding of the gospel through an evangelical lens, improving relationships between evangelical YMs, growth and defining the evangelical distinctiveness of Quakers.<sup>313</sup> Punshon does mention the Friends' early twentieth-century fundamentalist period, but generally limits his discussion to fundamentalist use of biblical literalism, encouraging modern day evangelical Friends to 'steer a middle course' between those who 'neglect the authority of scripture' and those who 'adhere rigidly to what is written but leave little space for the Spirit's continuing guidance'.<sup>314</sup> It is an important book for unraveling the contemporary theological and ecclesiological issues among Friends today, but more work is still needed on examining the process and methods by which fundamentalism moved into the Friends Church; a trend Punshon generally limits to a pre-millennialist revival of the late

---

<sup>310</sup> From the late nineteenth century onwards, evangelical Friends have preferred the nomenclature 'Friends Church', seeing themselves as part of the church universal under the lordship of Christ. See Margery Post Abbott, 'Friends Church', in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion, and John William Oliver Jr. (ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003), 107-108.

<sup>311</sup> Punshon, *Reason for Hope*, xi.

<sup>312</sup> Punshon, *Reason for Hope*, 4.

<sup>313</sup> Punshon, *Reason for Hope*, 5-11.

<sup>314</sup> Punshon, *Reason for Hope*, 145.

nineteenth-century. Punshon's discussion is brief, however. His one paragraph section<sup>315</sup> on the early twentieth-century claims that fundamentalism was, 'characterized by pessimism, cultural separation, and a shift to a dramatic form of premillennialism',<sup>316</sup> which in turn led to a 'curtailment of broader forms of social action',<sup>317</sup> but then little else is offered.

This thesis begins to redress these imbalances. A full analysis of the neo-evangelical tradition, much of which came through a strong fundamentalist impulse, is important to understanding Quakerism. Since scholars have indicated that fundamentalism appears to be an aberration, how then did that aberration become a normative experience for a major section of the Society? This work starts to fill this void in scholarship.

Other important studies to mention here are works specific to the modernist/fundamentalist era of the 1920s onward. Most notable in the field is George M. Marsden and his three books on the subject.<sup>318</sup> These sources have been widely cited in this study and have helped in forming a definition of fundamentalism. A weakness in

---

<sup>315</sup> Punshon uses the word 'fundamentalism' or 'fundamentalist' a total of nineteen times throughout his 386 page work (including the appended Glossary and Bibliography). For the most part, these are all quick single sentence usages and not specific to the Friends Church, such as, 'Before the overlay of fundamentalism, holiness believers were quite open to women in the pulpit.' (p. 270.) The one main section dealing with the fundamentalist movement is entitled 'The Premillennial Revival'. He attributes fundamentalism to an evangelical pessimism in responding to the intellectual and cultural shifts of late nineteenth-century. Punshon gives less than a paragraph to addressing the fundamentalist position. See Punshon, *Reason for Hope*, 323.

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>318</sup> George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1980); George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1987); and George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1991).

Marsden's work, as it relates to this study, is his emphasis on Presbyterians and Baptists. For a large overview such as his, it makes sense to focus on the two denominations scholars, such as Joel A. Carpenter, claim were 'hardest hit by the controversies of the 1920s'.<sup>319</sup> Quakers are mentioned only twice in Marsden's seminal work *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. Likewise, other scholars<sup>320</sup> of fundamentalism have all generally focused in on other denominations. Robert Cole's work *History of Fundamentalism*, considered the first academic work on the fundamentalist phenomenon, includes dedicated chapters on the Northern Baptist Convention, the Presbyterian Church, The Disciples of Christ, Methodism and the Episcopal Church, but nothing on the Religious Society of Friends. Norman Furniss's work (*The Fundamentalist Controversy*) includes sections on all the same denominations as Cole's work, with the addition of the

---

<sup>319</sup> Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 7.

In America at least, the fundamentalist/modernist controversies were so highlighted in the Presbyterian Church, the conflict is sometimes nominally referred to as the Presbyterian Controversy. Although Presbyterians were only the fourth largest denomination in America in the 1920s, Longfield has argued that the Presbyterian Church had a theological and social influence far greater in proportion to its size. The classic 1922 sermon 'Shall the Fundamentalist Win' by Baptist minister Harry Emerson Fosdick (preaching in a Presbyterian pulpit in New York) sparked a schism within the Presbyterian Church led by militant conservative Presbyterian minister and teacher J. Gresham Machen that was well played out in national headlines and the popular press at the time. In addition to separating the Presbyterian denomination, Princeton Theological Seminary (overseen by the Presbyterian Church) was reorganised around more modernist pedagogies, while Machen formed the evangelically conservative Westminster Theological Seminary around fundamentalism. Later in the 1940s, neo-evangelical Presbyterians formed Fuller Theological Seminary. Many of the major influences within the broader fundamentalist-modernist controversy belonged to the Presbyterian denomination. In addition to Machen: Clarence Macartney, William Jennings Bryan, Charles Erdman, Robert E. Speer and Henry Sloane Coffin. See Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalist, Modernists, & Moderates* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1991).

<sup>320</sup> In addition to the aforementioned works of George Marsden, some of the more notable academic works over the years include Stewart Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism* (CT: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1931); Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931* (CT: Archon Books, 1954, reprinted 1963); Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (Paris, France: Mouton & Co., 1963). Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (MI: Baker Book House, 1970, reprinted 1978); James Barr, *Fundamentalism* (London: SCM Press, 1977); and Harriet A. Harris, *Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). Without exception, these works do not include primary data on the Religious Society of Friends.

Southern Baptists, but again, nothing on the Religious Society of Friends. Ernest Sandeen's *Roots of Fundamentalism*, does not cover Quakers either, and spends less time on denominational characteristics, attempting to find a common fundamentalist thread within the millennialism movement. James Barr's work (*Fundamentalism*), which also does not cover Friends, is more coloured by its British context than by American fundamentalism.<sup>321</sup> Without exception, these works do not include significant evidence from the Quakers. Thus, this research not only breaks new ground in Quaker studies, it also makes an original contribution to the study of Christianity in the USA.

## Methods and Sources

This research is an historical study of archival data. In attempting to define a theological identity for a non-creedal case population, I have allowed for the archival records of historical events to represent the primary reflection of denominational identity. The archival data is limited to surviving written documents. The bulk of the archival data gathered in this research is held at George Fox University, Newberg, Oregon.<sup>322</sup> In the archive, I was able to access Oregon Yearly Meeting Minutes[g] from the YM's inception, minutes of Yearly Meeting Committees, Oregon YM's newsletter (*Friendly Endeavor*, later changed to the *Northwest Friend*), personal correspondence of key

---

<sup>321</sup> By most accounts, the British fundamentalist movement of this era, while clearly able to be delineated, was a far less influential group within larger British evangelicalism, than the American counterpart. Bebbington writes, 'Whereas in the United States Fundamentalism was a large and forceful movement, in Britain it was neither. Fundamentalism in Britain was small and frail'. See David Bebbington, 'Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism in Britain' (Concluding paper from a series of conferences held between January 2008 and June 2009 by The Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism in Britain Network), 8.

<sup>322</sup> Where Oregon Yearly Meeting and George Fox University (formerly Pacific College) both store their archival data.

Yearly Meeting officials, previous versions of the Yearly Meeting's *Faith and Practice*[g], George Fox University Board Meeting minutes and archived information from various Monthly Meetings. In the *Special Collections* section, the University also has available a wide range of Friends' periodicals, copies of Yearly Meeting minutes from many other YMs around the U.S., and a broad range of Quaker books. There is no other central storage location for both the YM and University records.

Of particular use was the access I was given to the Levi Pennington Papers – thirty boxes of records he kept over the almost 100 years of his life. The records include all his retained correspondence with Yearly Meeting Officials, with Quakers from around the world and with national leaders (in many cases both incoming and outgoing). Pennington also kept detailed minutes of most meetings he attended, wrote almost daily to various family members and kept a regular journal. By Pennington's own estimate, he wrote over 1,000 letters a year.<sup>323</sup> Although valuable, the collection in itself does reflect some historical recreation (or elimination), as Pennington admitted to having burned 50,000 letters and documents from his own collection prior to his death (a number he estimates to be over 90% of what he originally had).<sup>324</sup>

In addition to the personal records of Pennington, well-known neo-evangelical Quaker leader Arthur Roberts (of OYM) has started to transfer his personal records over to the University, currently resulting in a twenty-five box collection available for study.

Apart from records specific to Oregon Yearly Meeting, I used the periodicals the *American Friend* and *Evangelical Friend* for the corresponding time period. Prior to the

---

<sup>323</sup> Pennington, *Rambling Recollections*, 100-104.

<sup>324</sup> Pennington, *Rambling Recollections*, 100-104.

twentieth-century, Friends in America largely had one organ as its voice (*American Friend*, edited by Rufus Jones), but soon the revivalist Friends found it to have too much of a modernist bent.<sup>325</sup> In 1905, they turned the *Soul Winner* into the *Evangelical Friend* and made it the voice of Quaker evangelicalism.<sup>326</sup> The debates between the modernist and revivalist groupings are clearly (and vehemently) evident throughout the pages of both periodicals. These periodicals provided a helpful national perspective on issues being addressed within Oregon Yearly Meeting. Edward Mott, who came to Oregon Yearly Meeting in 1922, had just come from a long stint as editor of the *Evangelical Friend*. His thinking on modernism is important to understanding the actions he took while in OYM. Likewise, Walter Woodward, also of Oregon Yearly Meeting, edited the *American Friend* from 1917 to 1942.<sup>327</sup>

In addition to the extensive Quaker resources generally available through George Fox University, I spent considerable time accessing records at the Oregon Historical Society and at Seattle Pacific University (both institutions holding archives for Portland Bible Institute and Cascade College).<sup>328</sup> Also, considerable time was spent in residence at Woodbrooke Quaker Study Centre in England (which holds the second largest collection of Quaker material in Europe) and in accessing the holdings on religion and history at the University of Birmingham (U.K.). Furthermore, I researched the archival data of

---

<sup>325</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 166.

<sup>326</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 67.

<sup>327</sup> *Minutes of The Five Years Meeting of Friends in America - 1945*. (Richmond IN: The Five Years Meetings of Friends in America, 1945), 24. Hereafter, *FYM Minutes*, followed by respective year.

<sup>328</sup> Portland Bible Institute became Cascade College in 1939.



American Friends Service Committee located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and the archives of Five-Years Meeting located in Richmond, Indiana.

As an historical case-study analysis, there are two goals for this work. The first is to provide accurate historical recreation to optimise insight into this particular population of evangelical Quakers. One important question to be addressed, then, is: how can academia improve its understanding of the subject (Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends: 1919-1947)?<sup>329</sup> This first goal is an intrinsic design, seeing historical research as having lasting value in and of itself, outside of any illustrative value it may hold. As nineteenth-century historian Leopold von Ranke said of his own historical work, 'its aim is to merely show how things actually were.'<sup>330</sup> In agreement with this approach, historian John Tosh argues that historical recreation is one important goal for the field of historicism today:

---

<sup>329</sup> In attempting to create boundary lines to delineate the object of this case study, the general rule is simply those active participants in the life of the legal corporation of the Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends during the years reflected in this study. This particular study does not differentiate between those who were formal members as opposed to those who were simply active participants without membership – although by Discipline stipulation most positions of authority within the Yearly Meeting were to be held by members only.

During the years covered in this study, OYM churches were entirely inside the boundaries of the States of Idaho, Oregon and Washington – although it did have ministry points and mission activities extending beyond this region. In contrast though, not all individual members who were a part of the life of the Yearly Meeting had permanent residences themselves within the same tri-state boundaries, nor was such a stipulation required for membership. It would be fair to say, however, that most OYM churches during this era were in the State of Oregon, with most individual members residing in that same State as well.

It would be inaccurate to say, however, that this is a study of all the Quakers in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington from the dates 1919 to 1947. In addition to those members of the Society who were tied to OYM, there was also a stronghold of Gurneyite Friends from Indiana Yearly Meeting in the Puget Sound region of Washington State. They are mentioned in this story only peripherally. Likewise there was a large contingent of Friends in the same tri-state area who were organically tied to Friends General Conference (Hicksite). They would eventually become Pacific Yearly Meeting in 1947, which would eventually set off North Pacific Yearly Meeting (Oregon and Washington) in 1973. These Quakers are not part of this study either.

<sup>330</sup> L. von Ranke, *Histories of the Latin and German Nations from 1494 to 1514*, extract translated in G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (London: Longman, 1952), 74.

The re-creation of episodes and ambiances in the past has the same kind of claim on our attention as the re-creation of the thought expressed in a work of art or literature. The historian, like the literary critic and art historian, is a guardian of our cultural heritage, and familiarity with that heritage offers insight into the human condition... and any venture in historical reconstruction is worth doing.<sup>331</sup>

With the obvious caveat that truncating thirty-plus years of history into one work risks telling a rather ‘smooth, almost pre-ordained route’<sup>332</sup> to the present, the goal of historical recreation herein is to provide an accurate and useable past and this intention is foundational to the second goal of this work.

The second goal of this research is to provide a practical, but not predictive, analysis of the twentieth-century evangelical tradition. Although historical recreation has value in itself, practical analysis allows the historian to understand events within their broader historical context and academic classification. Thus, seeing the events within OYM as they actually happened holds value, as does understanding that behaviour observed in OYM mimics a pattern unfolding in larger Protestant America. It is important to make two comments regarding the methods of analysis used here. Firstly, such theoretical construction, no matter how grounded in data, involves analysis of the researcher. It is up to the historian to make choices about which conclusions make the most sense and which do not help to fit the pieces of the puzzle together nicely. As a current member of the Northwest Yearly Meeting (formerly OYM) and heir to the conflicts discussed in this study, I carry the same potential entrapments as Ralph Beebe writing about the garden in his own back yard, Thomas Hamm writing about Indiana

---

<sup>331</sup> John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History; Aim, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History* (London: Longman, 1984), 23.

<sup>332</sup> John Tosh, *Why History Matters* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 48.

Friends, or Rufus Jones writing the story of the inception of American Friends Service Committee. Aside from just being a member of OYM, I have personally embraced a way of Quakerism, which according to the definition used herein, would be considered evangelical. So I am writing not just about my heritage, but about my faith. Although my ‘convincement’ to the Society and involvement in OYM came later in life, I still carry the potential bias of an insider.

Although it is important to reflect on this bias, I am not convinced it skews the final analysis more so than an outsider perspective would. This is partly because the idea of detached observer-neutrality is widely held to be impossible today.<sup>333</sup> In contrast, Peter Donovan defines neutrality as, ‘[T]o stand in relation to two or more parties which are themselves in tension, in such a way that the respective interests of those parties are not thereby materially affected.’<sup>334</sup> The important word in Donovan’s definition is ‘relation’. It is assumed the observer is in some type of relationship to the observed. My relational role to the larger OYM structure is as researcher more so than any other role that I hold. This research role, according to Donovan, inherently gives me a certain amount of ‘role-neutrality’, which goes far beyond ‘participant-neutrality’ (i.e. the success of my role is contingent on the extent to which the neutrality procedures and structures inherent in the

---

<sup>333</sup> Peter Donovan argues the idea of observer-neutrality within the academic study of religion is simply unrealisable and exists in ideal only. When such research is attempted, the observer is limited by his/her own location or point of view and by his/her own frame of mind (observer bias). The observer, unaware of the significance of the way things are for the parties themselves, may entirely miss the point (observer-incomprehension). Or the mere presence of the observer, however neutral, may itself alter or distort facts (observer-effect). Peter Donovan, ‘Neutrality in Religious Studies’, in *The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Religion*, Russell T. McCutcheon, ed. (London: Cassell, 1999), 236.

<sup>334</sup> Donovan, ‘Neutrality in Religious Studies’, 235.

position are adhered to).<sup>335</sup> So I am still a participant, but within a clearly defined role that inherently creates a level of neutrality. I also benefit from a geographical isolation from the epicentre of OYM, as I live in a different region from the Yearly Meeting offices and have no official position within the YM's corporate structure. Furthermore, I have no direct family connection to any of the people in this work or their immediate surviving descendants; I know them only through what documentation exists and what others have written about them. I also have ensured that scholars who are not OYM 'insiders' have reviewed this work as well.

The second comment about the research design is that, as an archival study, it risks letting primarily those who were the articulate and prevailing record keepers of the past have the opportunity to shape the current interpretation. Sadly missing from this work is precise detail and primary source documentation from many other leaders in OYM during this tumultuous period. As an archival study, focused exclusively on written documentation, some data is inherently omitted. Pennington and Mott, who came to represent the two leading protagonists in the debate, both have a reasonable portion of their thinking preserved in print. In some ways the whole time period and geographical emphasis for this work can start to look like a power struggle between these two men alone (which, at times, it was), but this is a weakness of this type of study. Although theological battles are often fought by the generals, the arguments went beyond just these two personalities and many more individuals were involved in influencing corporate decisions. The near absence of personal records from Chester Hadley, Clark Smith and Rebecca Pennington (all powerful leaders in OYM who failed to document or archive

---

<sup>335</sup> Donovan, 'Neutrality in Religious Studies', 235-239.

their words, thoughts and actions as well as others did) is disappointing. Each played an immeasurable role in shaping the YM in different ways. I gained a brief look at them in meeting minutes, some personal correspondence saved by others and even in the difficulty to discern reality of looking through another's eyes. When Pennington explodes about Clark Smith, blaming him for the whole ordeal with American Friends Service Committee – I only have Pennington's version of that story, but I still catch a glimpse of Smith.

Also, because this work primarily uses the actions of the leaders (and corporate decisions) as evidence for its conclusions, the paucity of qualitative data from the everyday people behind these leaders, who are rarely heard from and often only in a kind of 'off-screen' sort of way, is clearly missing. When a stenographer aggregates the comments of the entire committee simply saying '*and all the people were in agreement*', assumptions have to be made as to whether this is a literal claim and, therefore, a powerful act of a unified mass, or simply a silent acquiescence for the sake of compromise and moving forward. Such caveats do not prevent theoretical constructs about the subject from being formed, but they are important to state them alongside the conclusions. Since this work zeros in on the corporate identity of OYM, the near exclusive focus on identified leaders and defining decisions allows for accurate general conclusions to be made at the corporate level, based on the archival data used, while simultaneously acknowledging that individual exceptions and various sub-groupings still existed.

To assist in the process of working through some of the challenges inherent in this type of qualitative archival study, I have adopted the 'Parallel Criteria' method of social

science research, as outlined by Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln.<sup>336</sup> This approach ‘parallels’ the traditional scientific model, based on validity, reliability, generalisation and objective – but is applied to social science qualitative analysis and emphasises, instead, credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.<sup>337</sup> Credibility (according to Guba and Lincoln) is similar to the idea of internal validity in a more scientific based study. It seeks to improve the match between the reality being studied and that being described herein.<sup>338</sup> Transferability is related to generalisation, but is more relative and depends on the overlapping conditions. The burden of proof for transferability, then, is on the receiver, who uses this work to draw conclusions about another case.<sup>339</sup> Dependability is similar to reliability and is concerned with the stability of the data over time, i.e. how did the design and design changes impact conclusions?<sup>340</sup> Confirmability is to be thought of as related to objectivity.<sup>341</sup>

Here, credibility was established using three methods: 1) prolonged engagement with the archival data, 2) persistent analysis of the data, and 3) peer debriefing methods,

---

<sup>336</sup> Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln, *Fourth Generation Evaluation* (CA: Sage Publications, 1989), 236-243.

<sup>337</sup> In fairness to Guba and Lincoln the ‘parallel criteria’ method is not their preferred method of developing constructs from social science research – though they do see the ‘parallel criteria’ method as one of three valid possibilities (‘each set has utility for certain purposes’). Their preferred approach, ‘The Authenticity Criteria’, involved significant collaboration with the subject matter (or ‘stakeholder’, as they say) such that obvious impossibilities existed with that method for this particular project. See Guba and Lincoln, *Fourth Generation*, 233, 245-251

<sup>338</sup> Guba and Lincoln, *Fourth Generation*, 236-241.

<sup>339</sup> Guba and Lincoln, *Fourth Generation*, 241-242.

<sup>340</sup> Guba and Lincoln, *Fourth Generation*, 242.

<sup>341</sup> Guba and Lincoln, *Fourth Generation*, 242-243.

such as presenting each of the three main sections of this work at conferences.<sup>342</sup>

Transferability was established through a detailed thick-description<sup>343</sup> of the phenomenon being studied and how it is being studied, so that future researchers could replicate and/or transfer the study to other settings. Dependability was created by having the data and the findings reviewed by existing independent scholars who are aware of the field of study. Similarly, any changes in methodology were reviewed with my supervisors.

Confirmability was established both through reflecting systemically on the context of knowledge construction used, and on the author's own bias (see above section on insider perspective). Confirmability was also established through regular external auditing from academic supervisors.

## **Thesis Outline**

The rest of this work is organised around three main chapters followed by a concluding chapter. While the three middle chapters proceed in chronological ordering (1920s, 1930s and 1940s respectively), there is significant overlapping of theological issues, dates and personnel. Social/theological identity shifts are seldom linear, rather

---

<sup>342</sup> These presentations included presenting the findings of chapter two at the *Conference of Quaker Historians and Archivists* on June 25-27, 2010 – paper title ‘The Rise of 20<sup>th</sup> Century American Quaker Evangelicalism: Oregon Yearly Meeting and its Relationship to Five Years Meeting’. The findings of chapter three were presented at the Pacific Northwest regional gathering of the *American Academy of Religion* on May 7-9, 2010 – paper title ‘No Peace Among Friends: Soteriological Debates within the American Religious Society of Friends’. The findings of Chapter Four were presented at the Pacific Northwest regional meeting of the *American Academy of Religion* on May 13-15, 2011 – paper title ‘From Fundamentalism to Free Thinkers: The transition of evangelical Bible schools into a liberal arts college’. A broad overview of the entire work was presented to peers during student day conference for the *Centre for Postgraduate Quaker Studies* on March 24, 2011 – paper title ‘American Neo-Evangelical Quakers – Research Overview’.

<sup>343</sup> Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers, 1973), 3-30.

they are circuitous at times and often start slowly only to be jolted along by sudden crises. I have elected to highlight these critical moments of change throughout this work as they represent important microcosms related to broader identity shifts. The following is an overview of each of the remaining chapters.

Chapter Two ('The Rise of Fundamentalist Friends') addresses the shift in OYM to a corporate identity with fundamentalist tendencies. Two specific events, which occurred in the 1920s, are analysed in this chapter: the separation of OYM from the FYM and the formation of a new Bible School by Oregon Friends. A brief history of Five-Years Meeting is offered as well as a brief history of the attempt by some Friends to set up an alternative revivalist Bible School. In addition, the arrival of Edward Mott and his rise to power within the YM further exacerbated already present fundamentalist tendencies. Although fundamentalist thinking is evident at the YM level as early as 1919, this chapter shows that it is not until 1926 that the corporate identity can be classified as fundamentalist. Using McDermott's seven characteristics of fundamentalism, identified above, a detailed analysis is offered to show that a similar shifting process unfolded within OYM over this decade, as it came more in line with a fundamentalist way of thinking.

Chapter Three ('The Altered Ethos of Quaker Holiness') addresses the further rejection in Oregon Yearly Meeting of most socially progressive practices in favour of evangelism during the 1930s. The primary event analysed in this chapter relates to the relationship of OYM to the American Friends Service Committee and their decision, in 1938, to sever organic ties with the AFSC due to concerns over the lack of Christ-centred, evangelistically-orientated social service in AFSC. Since social service was seen



by evangelicals as a consequence of sanctification, something reserved for the justified, social programming by the perceived unregenerate became more and more suspect.

Additional evidence in this chapter points to a declining social ethic in the YM's mission and humanitarian work. In the larger picture, these developments can be seen as part of a fundamentalist response by the YM to perceived theological liberalism in social gospel type programmes. In efforts by OYM to avoid contamination from, and association with, such theologies, social and humanitarian programmes were relegated to a secondary role. In the efforts of OYM to ensure Christological transformation was given primacy as part and parcel of holiness campaigns, evangelism and conversion were elevated.

Chapter Four ('The Establishment of Neo-Evangelical Quakerism') examines the quest of OYM in the 1940s to reshape the Yearly Meeting into the centre of neo-evangelical Quakerism. For most of the decade, the corporate identity of OYM was still firmly fundamentalist, and this way of thinking continued to be evident in the YM's attempts at renewed control of its higher education institution (Pacific College) and the removal of the remaining perceived modernist-leaning personnel. A brief history of this process is offered. Throughout the 1940s though, shifts were also developing in OYM demonstrating a moderate renewal of social and engagement with the world, which in many ways influenced this fundamentalist mindset. By the end of the decade, the YM showed far more ecumenism as it sought greater involvement with other evangelical Quakers and also demonstrated an increasing tolerance toward evangelical modernist thinking. Also, by mid-century, there is evidence of renewed interest in the value of modern education within a Christian milieu, as OYM tried to reshape its pedagogical philosophy around neo-evangelical principles. Using this author's typology of neo-

evangelicalism to analyse the events examined in this chapter, we can claim that, by the middle of the twentieth-century, a new and fourth strain of the Society was officially formed – American neo-evangelical Quakerism, with the Oregon Yearly Meeting as its headquarters.

Chapter Five ('Conclusions and Findings') is where the main findings of this work are addressed, conclusions and original contributions stated and the implications for current scholarship are offered along with an agenda for future research. Following Chapter Five there is an Appendix, Glossary and Bibliography.

### **Chapter Summary**

This chapter began with a brief abstract and put the research into its historical context. This was followed by contextualisation and definitions of the following terms: evangelicalism, holiness, social gospel, modernism, fundamentalism and neo-evangelicalism. In the remainder of the chapter, a brief overview of the Religious Society of Friends, and, in particular, the Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends, was given. This was then followed by a discussion on the relationship of this work to previous scholarship, the research methods used and an outline of the thesis.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE RISE OF FUNDAMENTALIST FRIENDS

#### Introduction

On the floor of the 1897 conference of all Friends in America, during the height of the debates about whether or not the Gurneyite wing of the Society should form a national headship having legislative power and authority over Quaker polity in America, the Clerk of Kansas Yearly meeting (Edmund Stanley) rose and spoke passionately to those who feared that such a move would only further fracture the Society:

It has been thought that the eastern yearly meetings might unite on a form of discipline that would not be satisfactory to the west, and that the western meetings might take similar action as regards a discipline for that section, and so array the east against the west... But such a thing is not likely to occur. Our western yearly meetings are made up of your sons and daughters from the east, and we are not so forgetful of our training as to lose all respect and esteem for our parental training.<sup>1</sup>

Although well meant at the time, Stanley's hope for Quaker unity in America proved false. The newly formed conglomerate of Gurneyite Friends lasted less than twenty-five years before a steady exodus of one evangelical YM after another started, with the Oregon Yearly Meeting leading the way in 1926.

This chapter focuses on these initial shifts, highlighting the move within Oregon Yearly Meeting (OYM) toward a fundamentalist culture,<sup>2</sup> which exacerbated separatist tendencies. Again, for the purposes of this study, fundamentalism is being characterised

---

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings of the Conference of Friends of America – 1897* (Indianapolis, IN: Published by Direction of the Conference, 1898), 134.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this work the word 'culture' is used exclusive to the phrase 'fundamentalist culture', 'culture of fundamentalism', or similar. By this it is not meant that the cognitive and attitudinal attributes of fundamentalism stemmed from or were influenced by the larger cultural environs in which they occurred. Rather, the term 'culture' in this capacity is used to describe how the characteristics of fundamentalism (defined according to McDermott's typology) became dominant, and thus created a governing pattern (culture), within the YM's corporate religious identity.

through McDermott's typology of fundamentalist thinking. This study contends that fundamentalism, while often attitudinal and insular, offered no real change to the evangelical doctrine and was still consistent with the evangelical theological rubric.

The data supporting the claim in this chapter centres on two key changes within OYM around the end of WWI. The first was the decision to separate from the Five-Years Meeting umbrella of Gurneyite Friends in America. Staunchly conservative evangelical Quakers in America had garnered several important gains relating to Five Years' mission statement, but, by 1926, they perceived an unbridgeable gap between what was in writing and what they thought of the orthodoxy of its leaders, missionaries and publications. In 1926, OYM decided to sever all official connections with FYM and instead became a stand-alone independent Yearly Meeting. Since the decision regarding the relationship of OYM to FYM occupied considerable space in the YM sessions and discussions, along with the clear tension perceived over FYM's modernist impulses, the overall debate deserves considerable attention for it is indicative of the changing corporate identity of the YM.

The second change that took place during this era, which suggests a changing corporate identity toward fundamentalism, was the process of forming a Bible School in reaction to the perceived modernist teachings at Pacific College. Started by Oregon Friends late in 1918, but not under the Yearly Meeting's tutelage, North Pacific Evangelistic Institute (NPEI) became a thriving centre for revivalist-sanctification teachings and was an expression of the larger fundamentalist patterns growing within the Yearly Meeting. With many in the YM seeing NPEI as the doctrinally sound alternative to perceived modernist teachings at Pacific College, the establishment and success of the

small institute became indicative of the growing strength of fundamentalist Friends in Oregon.

Interspersed throughout these same years are smaller scale events that, when seen as a whole, become further evidence of the larger social shift towards fundamentalism. Although no organisational identity shift is completely adhered to by all the constituents or thoroughly impressed throughout all elements, this chapter shows that, in 1919, a start was made towards a generally pervasive fundamentalist trend, which, by 1926, could claim hegemony. This new fundamentalist culture would have lasting influence on the corporate identity of the YM for over twenty years.

This chapter starts with a brief history of Five-Years Meeting; an organisation which single-handedly united and then divided early twentieth-century American Gurneyite Friends. Then a history of the formation of North Pacific Evangelistic Institute is tied in showing how both trends were indicative of a budding spirit of anti-modernism, fissiparousness, exclusivity and literalism. The remainder of the chapter then focuses on the key years 1922-1926, when the YM transitioned into a strong fundamentalist bastion. This chapter then concludes with an overall analysis of these events.

### **Five-Years Meeting: A Brief History**

The debate over divisive issues like the leadership and doctrinal position of FYM was inherent in its inception. The Society had already experienced two major splits<sup>3</sup> and, nearing the last quarter of the nineteenth-century, the Gurneyite tradition was

---

<sup>3</sup> The Orthodox/Hicksite division of the 1820s and the Conservative Wilburite division of the 1830s, 1840s and 1850s (see Chapter One).

experiencing discord again. What Hamm describes as a moderate ‘renewal movement’ amongst Gurneyite Friends from about 1850-1870, was paralleled by a ‘revival movement’ from 1867-1880.<sup>4</sup> Theologically, these new revivalist Friends further embraced the larger interdenominational instant sanctification movements and were fueled by revivalism.<sup>5</sup> As large numbers of converts entered the Society, primarily due to the mechanisms of revivalism, new forms of worship arose: public testimony of a definite conversion experience, vocal prayers, Bible reading during service and singing.

In 1887, representatives from the American Evangelical Quaker Yearly Meetings<sup>6</sup> gathered together in Richmond, Indiana to discuss the growing controversies between revivalist and renewal Friends.<sup>7</sup> Aside from a general resolution to the two contentious

---

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907* (IN: Indiana University Press, 1988), Chapter 3 & 4.

<sup>5</sup> Ohio Yearly Meeting became an epicentre of Quaker revivalism with such renowned Quaker evangelists as David P. Updegraff, Dr. Dougan Clark, John Henry Douglas, Luke Woodard and William P. Pinkham.

<sup>6</sup> The opening minute of the Richmond Conference states the attendees were ‘composed of delegates appointed by all the Yearly Meetings in the world, except that of Philadelphia.’ Generally speaking, it was hoped the conference would bring together all Gurneyite Friends. See *Proceedings of the Conference of Friends in America-1887*, (Richmond, IN: Published by Direction of the Conference, 1887), 3.

<sup>7</sup> In particular, there were two new ecclesiastical issues that became contentious in the Society following 1880: the introduction of a pastoral system and observance of the outward ordinances. In regards to the pastoral system, Rufus Jones acknowledges that due to the great number of new converts to the Society, ‘the old “form” as it stood would plainly not do for the new conditions of life.’ At the same time, though, he believed the form of solution finally adopted (hiring ministers) was entirely ‘germane to a different type of Christianity from that of Friends, and could become general only through profound alterations of the Quaker basis.’ Despite Jones’ concerns, the reality is that a pastoral system sporadically sprang up in the Society in America in a rather ad hoc fashion as opposed to a single deliberate move. By 1900, the perceived benefits of the new system became evident to so many Friends that a pastoral system was an established method in a large part of Gurneyite Quakerism outside Philadelphia and Baltimore Yearly Meetings. See Jones, *Later Periods vol. 2*, 917.

The second issue, observance of the ordinances, was initially more contentious. In the second half of the nineteenth century a small group of revivalist Friends started practicing and encouraging such expressions as necessary evidence towards obedience to the word of God. Most vocal among these leaders was David Updegraff, a Quaker minister from Ohio Yearly Meeting.

issues about which the conference was originally convened (water baptism and development of a pastoral system),<sup>8</sup> the real impact of the 1887 conference was in the attempt to bring all American evangelical YMs under one unified Discipline and one national headship. The first recommendation was to consider this motion: ‘Is it desirable that all the Yearly Meetings of Friends in the world should adopt one declaration of Christian Doctrine?’<sup>9</sup> After much debate, such a document was drafted and adopted by the Conference and has been known since as the Richmond Declaration of Faith (hereafter, RDF). The document was a testament to the growing strength of the revivalist evangelical wing within Gurneyism. As examples of the larger documents, here are a few key sections:

---

<sup>8</sup> By the time of the Richmond Conference, eight Yearly Meetings in America had already adopted declarations reaffirming their embrace of the historical ideas of Quaker baptism and communion. Ohio had tried to pass a similar declaration, but in Updegraff’s own Yearly Meeting there was no such unity. They embraced toleration of a variety of viewpoints on the subject, instead. Although the issue came up at the Richmond Conference, it only came up in the Business Committee, whose members attempted to limit the debate to committee proceedings. ‘A number of suggestions having been made by members of the Conference to the Business Committee, in reference to the teaching and practice of Water Baptism and the Supper, by those in official positions in the Society of Friends, the Committee have given careful attention thereto, but believe that the recent official utterances and reaffirmations of eight Yearly Meetings on this continent have definitely settled these questions... and we advise that the subject be not entered upon or debated at this time.’ (*Conference of Friends-1887*, 13). Although minimal debate regarding the topic occurred at that moment, it was Updegraff’s conciliatory statement to ‘express my hearty acquiescence in the report of the committee as the very best thing’, (*Conference of Friends-1887*, 13) that appeared to open the way for quick and peaceful passage of the minute. Two days later the Conference did redebate, however, if they had worded the statement correctly to reflect the sense of the meeting. After several hours of discussion it was referred back to the Business Committee, who resubmitted a new report with some modifications in wording and content, but generally with the same conclusion. The new report was adopted without debate. Updegraff, late in the conference, requested clarification that each YM was free to take independent action on the matter and was not in any way subject to the Conference’s resolutions.

The issue of ‘hireling ministers’ was given more tolerance (and considerably more debate) by the Conference. ‘There was considerable diversity of opinion as to what those arrangements are allowable for securing a regular ministry in those congregations already provided for in that respect. The Conference did not presume to advise our meetings as to the exact course which it might be right to pursue in each case... but it is important that those who are rightly occupying a prominent position in our meetings should not become a separate order of men and women,’ (*Conference of Friends-1887*, 22). Although the last caveat would generally not be adhered to by all YMs over the course of the next century, the conclusion was vague enough to satisfy all Yearly Meetings.

<sup>9</sup> *Conference of Friends-1887*, 10.

We believe in one holy, almighty, all-wise, and everlasting God, the Father, the Creator and Preserver of all things; and in Jesus Christ, His only son, our Lord, by whom all things were made, and by whom all things consist, and in one Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son.

The Scriptures are the only divinely authorized record of doctrines which we are bound, as Christians, to accept, and of the moral principles which are to regulate our actions. No one can be required to believe, as an article of faith, any doctrine which is not contained in them; and whatsoever any one says or guidance of the Holy Spirit, must be reckoned and accounted as mere delusion.

We believe that justification is of God's free grace, through which, upon repentance and faith, He pardons our sins, and imparts to us a new life.... Sanctification is experienced in the acceptance of Christ in living faith for justification, in so far as the pardoned sinner, through faith in Christ, is clothed with a measure of His righteousness and receives the Spirit of promise.<sup>10</sup>

Despite the apparent widespread acceptance of the RDF by the Conference attendees, Rufus Jones (who was not present, but who would later become a galvanising figure in the fundamentalist/modernist debates) later argued that the reasons it was embraced and consensus on it agreed, were not very positive and beneficial ones:

The declaration, adopted by the Conference and known as "The Richmond Declaration of Faith", was the culmination of Gurneyism. It was too long and too argumentative, but it was soundly orthodox and unequivocally evangelical. It revealed no clear consciousness of existing modern problems. It reflected no sign of the prevailing intellectual difficulties over questions of science and history. It preserved the air of infallibility which has always marked creeds and declarations. It was in every sense a relic of the past. Those who hesitated to approve it because they saw that it might, at some points, curtail their liberty, submitted to it on the ground that it was a summary of extracts from existing Disciplines and contained nothing new. Nowhere did it strike down into fresh depth of life and experience. It made no effort to interpret Christianity to this age. It was a collection of words and phrases, effectively connected for the immediate purpose at hand, but a poor, thin, mediocre expression of vital Quaker faith at the close of the nineteenth century. The only good that can be said

---

<sup>10</sup> *Conference of Friends-1887*, 24-43.



of this Declaration is that it fairly well satisfied the superficial demand of the hour. It rallied against divergent forces and brought them for the moment somewhere near together.<sup>11</sup>

Jones' pessimism is not evident in comments recorded in the Conference proceedings (recorded in detail by a stenographer), which, for the most part, show all members expressing a positive embrace of the document, with no real objections to general conclusions.<sup>12</sup> Fully-fledged modernism had yet to gain strength or momentum in the American branch of the Society by 1887,<sup>13</sup> and despite tensions between what Hamm calls 'Revivalist Friends' and 'Renewal Friends',<sup>14</sup> most Gurneyite Quakers still fell into a consistent evangelical theology.<sup>15</sup> But unlike Jones' claim of 1921, there is no sense, in the minutes in 1887, of the final result being a 'relic of the past'. Within the next few years, as modernism gained strength in the Society, that perception would change.

The second recommendation that came out of the 1887 Richmond Conference was the suggestion to form a larger umbrella organisation with legislative power and ultimate authority over the participating American Yearly Meetings.<sup>16</sup> The proposal was

---

<sup>11</sup> Jones, *Later Periods* vol. 2, 931.

<sup>12</sup> *Conference of Friends-1887*, 274-292.

<sup>13</sup> Although, as we will see below, it was starting to gain a stronghold in Quaker academic institutions. See Thomas D. Hamm, 'Friends United Meeting and its Identity: An Interpretative History', *Quaker Life* (January/February 2009): 12.

<sup>14</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, Chapters 3 & 4.

<sup>15</sup> It was true, however, that RDF was the culmination of existing and past YM doctrinal statements in general: Joseph Bevan Braithwaite, representative from London Yearly Meeting and primary author on the committee, admitted this was done intentionally after reviewing all the correspondences of various Yearly Meetings. *Conference of Friends-1887*, 279.

<sup>16</sup> The question originally put before the attendees was, 'Is it desirable that there should be a union of the Yearly Meetings for Foreign Mission work?' However, by the end of the conference, the proposal had evolved from joining together for the purpose of mission work into a fully-fledged 'delegate body' with detailed organisational structure and authority. See *Conference of Friends-1887*, 12. See also, *Conference of Friends-1887*, 263-269.

tabled at this conference,<sup>17</sup> but, by 1892, the idea had garnered enough support that ten Yearly Meetings (all the aforementioned, plus New England, Ohio, and the newly formed Wilmington YM) met in Indianapolis, Indiana to discuss the plan further.<sup>18</sup> In 1897, they met again in Indianapolis,<sup>19</sup> and two papers were presented on the topic: ‘Shall Future Conferences have Legislative Authority?’ given by Jones,<sup>20</sup> and, ‘A Uniform Discipline’, given by Edmund Stanley (Clerk of Kansas YM). Likewise, Indiana YM, Wilmington YM, Western YM and Kansas YM all sent resolutions favouring the general concept of a Uniform Discipline with future conferences having some legislative authority.<sup>21</sup> After much debate, which consumed almost a full day of the conference, it was determined that a committee (made up of delegates from each YM) would be formed to report back directly to the respective YMs with a detailed plan for how the Conference could have ‘legislative authority within distinctly defined spheres that would not interfere with the

---

<sup>17</sup> *Conference of Friends-1887*, 274.

<sup>18</sup> Seven Yearly Meetings had already formed committees and considered the subject of a unified Friends’ organisation for the American Yearly Meeting: New York, Baltimore, North Carolina, Indiana, Western, Iowa and Kansas. See *Conference of Friends-1892*, 3. In 1891, four of these Yearly Meetings (Iowa, New York, Baltimore and North Carolina) adopted the following resolution, ‘We therefore propose, that, provided, six yearly meetings, or a smaller number of yearly meetings, containing, in the aggregate, two-thirds of the membership of Friends in America, unite in the concern, such a conference be held every five years.’ See *Proceedings of the Conference of Friends in America-1892* (Indianapolis, IN: Published by Direction of the Conference, 1892), 4. Also, an invitation was extended for representatives to attend from Philadelphia YM, without the privilege of being delegates, but they did not agree to be present, see *Conference of Friends-1892*, 5.

<sup>19</sup> This time, in addition to the original ten Yearly Meetings, the three most recently formed YM’s (Oregon, California and Canada) sent delegates, too – ‘thus uniting thirteen Yearly Meetings in the conference of 1897’. *Conference of Friends-1897*, 1. In 1859, the Orthodox YM of Philadelphia decided to curtail correspondence with other YMs primarily to avoid the appearance of favouring one group of Quakers over another. See Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 34.

<sup>20</sup> This was the first time Jones attended the Conference and, although, in 1893, he moved to Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (which had no official delegates to FYM) to teach at Haverford, Jones maintained a life-long membership in his native New England YM and served as one of its delegates to this Conference for his whole life.

<sup>21</sup> *Conference of Friends-1897*, 15-19.

autonomy of the yearly meetings...,’ and, ‘to prepare a Discipline for submission to the yearly meetings for their approval.’<sup>22</sup> By 1902, all Gurneyite Yearly Meetings throughout America, except Canada and Ohio, endorsed the Uniform Discipline and the Five-Years Meetings<sup>23</sup> was officially created.<sup>24</sup>

While the Five Years Meeting made some progress improving unification among Gurneyite Friends (particularly in mission work and organisational structure), it never operated with complete or ultimate authority and held no power to sanction any particular Yearly Meeting. Also, it did not directly endorse the RDF into its own Uniform Discipline. Instead the Uniform Discipline referred to it and stated:

For more explicit and extended statements of belief, *reference is made to those officially put forth at various times*, especially to the letter of George Fox to the Governor of Barbadoes in 1671, and to the Declaration of Faith, issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887.<sup>25</sup>

Even at this time tension was developing within the Gurneyite tradition. Hamm astutely identifies that this growing intra-denominational debate was not so much due to the

---

<sup>22</sup> *Conference of Friends-1897*, 36-37.

<sup>23</sup> In traditional Quaker practice, Five-Years Meeting was named after the frequency with which it was supposed to meet for business.

<sup>24</sup> Including New England, New York, Baltimore, North Carolina, Indiana, Western, Iowa, Kansas, Wilmington, Oregon and California Yearly Meetings. See *Minutes of the Five Years Meeting of Friends-1902* (Richmond, IN: Five Years Meeting), 9-12 (Hereafter, *FYM Minutes* followed by respective year and page number). Canada initially adopted the Uniform Discipline, but then reconsidered it (*FYM Proceedings-1902*, 4). They did not join officially until 1907 (*FYM Minutes-1907*, 5-6.). Ohio rejected the Uniform Discipline because, according to Hamm, Ohio YM claimed it was insufficiently evangelical. Just prior to the 1907 FYM sessions an invitation was sent to the Clerk of Ohio YM suggesting they should become a ‘component part of the Five Years Meeting’. The clerk responded that Ohio did not see a way open for this action (*FYM Minutes-1907*, 5-6.). Ohio never joined FYM. Both Canada and Ohio sent fraternal delegates to the 1902 Conference. Likewise Philadelphia Orthodox and London sent representatives to attend.

<sup>25</sup> *Constitution and Discipline for the American Yearly Meeting of Friends*, 10. Earlham College Archives, Richmond, Indiana. Emphasis added.

general idea or bureaucratic structures of FYM, but more due to the increasing role modernism played within the Gurneyite tradition, most typified by Rufus Jones:

Jones had also become the leader of a small but extremely influential group of Gurneyite Friends, largely associated with Haverford, Wilmington, Guilford, Earlham, Whittier, and Pacific colleges, who embraced modernist Protestantism - the Social Gospel, postmillennialism, critical study of the Bible. These modernist Friends, while emphatically Christian, were skeptical of revivalism, emphasized the love and example of the life of Christ over salvation through His Blood, and stressed progressive or continuing revelation...their influence was such that they could prevent the incorporation of the Richmond Declaration in the Uniform Discipline [of Five Years Meeting].<sup>26</sup>

Further evidence of this growing tension amongst Friends on the issue of modernism can be seen in the response to two statements adopted at the 1897 conference. The first statement concerns the issue of higher criticism:

In the activities of modern thought new questions are constantly presented to the Church. Among these are those growing out of what is called "Higher Criticism," and upon these true Christians desire to take correct positions. We desire to have the absolute truth of God; and we approve of the efforts of true scholarship that is consecrated to the service of God, to correct the text of the Scriptures; and we rejoice in all the investigations that aid in the true understanding of the revealed Word; but we wish to condemn the frequent attempts to attack the integrity of Scripture and to undermine their authority which varying forms of unbelief make upon the canon under the cloak of "Higher Criticism," and which work very serious injury to those who are misled by them.<sup>27</sup>

The second statement adopted is in regard to Christian Sociology:<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Hamm, 'Friends United Meeting and its Identity', 12. In 1912, James Wood, the primary author of the original Uniform Discipline admitted that, 'this clause was written to give an official sanction to these documents without incorporating them in the Uniform Discipline.' See *full stenographer's report of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends in America-1912*, 61. Earlham College Archives, Richmond, Indiana.

<sup>27</sup> *Conference of Friends-1897*, 38.

<sup>28</sup> This is an earlier term for social gospel.

We hold that the Gospel of Christ is the remedy for the ills of mankind and that it is wide-spread in its application and far-reaching in its results. It is facilitated in reaching men by the removal of the multitudinous barriers that surround them. Human society in all its interests needs its transforming power and Christians should be unremitting in every effort that will aid its work. We therefore feel a deep interest in true Christian Sociology, and we distrust all the movements in this new science that are divorced from faith in Christ.<sup>29</sup>

Eventually, both statements were accepted because they were inherently evangelical, but not without widespread division which was indicative of future theological disagreements over issues of biblical authority and the role of conversion in missionary enterprises (both foreign and domestic). Although it would be premature to call these early debates in FYM part of the fundamentalist/modernist controversies, as with the national trends, they do show a budding friction at the turn of the century within the evangelical holiness movement, as modernism and revivalism both attempted to navigate the changing evangelical ideology. Although a spirit of ecumenical unity still existed among holiness Friends, modernism would soon become an important line of division. Thus, it is helpful to understand that the simultaneous push for unity among American Gurneyite Friends, which led to the formation of FYM, was being paralleled by a fracturing tendency over issues of higher criticism, the social gospel and literalism.

By the next session of Five-Years Meeting in 1907, whatever unity was gained in 1902 was increasingly strained. While those revivalist Friends coming out of the Holiness Movement were distracted with an emotional Pentecostal wing of their party,<sup>30</sup> modernist Friends like Jones made some significant strides going on a nationwide good-will tour of

---

<sup>29</sup> *Conference of Friends-1897*, 38.

<sup>30</sup> One that advocated the third blessing of speaking in tongues. See Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 170-172.

Friends Colleges and Yearly Meetings and spreading the modernistic message of Quakerism.<sup>31</sup> During that year's conference some papers with strong modernist views were delivered. When an attempt was made to stop these papers from being published in the official proceedings the opposition was voted down by a large majority.<sup>32</sup> The success of the tour and the ensuing victories at the FYM were *causes célèbres* among modernist Quakers, prodding Thomas Newlin to write to Jones telling him, 'You have got them whipped for all time now.'<sup>33</sup> In hindsight, the acrimony was just getting started.

By 1912, the revivalist Friends had regrouped (denouncing their perceived Pentecostal distractions) and renewed their outcry against the perceived unsoundness of Quaker modernists – most notably with respect to the status of the RDF. In 1912, Western, Kansas and California YMs all sent in resolutions to FYM requesting that the somewhat vague endorsement of the RDF in the original Uniform Discipline be rectified. The Business Committee, chaired by Jones, elected to put forth a minute that 'approved these documents', rather than one incorporating them. And, most contentious of all, the minute stated that such historical documents were 'not to be regarded as constituting a creed.'<sup>34</sup> Since early Friends eschewed creeds one would think such a caveat would be commonplace.<sup>35</sup> However, at this particular moment the choice of vocabulary was

---

<sup>31</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 171-172.

<sup>32</sup> *FYM Minutes-1907*, 446-451.

<sup>33</sup> Personal letter from Thomas Newlin to Rufus Jones dated March 20, 1907, as quoted by Hamm, *Transformation*, 172.

<sup>34</sup> *Full stenographer's report of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends in America-1912*, 120.

<sup>35</sup> Cooper argues that a major reason for the Friends' testimony against doctrinal statements or creeds is that some Friends have a genuine fear of thinking or talking about faith outside from experiencing it, thus, Quakers have historically regarded theological formulations as suspect. See Wilmer A. Cooper, A

perceived as declaring the document optional, which created a stir. Neither revivalist nor modernist Friends were entirely satisfied. Modernists Friends felt like the inclusion of the RDF as part of the Uniform Discipline was a ‘constitutional’ change in the Uniform Discipline, giving it higher status than some Yearly Meetings originally intended.<sup>36</sup> Meanwhile, revivalist Quakers believed they were misled about the RDF, thinking that it had been adopted originally and they were now trying to correct the oversight.<sup>37</sup> Neither side was entirely satisfied with the final result.<sup>38</sup>

In the 1912 sessions of FYM, two other important changes occurred as well. The first was the creation of a General Secretary position in the organisational structure,<sup>39</sup> and the second was the decision to take over the operations of the *American Friend*, as the official organ of American Quakers.<sup>40</sup> Primarily due to financial efficiencies, it was also recommended and approved that the newly created General Secretary position would be a

---

Living Faith: An Historical and Comparative Study of Quaker Beliefs, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (IN: Friends United Press, 1990), xiii.

<sup>36</sup> *Full stenographer’s report of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends in America-1912*, 59-85, 118-131.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>38</sup> An amendment to strike the caveat from the change in Uniform Discipline failed by a vote of 65 to 69. Without the amendment, the final minute passed 92 to 19. See *Full stenographer’s report of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends in America-1912*, 127. See all *Full stenographer’s report of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends in America-1912*, 131.

<sup>39</sup> The General Secretary position was a component of the original Uniform Discipline approved in 1902, and re-affirmed in the 1907 session, but was not officially put into action until 1912. See *Full stenographer’s report of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends in America-1912*, 429-433.

<sup>40</sup> The periodical was previously owned by a small group of Philadelphia stockholders, with Jones as its editor. It operated mostly at a loss and the shareholders and directors of the *American Friend* offered to turn over the periodical (‘without compensation’) to Five-Years Meeting in the hope that, by their official endorsement of it as the official organ for American Quakers, the periodical might achieve a more widespread acceptance and become more fiscally sound. See Hamm, ‘Friends United Meeting’, 12 and *FYM Minutes-1912*. 63.

dual role, with the incumbent also serving as editor of the *American Friend*.<sup>41</sup> In exchange for these modifications, revivalist Friends agreed to discontinue the *Evangelical Friend*, which, despite a comparable number of subscriptions, was also struggling financially.<sup>42</sup>

In 1917, Walter C. Woodward (1878-1942) of Oregon Yearly Meeting, was appointed the first permanent General Secretary of Five-Years Meeting<sup>43</sup> and was named as editor of the *American Friend*.<sup>44</sup> Woodward's family had moved to Newberg, Oregon when he was an infant. He attended Pacific Academy (as a classmate of Herbert Hoover),<sup>45</sup> he attended the Yearly Meeting faithfully every year and his father owned the town's local newspaper (*Newberg Graphic*). Like many Quakers in Newberg, his family invested heavily in the development of Pacific College, fought vehemently to keep the county 'dry' and voted Republican.<sup>46</sup> In many ways Woodward should have been the perfect candidate to calm the growing discontent over FYM and the *American Friend*. He was reared in the heart of an evangelical holiness Quaker bastion. Among other schools, he had also trained at Earlham College and he eventually settled in Richmond; neutral ground between Philadelphia and evangelical Friends.<sup>47</sup> Woodward's presence did

---

<sup>41</sup> *FYM Minutes-1912*, 73.

<sup>42</sup> *FYM Minutes-1917*, 153. *The Evangelical Friend* resumed, in 1927, as the official organ of Ohio Yearly Meeting.

<sup>43</sup> *FYM Minutes-1917*, 21.

<sup>44</sup> *FYM Minutes-1917*, 28.

<sup>45</sup> Pacific Academy was then a preparatory academy. It eventually became Pacific College.

<sup>46</sup> Of these three, Walter retained a strong passion for the first two for his entire life.



nothing to stymie the ire. The debates were already too entrenched and Woodward quickly developed into a strong articulate thinker, with heavy modernist leanings and strong affinity to the social gospel,<sup>48</sup> while YMs such as Oregon were moving more towards fundamentalism.

What is significant about this brief history, aside from seeing the various tensions that would be foundational to the debates in the 1920s, is that no Yearly Meeting discussed separation on an official level. Ohio never joined in the first place and there were two smaller separations mentioned in Chapter One,<sup>49</sup> but otherwise separation was not discussed either at the FYM level or at the individual Yearly Meeting level. That soon changed. After the Great War, conservative evangelical Friends, tired of trying to reform FYM, were now interested in separation. On the national scene, as fundamentalism strengthened its position within Protestant America and sought to eradicate modernism from the church and modernists from leadership positions,<sup>50</sup> a similar pattern followed within OYM. A marked shift in the desire of Oregon (and several other YMs) to sever ecumenical ties with FYM, in a perceived defence of evangelical orthodoxy against the inroads made by modernism into that organisation, began in the year immediately following the Armistice in 1918. Whereas they had, for the previous seventeen years, worked together in intra-denominational ecumenism (admittedly acrimoniously at times)

---

<sup>47</sup> For a more detailed biography on Walter Woodward see: Elizabeth H. Emerson, *Walter C. Woodward: Friend on the Frontier, A Biography* (Printed by the Walter C. Woodward Memorial Commission, 1952).

<sup>48</sup> Hamm, "Friends United Meeting," 12.

<sup>49</sup> See Chapter One, Footnote 15.

<sup>50</sup> George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1980), 141.

under a common evangelical corporation, OYM now became the first full YM to separate from FYM.

However, before I look at the history of those post-War years, it is important to examine another trend among Friends growing in parallel to the discontent with FYM: the Quaker Bible School Movement.

### **The Quaker Bible School Movement**

A significant shift, which derived from the Hicksite/Orthodox schism of the 1820s, was in response to the perception by some of the intellectual weakness within the Society at the time.<sup>51</sup> After the schism, some members (particularly those from the Orthodox branch) felt Friends had failed to keep up with the advance in ideas and knowledge quickly evolving in the world around them and they sought to remedy this:

The members of the Society of Friends have hitherto labored under very great disadvantages in obtaining for their children a guarded education in the higher branches of learning. Combining the requisite literary instruction with a religious care over the morals and manners of the scholars, enforcing plainness and simplicity of dress and deportment, training up the children in a knowledge of the testimonies of our Religious Society, and carefully preserving them from the influence of corrupt principles and evil communications.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Jones, *Later Periods* vol. 2, 690-691. Jones claimed there was an indirect (but significant) connection between the schisms and the quest for the establishment of Friends colleges. Likewise, the authors of *A History of Haverford College* (the first Quaker college in the U.S.) say there is circumstantial and indirect evidence that the founding of Haverford was due to the Philadelphia schism of 1827. Both authors verify an increase in the rhetoric in Quaker periodicals of the time about the lack of intellectual preparedness of their youth (and its supposed correlative influence on the schisms). See, *A History of Haverford College* (Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1892), 56-57.

<sup>52</sup> 1830 proposed draft of an appointed committee to consider the propriety of establishing a Friends school in a central location. As quoted in, *A History of Haverford College* (Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1892), 63-63.

For Friends, their first foray into solving the perceived crisis of ‘intellectual weakness’ came, in Philadelphia, in 1833, with the founding of Haverford School.<sup>53</sup> The founders sought to create an atmosphere where young scholars could have a competent education without undermining their attachments to the Society:

It is therefore proposed that an institution be established in which the children of Friends shall receive a liberal education in ancient and modern literature and mathematics and natural sciences, under the care of competent instructors of our own Society, so as not to endanger their religious principles or alienate them from their early attachments.<sup>54</sup>

After Haverford’s success, Friends around the country established similar colleges wherever there were strongholds of the Society.<sup>55</sup> These institutions were all formed by members of the Society, were usually corporately owned by Friends and/or Yearly Meetings and were predominately (if not, exclusively,) attended by Quaker students. They were designed to provide a high quality Christian liberal arts education to the youth of the Society ensuring the continuation of Quaker ways.

---

<sup>53</sup> The school was set up to be exclusive to Friends and their children over twelve and stock holders had to be members of the Society.

<sup>54</sup> *A History of Haverford College*, 64.

<sup>55</sup> In 1837, Friends in North Carolina formed the New Garden School (which became Guilford College in 1888). In 1847, Friends in Richmond formed the Friends Boarding School, and in 1859, it became Earlham College. In Philadelphia, Hicksite Friends formed their first college with Swarthmore College in 1869. In the last thirty years of the nineteenth century there was an explosion in the foundation of Friends Colleges by Orthodox Friends (most of which came out of existing academies, boarding schools, or mergers ). Wilmington College in Ohio in 1871, William Penn College in Iowa in 1873, Pickering College in Ontario, Canada in 1878, Bryn Mawr (all-women’s college) in Pennsylvania in 1885, Pacific College in Oregon in 1891, Friends University in Kansas in 1898, Nebraska Central College in Nebraska in 1898, and Whittier College in California in 1901. See Opal Thornburg, *Earlham: The Story of the College 1847-1962* (Richmond IN: The Earlham College Press, 1963), chapter 4); S. Arthur Watson, *William Penn College: A Product and a Producer* (Oskaloosa: William Penn College Publisher, 1971), 69; Veldon J. Diment, *The First Fifty Years* (Newberg OR: Published by authority of the Board of Managers, no dated given), 7; Floyd and Norma Sounders, *Friends University: 1898-1973* (Wichita: Published as a Part of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary Celebration of Friends University, 1974), 7-12; Herbert Harris, *The Quaker and the West: The first sixty years of Whittier College* (printed by Whittier College, 1943), 39. Jones gives an earlier 1896 date for when Whittier was chartered as an actual college, see Jones, *Later Periods* vol. 2, 710.

Alongside these developments within the Society, however, came radical changes within the educational landscape as a whole in antebellum America. Colleges in America as a whole, which had been almost the exclusive domain of the church rather than the state, grew more in tune with the rising scientific and social teachings in the world, and less focused on denominational and religious teachings. In 1839, fifty-one of the fifty-four presidents of America's colleges were clergy, by the end of the century the number had significantly decreased as they were replaced by businessmen.<sup>56</sup> Noll describes the newly emerging universities of this era as being more 'secular' in nature:

For its curriculum, the new universities took a German model of education to replace the older British standard. Not character but research, not the handing on of tradition but the search for intellectual innovation became the watchword. In the curriculum of the renovate universities, moreover, new ideas of science, modeled especially after the striking proposals of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*, took on an unprecedented importance.<sup>57</sup>

It became less important in the new schools of thought to reconcile the Christian faith and the world of learning.<sup>58</sup> Nearly every denomination in America experienced a rising level of discord with its own institutions as these new ideas were taught. Old time traditionalists and evangelists found themselves at odds with often more liberal leaning faculty and administrators, particularly over the Bible and the use of higher criticism. Over time, as ideas such as evolution, social Christianity and post-millennialism found their way into the classroom, open acrimony developed over these perceived modernist apostasies.

---

<sup>56</sup> Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1994), 111-112.

<sup>57</sup> Noll, *Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, 112.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

The Quakers were not immune to this conflict. The growing influence of modernism on Friends found ideal conditions within Quaker academic institutions, which, in turn, had an effect on shaping the Society itself. Hamm argues that modernism found its way into the Quaker polemic primarily through educators.<sup>59</sup> In response, a large revivalist faction of Friends started attacks against this perceived rising heresy.<sup>60</sup> It did not take long for Friends to pursue another course of action in response to their own perceived liberal institutions.

In 1892, a wealthy Quaker businessman from Ohio opened the first Quaker Bible School, the Friends Bible Institute and Training School in Cleveland (later known as the Cleveland Bible Institute).<sup>61</sup> J. Walter Malone was a mild mannered Quaker with strong revivalist leanings.<sup>62</sup> Having perceived that there was a dearth of Friends' schools for the training of ministers, as well as an increase in the acceptance of higher criticism in existing Friends' colleges, he set out to establish the first bastion of soundness:

Five or six years after we were married, we found our hearts turned to the Lord repeatedly for the young people of the church and at large who had the call of the Lord on their heart to preach, but for whom no way was open for the exercise of their gift... The Spirit, therefore, impressed our hearts to open a small school in which the Bible could be taught every day and supervision given in practical Christian work... About the time we discovered that "higher criticism" and other forms of destructive teaching were fast getting a foothold in our denominational colleges.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Most notably: Elbert Russell at Earlham, Mary Mendenhall Hobbs at Guilford, Thomas Newlin at Pacific, and above all, Rufus M. Jones at Haverford. See Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 147-153, 166 – 167.

<sup>60</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 166-169.

<sup>61</sup> Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 160.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> J. Walter Malone, address given at the opening of the school, as quoted in Bryon Lindley Osborne, *The Malone Story: The Dream of Two Quaker Young People* (Newton KS: United Printing, 1970), 53-54.

Under the Malones, the school flourished and quickly became the model for other such Bible Schools around the nation. In Huntington Park, California Friends established the Training School for Christian Workers (which nearly bankrupted enrolment at Whittier),<sup>64</sup> Indiana Friends established Union Bible Seminary and Friends in Kansas founded the Kansas Central Bible Training School Association.<sup>65</sup> It did not take long for Oregon Yearly Meeting to follow suit in reaction to the growing perception of modernism at Pacific College.<sup>66</sup>

The story of the experience of Oregon Yearly Meeting with their own Bible School starts with a well-traveled fiery Quaker preacher from Illinois. Lewis Isaac Hadley was born to a Quaker family in 1848. His own father passed away when he was three months old. His mother was a Quaker minister.<sup>67</sup> As a youth, Hadley, prepared for life as a lawyer, fell in love with the dance floor and took little to his mother's strict pious lifestyle.<sup>68</sup> By his late teens, however, he seems to have had some sort of definitive conversion experience:

---

<sup>64</sup> Charles Elliott, Jr., *Whittier College: The First Century on the Poet Campus* (Redondo Beach: Legends Press, 1986), chapter 3.

<sup>65</sup> Sheldon G. Jackson, *Barclay College: Lighthouse on the Prairies* (KS: Barclay College, 1992), 39.

<sup>66</sup> Ankeny argues that western U.S. colleges, particularly small liberal arts schools such as those in the State of Oregon, retained their emphasis upon developing student character through disciplining the mind and embracing the ideal of Western culture far longer than their eastern counterparts, were primarily denominationally controlled and sought clergymen as leaders. Mark Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington, Quaker Leader and Educator: Pacific College Presidential Years 1911-1941* (Dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Oregon), 160-161.

<sup>67</sup> Arthur Hein, *Lewis Isaac Hadley: A Short Biography of the Life of Reverend Hadley* (March 1962, Cascade College History Seminar Course for Dr. Lee M. Nash), 2. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled, 'SPU Archives Cascade College Box 383 of 840'.

<sup>68</sup> Hein, *Lewis Isaac Hadley*, 3

While resting on the couch one evening the verse in Psa. 34:6 flashed through his mind; ‘the face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to cut off the remembrance of them from the earth.’ A great change took place in his life and he began to grow spiritually and the dreams and desires of this world continued to have less influence upon him. His former ambitions were changed and he felt called to be a minister of the Gospel<sup>69</sup>

By 1872, Hadley had married and become the principal of a small Quaker school in Indiana, while concurrently serving as pastor in a local Friends’ congregation. His sermons were often long and full of prophecy, as Hadley preached on the first and second coming of Christ, as foretold in the Old Testament. He frequently called his audiences to repentance, railing against the lack of urgency in preparing for the Second Coming. According to Arthur Hein, the tall red-headed preacher was a man of conviction, authority and sincerity; and his altar calls were packed with weeping and contrite sinners.<sup>70</sup>

Over the next twenty-five years the Hadleys had four children, moved throughout Indiana, Iowa, Ohio and Virginia, all the while keeping up a ranch in Indiana. In 1905, the Hadleys accepted a call to come west to First Friends Church in Portland, Oregon. Under Hadley’s leadership and ‘forceful preaching’ the church grew.<sup>71</sup> By 1908, however, the sixty year old Hadley had moved to California and purchased another ranch. While in California he taught at Huntington Park Training School for Christian Workers and Deets Pacific Bible School (part of Nazarene University) and served as pastor for one year at Bethel Friends Church in Long Beach.<sup>72</sup> In 1917, Lewis received a letter from his

---

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> Hein, *Lewis Isaac Hadley*, 1-2.

<sup>71</sup> Hein, *Lewis Isaac Hadley*, 7-8.

<sup>72</sup> Hein, *Lewis Isaac Hadley*, 8-9.

son (pastor at Rosedale Friends in OYM) to come back north and hold evangelistic services.<sup>73</sup> Lewis accepted the invitation, not as a father visiting his son, but ‘as a God called – blood washed – blood cleansed, Holy Ghost anointed preacher.’<sup>74</sup> Lewis stayed in Oregon afterwards to accept the pastorate at Piedmont Friends Church in Portland.<sup>75</sup>

In the winter of 1917, the well-traveled Lewis Hadley and another Quaker Pastor, Lurana Terrell, sat in a Portland home with a small private group of friends (many of whom were Friends) to share their concern about the Christian young people of Portland, who would go away to college (mainly naming Pacific College) and then return with a liberal attitude towards sanctification and the Christian life.<sup>76</sup> Sophia Townsends writes:

The North Pacific Evangelistic Institute was conceived in the minds and hearts of a group of God’s faithful stewards. There were no less than ten in the group of these concerned about establishing such an institution, but probably all will agree that the leading spirits in the undertaking were Lurana Terrell, at that time the pastor of Lents Friends Church, and Lewis I. Hadley, pastor of the Piedmont Church... Both Lewis I. Hadley and Lurana Terrell had, previous to this time, been connected with holiness schools. They along with others recognized that there was no such school within easy reach of the young people of Oregon and Southwest Washington. They were aware, too, of the fact that there were numerous young people in this area who desired a formal course of training, under spiritual leaders, in preparation for full-time Christian service. The persons especially concerned in the matter, most of them of the Friends Church, formed a loose organization....<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Hein, *Lewis Isaac Hadley*, 10.

<sup>74</sup> Lewis Hadley in a letter to Chester Hadley dated, October 10, 1917. As quoted in Hein, *Lewis Isaac Hadley*, 11.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> Mark Ankeny includes a couple of paragraphs on North Pacific Evangelistic Institute arguing that, ‘Some Friends in Oregon Yearly Meeting refused to send their students to Pacific College believing that it did not prepare students for active ministry. In 1918, these Friends along with other Wesleyan-oriented Protestants developed a Bible institute in Portland that competed directly with Pacific College for students.’ See Mark Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 177, 257 & 259.



Lyle Good claims that Hadley first took his concern for a Bible School to Pacific College in an attempt to form a collaborative project with them. Levi Pennington, who was interviewed by Good, claimed he had no recollection of this offer and the Pacific College Board minutes show no formal discussion of the matter, though Pennington did admit the idea would probably have been rejected because:

Hadley's circles of friends were too narrowly conservative in their religious attitude for the controlling regime at Pacific. Hadley's theology was not compatible with the more open-minded philosophy that Pennington was attempting to maintain at his Quaker college.<sup>78</sup>

By 1918, the small group would instead form the North Pacific Evangelistic Institute<sup>79</sup> and it was agreed that Piedmont Friends would house the Institute. They converted their basement into an office and living area for the dean and dormitories for boys and for girls and the main building was used for classes.<sup>80</sup> The new Board was officially incorporated in June 1918<sup>81</sup> and adopted the Constitution of the Huntington

---

<sup>77</sup> Sophia E. Townsend, *Our College, A History of Cascade College from 1918-1957* (privately printed, 1957), 1. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled, 'SPU Archives Cascade College Box 385 of 840'.

<sup>78</sup> Lyle Good, *The Founding and Early Years of North Pacific Evangelistic Institute* (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Oregon, 1969), 6. Also, Mark Ankeny argues that Pennington's view of higher education was more 'progressive', and that he sought to both prepare students 'to understand the world in which they lived' and 'to understand themselves in relation to the world around them.' Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 179 & 183.

<sup>79</sup> North Pacific Evangelistic Institute (NPEI) Trustee Minutes, June 19, 1918. Oregon Historical Society Archives (OHSA). Box labeled, 'MSS 1417', file labeled, 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929. Located in Portland, Oregon.

<sup>80</sup> With the agreement that Piedmont Friends could still use the facility for their services, the entire lot and structures on it were deeded over to the Institute. NPEI Trustee Minutes, April 6, 1918. OHSA. Box labeled, 'MSS 1417' file labeled, 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

<sup>81</sup> NPEI Trustee Minutes, June 19, 1918. OHSA. Box labeled, 'MSS 1417' file labeled, 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Park Training School for Christian Workers in California.<sup>82</sup> Hadley was named the Institute's first dean.<sup>83</sup> On July 23, 1918, a prospectus was sent out to potential students:

For years there has been a burden of prayer upon the hearts of many of the Holiness people of the Northwest for a school where their boys and girls might receive specific instruction in the doctrine of Holiness and other fundamental Bible doctrines. This burden has been put upon us by the bitter cry of those whose children have returned from school suffering not only the loss of their Christian experience, but also their very faith in the Book itself.<sup>84</sup>

The printed doctrine of the Institute shows it was in line with both an evangelical theology of the day and the sanctification beliefs of the Holiness Movement, emphasising biblical inspiration and authority, the atonement and justification.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 7.

<sup>83</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 2.

<sup>84</sup> Lurana Terrell, North Pacific Evangelistic Institute Bulletin, May 1919 vol. 1, number 1 OHSA, Box labeled, 'MSS 1417'.

<sup>85</sup> NPEI official doctrinal standards - 1919:

1. The plenary inspiration of the Bible.
2. The unity and inviolable authority of the Bible.
3. The Bible as our only outward rule of faith and practice
4. The Scriptural doctrine of the Trinity.
5. The Man was created in the image and likeness of God.
6. The fall of man from innocency and purity of his created condition through transgression.
7. The spiritual death and sinful condition of all men by nature because of Adamic sin.
8. The actual willful sinfulness of all accountable human beings.
9. The consequent necessity of pardon, regeneration and subsequent Sanctification of the individual in order to restore complete "At-one-ment" with God.
10. The Atonement made by the vicarious substitution and death of Jesus Christ as the sinner's only hope of Salvation.
11. The necessity of repentance toward and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, as the Divinely appointed conditions of pardon and regeneration.
12. The necessity of the glad, loyal, loving eternal consecration of the redeemed soul to God and faith that He who called us to sanctification will also sanctify us. As the Divinely appointed conditions of sanctification.
13. The Holy Spirit one with the Father and Son and sent forth from Father and Son in this dispensation to call out a people for His name, i.e. a Bride for Jesus Christ. Reproving the world of sin, righteousness and judgment to come, Witnessing to Justification, and to entire Sanctification; Dwelling in the sanctified believer; He shall teach you all things and He will guide you into all truth so that we may walk in the light as He is in the light and be kept pure hearted and cleansed from all sin.

Despite the fact that ‘no entrance credentials were required from students, except assurances of a good moral character, an active Christian experience and a purpose in agreement with the spirit of the school’,<sup>86</sup> getting students enrolled proved difficult. By the autumn of 1918, with no official enrollments, Hadley recalled the unfolding of an intense spiritual battle:

So severely did the devil beset me that I, like George Fox, besought the Lord about it. And the Lord gave me assurances that I was where He wanted me to be and doing the thing He wanted me to do. I looked up to God through glad tears of victory and told Him I would stay all year and be in the classroom every day, ready to teach, whether anyone came or not.<sup>87</sup>

After delaying the start of the school year by a few weeks, due to non-enrolment and a late harvest, by October 1918 four students<sup>88</sup> started classes.<sup>89</sup> ‘Father Hadley’,<sup>90</sup> faithfully taught his classes every day as promised including ‘Bible Interpretation’,

---

14. The reconstruction and glorification of the saints at the personal Premillennial Coming of Jesus Christ to take the kingdom of this world and reign upon the throne of his Father David for one thousand years.

15. The resurrection of the wicked or the rest of the dead who lived not again until the thousand years were finished, to appear before the Great White Throne and Him that sat on it to be judged, out of these things written in the books according to their works.

16. The final eternal separation of the righteous and the wicked.

See *NPEI Annual Catalogue – 1919*, OHSA, Box labeled, ‘MSS 1417’.

<sup>86</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 2.

<sup>87</sup> Lewis Hadley, ‘Testimony of God’s Leading and Blessing’, as quoted in Hein, *Lewis Hadley*, 13.

<sup>88</sup> The students were Marion and Libbie Cook, Ruth Piggot and Pearl Boatwright. See *NPEI Institute Bulletin*, May 1919 vol. 1, number 1 OHSA, Box labeled, ‘MSS 1417’.

<sup>89</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 3.

<sup>90</sup> As he became affectionately known to the students. *NPEI Bulletin*, May 1919 vol. 1, number 1. OHSA, Box labeled, ‘MSS 1417’.

‘Theology’, ‘Doctrine’ and ‘Prophecy’.<sup>91</sup> All classes were generally focused on the ‘pre-millennial return of Christ and the Wesleyan-Arminian Theology.’<sup>92</sup> In addition to free housing, Hadley received all the tuition money that came in that year as salary.<sup>93</sup>

By the second semester of the first year, the Institute had grown to sixteen students.<sup>94</sup> By the second year, twenty-three students came and soon, thereafter, the enrolment reached fifty.<sup>95</sup>

Along with seeing itself as a doctrinally sound educational alternative, the Institute tried to instil in its students strict behaviour and moral codes, attempting to build character, cultivate piety and improve their gospel witness.<sup>96</sup> In addition to class times, NPEI regulated rising time, quiet time, chapel time and study hours.<sup>97</sup> As the school developed a campus life, more rigid standards developed. Stress upon modest dress and appearance, refraining from anything that would attract attention, became standard.<sup>98</sup> Relationships and social times between the sexes were monitored.<sup>99</sup> Dates (limited to

---

<sup>91</sup> NPEI Annual Catalogue – 1919. OHSA, Box labeled, ‘MSS 1417’.

<sup>92</sup> Hein, *Lewis Hadley*, 14.

<sup>93</sup> NPEI Trustee Minutes, December 2, 1918. OHSA. Box labeled, ‘MSS 1417’ file labeled, ‘Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929’.

<sup>94</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 3.

<sup>95</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 5. The students who came claimed a divine influence about their time at NPEI. The ‘Lord’s will’ was cited in just about all events – including that none of the students or faculty were infected with the influenza epidemic, which shut down much of the state (including Pacific College for four weeks), in 1919. See Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 16.

<sup>96</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 29.

<sup>97</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 27.

<sup>98</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 30.

<sup>99</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 29.

once per month for freshmen) were all chaperoned and boys and girls were not permitted to ride the same bus line while outside the institute.<sup>100</sup> In many ways, these strict rules were an attempt by NPEI to establish a ‘set apart people’, who evidenced genuine growth in spiritual life and provided an effective public witness.<sup>101</sup> Such behaviour also mimics the tendency in broader fundamentalist ideology for religious codification through moral and behavioural regulation. As indicated by Joel Carpenter, strict behavioural mores were often a method by which they [fundamentalists] established boundaries for being ‘a set apart people’.<sup>102</sup>

Although the Institute was not a part of the structure of OYM, it is clear it competed for the same students as Pacific College. In 1919, the unofficial organ of OYM, *Friendly Endeavor*, started to allow adverts to help underwrite its cost.<sup>103</sup> NPEI was one of the first to jump at this chance taking out a small 1”x4” advertisement marketing itself as a ‘training school for those looking forward to pastoral or evangelistic work, home or foreign missions or Sunday-school work. Also, for those who are not preparing for special work, but who desire a systematic study of the Bible and the Church.’<sup>104</sup> By this time, the school also started to receive press coverage. In 1921, the *Oregonian* ran a small

---

<sup>100</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 31.

<sup>101</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 28.

<sup>102</sup> Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1997), 57-58.

<sup>103</sup> *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II, no 4 (October 1919): 4. Although the *Friendly Endeavor* was the only periodical published for OYM, it was published by the YM’s Christian Endeavor Society and did not become the official YM organ until 1942 when the periodical was officially adopted by the YM as its organ and changed to *The Northwest Friend*. See *Northwest Friend* vol. 1 no. 1 (September 1942).

<sup>104</sup> *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II, no 9 (December 1919): 4.

introductory piece about the school with a photo.<sup>105</sup> In 1922, the Northwest Association for the Promotion of Christian Holiness dedicated almost a full issue of its organ to NPEI.<sup>106</sup> Thanks to a generous gift from Hadley, the Trustees purchased a house on an adjoining lot for a girl's dormitory.<sup>107</sup> In 1921, the Institute successfully raised \$30,000 for the construction of a four story building and later that same year embarked on a campaign to raise \$60,000, with more expansion in mind.<sup>108</sup> Despite the success, the school still operated in the red every year, relying significantly on volunteer service (expecting students to do jobs on the campus and to raise funds from relatives) and from outside donations. By 1922, with the school's enrolment static at around 75<sup>109</sup> (compared to about 150 students at Pacific College for that same time), the ailing and aged Hadley retired<sup>110</sup> and, within a few months, he succumbed to his heart condition.<sup>111</sup>

Although the death of Hadley was a loss, conservative evangelical Friends in OYM could see NPEI as a success in their cause against modernism. By 1922, the Institute was firmly established as a revivalist bastion in contrast to Pacific College. The formation of NPEI was mostly driven by evangelically minded leaders, who believed

---

<sup>105</sup> 'Evangelistic Institute to Enter Fourth Year of Work with Increase in Faculty', *Portland (OR) Oregonian* (August 23, 1921), 13. Geographical reference for the *Oregonian* hereafter left-off throughout document.

<sup>106</sup> *The Northwest Bulletin*, vol. II NO 4 (November 1922). OHSA, Box labeled, 'MSS 1417'.

<sup>107</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 14.

<sup>108</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 16.

<sup>109</sup> NPEI Annual Catalogue – 1922, OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

<sup>110</sup> NPEI Trustee Minutes, February 11, 1922. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417' file labeled, 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

<sup>111</sup> Hein, *Lewis Hadley*, 16-17; Townsend, *Our College*, 7-8.

evangelism to be the supreme goal of education and who were world-rejecting, particularly with regard to higher-criticism, which they perceived permeated the liberal arts pedagogy.<sup>112</sup> In that so much of the impetus for the school (as was true of all the Quaker Bible Schools) was driven by a desire for separation from perceived modernist institutions, it reflected a growing fundamentalist culture within the YM. Furthermore, it can be seen as part of the ‘double-separation’ tendency amongst fundamentalists, as the fundamentalist leaders within the YM were severing ties both within their corporate structure (Pacific College), and, as will be seen below, had started the process towards severing ties to perceived modernist systems outside their corporate structure, namely the Five-Years Meeting.

### **Initial Conflict between Oregon Yearly Meeting and Five-Years Meeting**

In the period immediately following the Armistice, there was growing rhetoric against modernism from revivalist Friends in Oregon. In December 1919, the *Friendly Endeavor* published a two-part front-page article on higher criticism. In the article E. H. Parisho (President of Greenleaf Seminary) claimed higher criticism was mostly the thinking of those who would discredit the Bible, those who love to be thought of as scholarly and those with natural unbelief.<sup>113</sup> He concluded that:

The result of lack of faith in God is the same no matter what the name under which it goes. Nihilism in Russia, Rationalism in Germany, and Communism in France have meant the destruction of society, loss of

---

<sup>112</sup> Mark Ankeny argues that Pennington was regularly criticised (mostly by a group of OYM ministers) that Pacific College was not Christian enough, that he allowed higher criticism to enter the curriculum and that some Friends in OYM stopped sending their students there. See Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 177-179.

<sup>113</sup> E. H. Parisho, ‘Criticism’, *Friendly Endeavor* vol. II no. 6 (December 1919): 1.

human feeling, war, bloodshed, wreck of civilization, no home, no marriage, no church – all swallowed up in the one cataclysm of anarchy.<sup>114</sup>

Two months later, the *Friendly Endeavor* again ran another two-part front-page article on the dangers of higher criticism. This time William H. Smith drew a line contrasting what he called the devout critic (or Bible Critic), whose goal it is to, ‘increase the value of the Bible to the reader, and the devotion of the reader to the Book’,<sup>115</sup> and destructive critics, who ‘seek to find and magnify difficult passages of the Scriptures, explaining away their generally accepted meaning and substituting some rationalistic interpretation in its place.’<sup>116</sup> The editors of the *Friendly Endeavor* acknowledged the repetition of themes (both two-part, front-page articles) published so closely together. However, they quickly established their own stance against criticism calling it the ‘present day peril’:

There is no enemy [higher criticism] more subtle in its action, more cunning in its deception, more treacherous to belief, more deadly to faith. So artfully is the leaven mixed with the meal, and such exquisite tact is employed in manipulation of truth, that many people do not detect it. They fail to hear the false note, the broken harmony.<sup>117</sup>

The growing acrimony against modernism within OYM coalesced in these early post-war years and altered the nature of the debate with FYM more towards organisational separation.

The first recommendation to separate officially from Five-Years Meeting arose at the Yearly Meeting level in 1919.<sup>118</sup> Scotts Mills Monthly Meeting and Salem Quarterly

---

<sup>114</sup> E. H. Parish. ‘Criticism’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II no. 7 (January 1920): 4.

<sup>115</sup> Wm. M. Smith, ‘The Critics Method’, *Friendly Endeavor* vol. II no. 9 (March 1920): 1.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>117</sup> Untitled notice, *Friendly Endeavor* vol. II no. 9 (March 1920): 4.



Meeting submitted a proposal to withdraw from the Five-Years Meeting because their missionary candidates and official publications were modernist and insufficiently orthodox.<sup>119</sup> The request was ‘seriously considered’ by the yearly meeting body and then ‘directed down’ to the Quarterly Meetings for their consideration and to be revisited in 1920.<sup>120</sup> In addition to this action, the Report of the Representatives included two resolutions regarding FYM Missions and Publications. Firstly, with respect to FYM missionary selection criteria:

That it would be well to have inserted in the application blank for the use of candidates for the field some questions which would help the Board to ascertain whether or not the applicant had definitely sought and received the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

And, secondly, with respect to publications of FYM:

That it is the sense of this meeting that in order to secure and maintain the full moral and financial support of the above mentioned Yearly Meeting, the Boards heretofore mentioned must cease to publish anything in any of their publications not in harmony with doctrinal standards heretofore mentioned.<sup>121</sup>

It must have been difficult for Walter Woodward, who had returned home for the first time since moving into this new role and had sat through the proceedings. Woodward had given the commencement speech at Pacific College and sat through (and participated in) the Yearly Meeting’s discussions regarding FYM. Woodward’s biographer writes:

---

<sup>118</sup> Although it did not rise to the Yearly Meeting level, Scotts Mills Monthly Meeting passed a resolution along to Salem Quarterly Meeting in 1915 recommending separation from FYM. The resolution was not approved at the Quarterly Meeting level and, therefore, did not rise to the YM level.

<sup>119</sup> *Oregon Yearly Meeting Minutes-1919* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1893), minute 89, page 33. Hereafter, ‘*OYM Minutes*’ followed by respective year, minute and page number.

<sup>120</sup> *OYM Minutes-1919*, m. 89, p. 33.

<sup>121</sup> *OYM Minutes-1919*, m. 88, p. 33.

At no time did his sense of humor stand him in better stead than on this first visit to his home yearly meeting in his official position, for while he found many loyal friends, he realized that he was indeed a prophet without honor in his own country. The personal attacks he could laugh away. Not so the situation he found.<sup>122</sup>

The Yearly Meeting sessions ended with a sense of unfinished business and more work to do the following year. Woodward went back to Indiana disheartened and probably exacerbated the conflict by publishing an emotive response in the *American Friend*:

It [Oregon Yearly Meeting] seems to be suffering from morbid introspection due to exaggerated egoism. It displays therefore an ingrowing intolerance and a disposition toward wholesale criticism and denunciation wherever it may disagree or misunderstand. This is probably due to two things: the existence in the yearly meeting of elements not Friendly in character, and its isolation and poor circulation... The only thing that will restore Oregon Yearly Meeting to health is not less but greater cooperation and better circulation with the greater body of the Church.<sup>123</sup>

Although Woodward's comments appear to be intentionally vindictive, there is an element of truth to what he says. His phrases 'morbid introspection', 'exaggerated egoism' and 'ingrowing intolerance', though caricatured, can almost be substituted for the definition of fundamentalism used here. The phenomenon he is witnessing becomes a testament to the changing identity of the Yearly Meeting.

Just prior to the 1920 Oregon Yearly Meeting sessions, two competing pamphlets were published highlighting the division for and against separation with Five Years Meeting. For those who were in favour of separation, the primary concerns listed were as follows:

---

<sup>122</sup> Emerson, *Woodward*, 176-177.

<sup>123</sup> Walter C Woodward, 'Editorial Correspondence – Rose and Thorns in Oregon', *American Friend* vol. VII no. 28 (Seventh Month 10 1919): 589-590.

1. The establishment of a strong centralized head over the Quaker churches, as opposed to the local yearly meeting following the leading of the Holy Spirit
2. An independent spirit in publishing official Quaker literature and curriculums contrary to Orthodox Quaker doctrines.
3. A belief that a conspiracy existed amongst the Five Years Meeting to unite all Friends under one un-orthodox umbrella.
4. The appointment of missionaries and board members who did not hold evangelical views, and/or who were directly opposed to it.<sup>124</sup>

It is hard to understand the logic of their first point of concern given the other three points. If Friends in Oregon truly believed there was something inherently ‘un-Friendly’ about a strong centralised headship and that such an entity in some way prevented local Yearly Meetings from following the Holy Spirit, then that argument becomes sufficient in itself for separation and such an action needs no further rationale, only proof to support the claim. To then go on and give recommendations for how FYM should function and operate, when it should not exist in the first place, undermines the strength of their first point. Despite the breakdown in logic, such arguments against a strong, centralised organisation probably spoke well to a growing separatist element within the YM, though the combination of the four points also reflects ambivalence over whether or not separation was the only option. Given that the debates were still in early stages, both conclusions are probably true: separation was the only option for some, while it was just an option worth exploring for others.

---

<sup>124</sup> W. Lloyd Taylor, *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, An Affirmative Argument*, (No publisher noted, 1920). George Fox University Archives (GFUA hereafter), section SU-2, box labeled ‘Five Years Meeting Controversy’. Located in Newberg, Oregon. Geographical referencing left off hereafter.

Later in the same pamphlet seven critical judgments are leveled against FYM and its leaders (specifically mentioning George H. Moore, president of FYM Mission Board, and Walter C. Woodward). They are as follows:

1. That they [FYM] hold and teach the authority of the canonical scriptures... to be questionable;
2. That they deny the necessity for, or merit of, Christ's death on Calvary, or the sacrifice of His Blood for our redemption;
3. That they adhere to the Evolutionary hypothesis of the existence of man and deny the record of creation by God's eternal fiat;
4. That they deny the necessity of every one being born again, or converted in the sense which the Scriptures demand;
5. That they teach the universal fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man with reference to their spiritual relationship;
6. That they reject the doctrine of the trinity
7. That they reject the Bible's testimony concerning future punishment.<sup>125</sup>

In a companion pamphlet entitled *Our Imminent Peril*, the following statement is made regarding the Inter-Church World Movement (a movement FYM had joined and supported):

The Lord spoke to us concerning the Interchurch Movement. He showed us that it was a movement which was to be the beginning of the ultimate movement which is to lead up to the anti-Christ. He showed us that rather than a movement to spread the glad tidings of Salvation to all the world, it was a movement originated by the devil himself, the purpose of which was to prevent, as much as possible, the spreading of the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. He showed us it would ultimately resort to actual persecution...<sup>126</sup>

After the first pamphlet was published, a group of moderate evangelical non-separatists Friends within the Yearly Meeting, who favoured maintaining an ongoing

---

<sup>125</sup> Taylor, *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, An Affirmative Argument*, 9-13.

<sup>126</sup> W. Lloyd Taylor, *Our Imminent Peril: An open letter with special reference to the educational movement, the Forward Movement and Inter-Church World Movement as related to Friends of Oregon Yearly Meeting and The Five Years Meeting* (no publisher or date noted), 22. GFUA. Section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

connection with Five-Years Meeting, published their own pamphlet trying to refute each of these objections. They claimed that, despite some flaws, nothing was so great an internal corrective force could not overcome it. The pamphlet made a case for ongoing unity for the sake of mission work (both foreign and domestic), denominational identity and larger accountability amongst Friends.<sup>127</sup> In the end, they reminded the reader that improvement was being made within Five-Years Meeting and that, ultimately, 'It is better to be helping in the salvation of heathens in Africa than worrying because some activity of the Five-Years Meeting is being carried out without what we consider proper legal ecclesiastical authority.'<sup>128</sup>

After one year of debating, voting and pamphleteering, the 1920 Yearly Meeting sessions began with an ominous speech on the threat of separation from FYM from the Superintendent of OYM, L. Clarkson Hinshaw, 'I have reviewed these facts as frankly and as impartially as I can in order to remind you that the gravest crisis in the history of the yearly meeting is now pending.' He also showed his strong bias toward continuing unity:

Failure to unite in a progressive, constructive program embracing the departments of church work recognized as essential, and accepting a policy of independent action led by personal leaders and local meetings, would be tragic in its effect upon all our Yearly Meeting's interest, and result in loss of influence with the evangelical forces in American Quakerism.'<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> No author noted but a list of almost 40 names are under the 'Presented By' section, *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, A Negative Argument*, (No publisher noted, 1920). GFUA. Section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

<sup>128</sup> *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, A Negative Argument*, 6.

<sup>129</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 35, p. 14. Although it is not recorded in the minutes, Levi Pennington claims that Hinshaw threatened to resign, if such an action was taken. Pennington's claim is partly verified by Hinshaw's resignation immediately following the 1926 decision.

Hinshaw's speech was immediately followed by a reading of the Quarterly Meeting's vote tallies, as had been directed from the year before. By means of a vote at the Monthly Meeting level, Newberg Quarterly Meeting favoured remaining in FYM. Both Portland Quarterly Meeting and Salem Quarterly Meeting favoured withdrawal and it seemed that the odds were leaning in that direction.

Boise Quarterly Meeting, however, sent in a lengthy resolution that stated, 'We also believe that before we can legally and honorably withdraw, a clear, definite protest should be made to the Five-Years Meeting through its General Secretary, against the prevailing conditions that have prompted the above proposition.'<sup>130</sup> Although the majority at the Yearly Meeting appears to have been in favour of withdrawal (as indicated by the vote tallies), the Yearly Meeting acted upon Boise Quarterly Meetings' suggestion.<sup>131</sup>

As had been customary for most of the existence of Oregon Yearly Meeting, the President of Pacific College also served as the Clerk of the Yearly Meeting.<sup>132</sup> President Pennington thus served as such during this time and was duly noted for his skilful clerking through these difficult 1920 sessions.<sup>133</sup> Pennington, who heavily favoured staying connected to FYM, admitted later that the Boise resolution was a 'compromise

---

<sup>130</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 36, p. 16.

<sup>131</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 39, p. 17.

<sup>132</sup> No particular reason is documented for this practice, but every year from 1893-1907, and resuming in 1915 until 1924 the pattern repeats. The same practice does not appear to be common in other Yearly Meetings. See *Minutes of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church*, 1893-1924.

<sup>133</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 40, p. 18.

action'.<sup>134</sup> He, too, sensed that a decisive decision would have led to immediate separation, so he agreed to Boise's measure in the hope of appeasing all sides. In the end, OYM agreed to Boise's compromise measure and issued three specific demands for change within Five-Years Meeting.

Firstly, that the Board of Publication of FYM renew its evangelical, Bible-based, emphasis on curriculum and Sunday school material.<sup>135</sup> Secondly, that the editor of *American Friend*, (Woodward) discontinue his disproportionate selection of articles dealing with social and political issues, and, instead, put greater emphasis on articles leading towards a fuller spiritual life. Finally, that all missionaries selected for work will come from educational institutions known to value the sacredness of Scripture.<sup>136</sup> The final statement, adopted by the Yearly Meeting, concluded: 'if these conditions are not remedied by the next Five Years Meeting..., Oregon Yearly Meeting will feel at liberty to withdraw should it so select.'<sup>137</sup>

In addition to the actions concerning FYM, the Yearly Meeting approved a strict resolution regarding the hiring of their own pastors, evangelists and elders.<sup>138</sup> Along with

---

<sup>134</sup> Levi Pennington, *Rambling Recollections of Ninety Happy Years* (OR: Metropolitan Press, 1967), 57.

<sup>135</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 35, p. 16.

<sup>136</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 35, p. 16-17.

<sup>137</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 39, p 17-18.

<sup>138</sup> 'Meetings on Ministry and Oversight or Pastoral bodies shall not recommend anyone to be recorded as a minister or appointed as an elder, nor shall they secure the services of anyone as pastor or evangelist who cannot subscribe fully in the affirmative to the following list of questions:

1. Dost thou believe in the One only wise, omnipotent and eternal God, the Creator and upholder of all things?
2. Dost thou believe in the Deity and Manhood of the Lord Jesus Christ...?
3. Dost thou believe in the Holy Spirit...?
4. Dost thou believe that man was created in righteousness and true holiness, without moral imperfections or any kind of propensity to sin?

approving this proposal, the Yearly Meeting agreed to incorporate these resolutions into their own Discipline. Both these documents (the edicts sent to the FYM and the new standards for ministers/elders) show that an increasing trend towards assuring the maintenance of theological purity was made a priority over world engagement or ecumenical collaboration. Likewise, the undoing of co-mingling with perceived modernists, who increasingly came to be viewed as apostate, now became the focus of an increasingly powerful group of fundamentalist Friends within the Yearly Meeting. While the two groups (OYM and FYM) had collaborated on mission activities and various publications under a common evangelical umbrella prior to this date, there was now a marked shift within OYM towards insularity. These formal documents, agreed to by the YM, coupled with the formation of North Pacific Evangelistic Institute, in response to the impact of modernism on Quaker colleges and the growing rhetoric against higher criticism, in particular, found in the YM's periodical (*Friendly Endeavor*), all suggest a rising anti-modernism and separatist mentality within the YM. The years 1919 and 1920, then, represent a significant era of change within the YM towards a budding fundamentalism. The complete lack of social ethics indicated in the newly revised standards for ministers and elders further verifies a fundamentalist worldview – a

- 
5. Dost thou believe in the fall of man through disobedience to God by yielding to the temptations of Satan...?
  6. Dost thou believe that thou has been born again and thus become a child of God?
  7. Dost thou believe in the Baptism of the Holy Spirit as a second definite work of Grace...?
  8. Dost thou believe that thou has been baptised [*sic*] with the Holy Spirit...?
  9. Dost thou believe that the Holy Scriptures were given by inspiration of God...?
  10. Dost thou believe in the spirituality of worship...?
  11. Dost thou believe in the resurrection of the just and the unjust and in the great judgment day and that the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal?
  12. Dost thou believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the head over all things to the Church...?
  13. Dost thou believe war is contrary to both the spirit and letter of the gospels?

See *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 79 & 105, p. 28-30 & 35-36.



worldview further seen in the refusal of the YM to participate in the mission activities of FYM unless the missionaries could be shown to be verifiably of sound doctrine. The totality of these actions, then, suggests a shift within OYM towards a growing pattern of separation, exclusivity and limited world engagement, which was increasingly common with fundamentalists across all of Protestantism in the 1920s. Although the trend was starting, as will be discussed below, it was still too weak to fully encompass the corporate policy and practices of the YM at this time.

After the actions of 1920, the Executive Committee of Five-Years Meeting responded with a letter.<sup>139</sup> The following statements represent a good sample of the whole:

We are convinced that those who hold positions of responsibility in the work of the Five Years Meeting have saving faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, which we recognize as the prime requisite for Christian service, and that they are loyal not only to the fundamentals of the Christian faith but also to those doctrines which characterize us as a denomination.

We feel that there should be continuously a clear note of evangelism in our publications; and we heartily commend the work of the Home Mission Board in preparing for a Five Years Meeting conference on Evangelism and in its plan to secure and put at the disposal of Yearly Meetings strong evangelists to emphasize in a positive, constructive way the fundamentals of the Gospel of Christ.

Though we have co-operated with other Friends and other religious denominations in certain things on which we hold common ground, we desire that our membership understand that we recognize the deity of Jesus Christ as fundamental in our faith, and we could not consider any movement toward organic union with any religious group which does not accept this basis of Christian truth.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> The letter appears to have been drafted for several Yearly Meetings, not just Oregon, as the exact same letter also appears in the minutes of at least California, Indiana and Kansas Yearly Meetings in 1921.

<sup>140</sup> *OYM Minutes-1921*, m. 11, p. 3-5.

The full letter from FYM Executive Committee was read at the opening of the 1921 sessions of OYM. It was immediately followed by a resolution from Salem and Portland QMs, ‘Requesting the release of those of their members who could not conscientiously support the Five Years Meeting Boards, from such support.’<sup>141</sup> It is not clear whether the letter from FYM was made public prior to the YM session, or if those members from Salem and Portland QMs (who would have had to authorise their requests to the YM months in advance) were aware of its existence. In some ways, it did not really matter. Even though the formal request for fiscal separation was made in 1921, it appears, from Hinshaw’s comments the year before that such actions were already occurring unofficially at that time.<sup>142</sup> The request from Salem and Portland QMs was forwarded to the Representatives who, after meeting together later in the week, took the middle road and reported back that the final decision, regarding supporting FYM fiscally, was a matter for the liberty and conscience of the individual, yet reminding everyone that the larger Yearly Meeting was currently still in unity with FYM and would still allocate its monetary allotments to them.<sup>143</sup> Although no detailed minutes from the Representatives’ meeting exists (other than what their final decision was), their actions appear to show ambivalence towards the separation tendency among the fundamentalists within their group, or even disagreement with it. Such competing tendencies are expected, however, when analysing corporate identity shifts. Up to this point, all actions regarding separation

---

<sup>141</sup> *OYM Minutes-1921*, m. 12, p. 5.

<sup>142</sup> ‘Prior to the presentation of those documents to the Yearly Meeting some Monthly Meetings by action of their own had withdrawn their moral and financial support from the American Friends Board of Foreign Missions, while others since the Proposition was received antedated the decision of the Yearly Meeting and withdrawn their support.’ *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 35, p. 13.

<sup>143</sup> *OYM Minutes-1921*, m. 52, p. 15-16.

appear to have stemmed from sub-sets within the YM's structure (i.e. Salem Quarterly Meeting, the splinter group that formed NPEI, the periodical *Friendly Endeavor*). Although these constituents do comprise an integral part of the larger whole, and the Society's traditional egalitarian business model would generally support a bottom-up approach to change, the larger systemic life of the YM was not yet in agreement with this shift. This hesitancy can be seen in the YM's decision to craft a moderate response to FYM rather than agreeing to official separation in 1919 and 1920, and in the Representative's (made up of a broad cross spectrum of the YM) decision not to withdraw fiscal support. While the early 1920s show a fundamentalist group increasing in power within the YM's corporate structure, by 1921, it had not garnered sufficient sway to alter policy and identity dramatically at the YM level.

### **Similar Trends in Other Yearly Meetings**

Oregon was not alone in expressing concerns with FYM as the fundamentalist mindset became far more widespread in several other YMs during those early post-war years. In 1921, California Yearly Meeting adopted the following resolution during their annual sessions:

The meeting on Ministry and Oversight recommended that we ask the Five Years Meeting convening in 1922 to amend minute number 37, page 49 of the minutes of 1912 by eliminating that portion of said minute, '*But they are not to be regarded as constituting a creed*'.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> *California Yearly Meeting Minutes-1921* (Whittier, CA: California Yearly Meeting of Friends Church, 1921), m. 37, p. 23. Emphasis added to reference the debate during the 1912 sessions of FYM that the Richmond Declaration of Faith and George Fox's letter to the Governor of Barbadoes were included as documents of faith to the Uniform Disciple of FYM, but 'were not to be regarded as constituting a creed'. See page 114 above.

The motion was approved by California YM and sent to the Executive Committee of FYM.<sup>145</sup>

Likewise, in 1919, Kansas Yearly Meeting received a proposition from Stella Quarterly Meeting requesting the Yearly Meeting, ‘To consider the advisability of its withdrawal from the Five Years Meeting.’ The reasons given were as follows:

1. Attitude of that body toward our Documents of Faith and Doctrine
2. The tendency to unite in religious activities with those who do not accept the atoning blood of Christ as the means of salvation.
3. The appointment of number Boards and Secretaries, not authorized by the constitution.
4. The tendency of the Board of Foreign Missions to discriminate between colleges and seminaries for the preparation of persons appointed to the mission field.<sup>146</sup>

In addition to this request, Sterling, Haviland and Hesper Quarterly Meetings presented concerns regarding the orthodoxy of the FYM publications and missionary selection as their two primary issues.<sup>147</sup> After establishing a special committee to work through the propositions, Kansas YM sent a letter to FYM requesting they adhere to their own stated standards of evangelical purpose, but elected to offer full support and continued membership.<sup>148</sup>

The next year, in 1920, Mt. Ayr Quarterly Meeting of KYM sent in a request, ‘To consider the advisability of withdrawing from the Five Years Meeting.’<sup>149</sup> This was

---

<sup>145</sup> *California Yearly Meeting Minutes-1921*, m. 37, p. 23.

<sup>146</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1919* (Wichita, KS: Kansas Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1919), m. 18b, page 6.

<sup>147</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1919*, m. 18d, 18e & 18f, p. 7.

<sup>148</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1919*, m. 60 & 74, p. 31-32 & 39-40.

<sup>149</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1920*, m. 7f, p. 8.

supported by a list of complaints filed on behalf of Hesper Quarterly Meeting. The complaints did not differ much from the year before. The request to withdraw again failed to garner consensus at the Yearly Meeting level, due to the fact that the issue had been discussed at length the year before and insufficient time had elapsed for change to occur.<sup>150</sup> The next session of FYM was still almost two years away. Several hundred Friends left Kansas Yearly Meeting over the next year.<sup>151</sup>

In 1921, in preparation for the upcoming 1922 sessions of FYM, Stella Quarterly Meeting sent in a request that its delegates to the next FYM, ‘Take a resolute attitude in regard to the following propositions:

1<sup>st</sup>. That she will in her relations to the Five Years Meeting, recognize that organization as an advisory body, but not as an authoritative one....

2<sup>nd</sup>. That there must needs be a change in the personnel of the various Boards of the Five Years Meeting, and also in the management of the *American Friend*.’<sup>152</sup>

The motion was approved, and a similarly phrased letter was sent to FYM.<sup>153</sup>

Similarly, in 1921, Western Yearly Meeting appointed a committee to consider several complaints regarding FYM sent in by three of its respective Quarterly Meetings.<sup>154</sup> In 1922, the committee reported back that it was unified in asking:

---

<sup>150</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1920*, m. 7e, 7f & 70, p. 7-8 & 37-38.

<sup>151</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1921*, m. 10a, p 7.

<sup>152</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1921*, m. 8, p. 8.

<sup>153</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1921*, m. 10e. & 36, p 8-9 & 29-31.

<sup>154</sup> Including Kokomo, Westfield, New London Quarterly Meetings. The letter sent in to Western Yearly Meeting from Westfield QM specifically mentions and paraphrases Oregon Yearly Meeting: ‘As expressed by Oregon Yearly Meeting, it is a source of disappointment and regret not to find in *The American Friend* those things which would lead into and develop a vigorous spiritual life. Instead we find a disproportionate attention and emphasis upon social service and political reconstruction, to the neglect of the teachings of the Bible on the redemption from all sin through the merits of the shed blood of our Lord

Five Years Meeting to consider amending its action in 1912, in connection with the Richmond Declaration of Faith and George Fox's letter to the Governor of Barbadoes, by elimination of the phrase, "But they are not to be regarded as a creed."<sup>155</sup>

The situation with respect to Indiana Yearly Meeting was more complicated.

Richmond, Indiana was the birthplace and home offices of FYM. The two entities shared the common life blood of personnel and funding. Any concerns raised against FYM by members of Indiana were felt as personal attacks. This connection did not stop Portland Quarterly Meeting in Indiana<sup>156</sup> from presenting the following resolution in 1921:

Portland Quarterly Meeting asks that the Yearly Meeting request the Five Years Meeting to rescind its action in 1912 by omitting the phrase "but they are not to be regarded as a creed." Portland Quarterly Meeting expresses its own conviction that these documents should be used as definitive tests for ministers, persons in official positions in the church, and for teachers in Friends institutions. Portland Quarterly Meeting also expresses its own belief that the Five Years Meeting should be merely advisory in its power so far as its relation to the constituent Yearly Meetings is concerned.<sup>157</sup>

The issue was referred to the Permanent Board of Indiana Yearly Meeting, of which Woodward was a member,<sup>158</sup> which simply reported back, a few days later, saying, 'After a free and full discussion of the propositions presented by Portland Quarterly Meeting, the Permanent Board was not in favor of endorsing their concerns.'<sup>159</sup>

---

Jesus Christ.' See *Western Yearly Meeting Minute – 1922* (Plainfield, IN: Western Yearly Meeting of Friends Church, 1922), m. 48, p. 29.

<sup>155</sup> *Western Yearly Meeting Minutes-1922*, m. 48, p. 26-27. See also *FYM Minutes-1922*, 102.

<sup>156</sup> Not the same Portland Quarterly Meeting as in OYM.

<sup>157</sup> *Indiana Yearly Meeting Minutes-1921* (Richmond IN: Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1921), m. 12, p 10-11.

<sup>158</sup> *Indiana Yearly Meeting Minutes-1921*, 160.

<sup>159</sup> *Indiana Yearly Meeting Minutes-1921*, m. 106, p 110. Hamm's *Earlham College* also records that, in the early 1920s, Portland Quarterly Meeting led a campaign against the perceived unsound

In all fairness to Woodward and the Executive Committee of FYM, they saw the danger in Woodward's dual titles (Five Year's Executive Secretary and editor of the *American Friend*) and tried to separate out the positions. The Executive Committee, however, without expressing any concern about Woodward himself, felt fiscally limited and, therefore, unable to support two full time employees. Instead they maintained the status quo.<sup>160</sup> In the end, Walter Woodward guided the Five-Years Meeting and edited the *American Friend* until his death in 1942.<sup>161</sup>

### **A Pause in the Acrimony**

By the time the 1922 sessions of the Five-Years Meeting arrived, both sides were deeply ossified.<sup>162</sup> Rufus Jones, however, presented a conciliatory resolution passed by the Business Committee, 'We wish to reaffirm the statements and declaration of faith contained in our Uniform Discipline, viz., "The Essential Truths," "The Declaration of Faith" issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887 and "George Fox's Letter to the Governor of Barbadoes."' "<sup>163</sup> Jones' statement went on to say, 'But we would further

---

modernistic teachings at Earlham College and tried (unsuccessfully) to remove several faculty. See Thomas D. Hamm, *Earlham College: A History, 1847-1997* (Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997), 127-139.

<sup>160</sup> *FYM Minutes-1927*, 21-21. See also Emerson, *Woodward*.

<sup>161</sup> *FYM Minutes-1945*. 24.

<sup>162</sup> Ohio Yearly Meeting, which had never joined the Five-Years, did not even 'see its way clear' to send fraternal delegates to the 1922 sessions. *FYM Minutes-1922*, 10.

<sup>163</sup> *FYM Minutes-1922*, 119. George Fox's 'Letter to the Governor of Barbadoes' [*sic*], written in 1671 by Fox and other Friends, is often referenced today in the Faith and Practice of evangelical Friends to connect early Quakers to Orthodox Christianity.

remind our membership that our Christian faith involves more than the adoption and profession of written statements however precious they may be.’<sup>164</sup> He concluded:

In the light of the above statement in which we unite and since the clause which was adopted ten years ago stating that these declarations of faith are not to be regarded as constituting a creed has been widely misunderstood in at least two directions, *it is our judgment that this clause should now be eliminated.*<sup>165</sup>

This was a momentous occasion for evangelicals and modernists alike, as both groups saw something significant to be gained from eliminating the contentious clause, and only the most extreme on either side found the FYM Uniform Discipline still wanting. Instead of a vote on the motion, ‘under a very real and precious sense of the overshadowing presence of the Holy Spirit, baptizing the entire meeting into a blessed unity of purpose, the delegates stood, thereby giving approval to the document as presented.’<sup>166</sup> They then sang *Blest Be The Tie That Binds* and the Doxology.<sup>167</sup>

In many ways, the simple act of deleting this sentence appears to have resolved the issue for a time. Woodward published a front page article in the *American Friend* entitled “From the Watershed into the Valley”. His optimism is self-evident:

Thus had Friends of the Five Years Meeting been speeding, unconsciously perhaps, toward the watershed. Almost before they realized it they stood at the Great Divide on September 7. Toward the cold and ice-bound north flowed the streams of dissension and division. Toward the fruitless plains of the south flowed the waters of conciliation and love. Quickly was the

---

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.* Emphasis added.

<sup>166</sup> *FYM Minutes-1922*, 120.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.* Although the singing of these two songs is recorded in the official minutes, the full stenographer’s report of the same sessions claims they sang ‘When We Asunder Part’ and ‘Praise God From Whom All Blessings Flow’. See *Full Stenographers report of the Five Years Meeting of Friends in America-1922*, 236-237.



watershed passed, and, thank God, Friends found themselves on the southern slope grasping each other's hand in praise and fellowship.<sup>168</sup>

During the 1922 and 1923 sessions of OYM, there is no mention of the tension.

In 1922, Woodward came home again and gave the commencement speech at Pacific College for the second time and also attended the YM, giving a brief report on the international reconstruction and peace work of Quakers around the world.<sup>169</sup> In 1923, Milo Hinckle (Field Secretary of the FYM) was noted in the Oregon minutes as attending their Yearly Meeting sessions and offered a brief talk on Christian stewardship to open one of the sessions.<sup>170</sup> In the end, however, the elimination of a one sentence clause to a document of faith did not prove sufficient gain for fundamentalist Friends, and due to their growing influence within the corporate structure of the YM, the conflict soon came to the fore again. Also, almost simultaneously, North Pacific Evangelistic Institute was in need of a new President.

### **Edward Mott**

With the passing of Lewis Hadley, North Pacific Evangelistic Institute was in need of a new president. By the start of the 1922 school year, another ailing Friends minister from Long Beach California was hired as President to oversee all academic and financial aspects of the Institute.<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> Walter C. Woodward, 'From the Watershed into the Valley', *American Friend* vol. X, no. 39 (September 28, 1922): 773.

<sup>169</sup> Emerson, *Woodward*, 169-170 & *OYM Minutes-1922*, m. 4 & 57, p. 3 & 23.

<sup>170</sup> *OYM Minutes-1923*, m. 4 & 26, p. 2 & 8.

<sup>171</sup> NPEI Trustee Minutes, May 8, 1922. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417' file labeled, 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Edward Mott (1866-1955) was a young man in New York at the height of evangelical Quaker revivalism. The moderate renewal period of the Society was giving way to revivalism in his own Yearly Meeting and he witnessed first-hand the changing dynamic at meetings, from largely silent time to active evangelism and pastoral style meetings. Mott's late-in-life comments about his early childhood memories reflect regret about the former state of his meeting:

Our meetings were held on First and Fourth day mornings with no evening services. In these there was no regular ministry, and often none at all. Occasionally a minister would break the silence with what was impressed upon his mind at the time. In this the Scriptures might be referred to but seldom read... There was a fear that the use of the Bible might be of the letter and not of the spirit. The preaching was therefore not Scriptural as to its emphasis.<sup>172</sup>

Mott gives credit to the work of two men for the changes that occurred in his meeting. The first was English Friend John Joseph Gurney. According to Mott, 'J. J. Gurney made a remarkable contribution to Friends while in this country in that he preached a sound faith and upheld Bible study as essential to progress in an understanding of the truth.'<sup>173</sup> The second was John Henry Douglas, who became one of the first called ministers to Mott's meeting in New York. Mott reflects, 'John Henry Douglas accomplished a great work for God and the Church while in Glen Falls... John Henry Douglas' service in Evangelism and in the Pastoral relation gave us direction and victories in true forward movements.'<sup>174</sup> Of these two men Mott says, they 'shall always

---

<sup>172</sup> Edward Mott, *Sixty Years of Gospel Ministry* (OR: Printed, 1946), 15.

<sup>173</sup> Mott, *Sixty Years*, 17.

<sup>174</sup> Mott, *Sixty Years*, 20.

stand out as great leaders in bringing the Church out of a dark period in its history into one of victory and success.’<sup>175</sup>

After completing preparatory schooling at Oakwood Academy, Mott became a recorded Friends minister in 1887.<sup>176</sup> In 1891, Mott would begin a twenty-nine year ministry in Ohio Yearly Meeting; the only Gurneyite American Yearly Meeting to not accept the Richmond Declaration of Faith because it was ‘insufficiently evangelical’. While in Ohio YM, Mott served in various roles, including being a pastor, teacher and Dean of Cleveland Bible Institute, Yearly Meeting Evangelistic and Pastoral Superintendent and Yearly Meeting Clerk.<sup>177</sup> Mott viewed the Cleveland Bible Institute as the ‘divinely provided means for deliverance from the evils which are on every hand in these days’<sup>178</sup> and claimed, rather succinctly that, as a whole, ‘Modernism makes absolutely no appeal to me; it is Satanic through and through.’<sup>179</sup>

During his time in Ohio, Mott also worked as an assistant to William Pinkham in publishing the *Evangelical Friend*, a conservative denominational periodical which originated in response to the modernist editorial policies of the *American Friend*. Mott later became editor of this publication and viewed it his responsibility as editor to use the periodical to combat the evils of modernism and to disrupt the plan of Jones to liberalise Quakerism.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>176</sup> Mott, *Sixty Years*, 22 & 27.

<sup>177</sup> Mott, *Sixty Years*, 15.

<sup>178</sup> Mott, *Sixty Years*, 34.

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*

In 1920, after struggling with significant health issues, Mott resigned from all his duties and planned to retire. Less than seven months later he was pastor at First Friends Church in California. The pastorate was short lived, and, in 1922, he moved to Oregon to accept the position of president of North Pacific Evangelistic Institute. Mott occupied the office of president of NPEI for the next eleven years.<sup>181</sup>

After starting his new post, Mott's first inclination was to go back to California, due to the difficult workload he anticipated would be necessary at the Institute. However, under his leadership the Institute survived, albeit with some difficult choices having to be made. Mott, who had to borrow money to meet his own family expenses during his early tenure, eliminated areas where the Institute had overstretched and he dismissed several faculty members and saved on operating costs.<sup>182</sup> By 1924, Mott could say, 'It is a matter of Thanksgiving that our income for the last year took care of running expenses.'<sup>183</sup> Nevertheless, the years ahead were difficult financially. The faculty had to relinquish a 'tithe' of their salary for a year and many months received no salary at all. Students continued to solicit friends and relatives for donations and the school regularly held campaigns for donations from the Institute's constituency.<sup>184</sup> Under Mott, the Institute also did away with the high-school completion programme and the four-year transfer

---

<sup>180</sup> Mott, *Sixty Years*, 34-37.

<sup>181</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 9 & 16.

<sup>182</sup> Donald M. Keister, *Edward Mott: The Influence of his Presidency on the Development of Cascade College* (Unpublished paper, Cascade College, 1967), 6-7. Archive located at Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled, 'SPU Archives, Cascade College, Box 384 of 840'.

<sup>183</sup> NPEI Trustee Minutes, October 15, 1924. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417' file labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

<sup>184</sup> The majority of these gifts were interest-bearing notes, however, which provided temporary relief, but, long term, meant further indebtedness. See Keister, *Edward Mott*, 7.

programme, electing to focus primarily on being a Bible School.<sup>185</sup> Simultaneously, a music and choral department was added to the fields of study, with groups touring much of the northwest and beyond.<sup>186</sup> Eventually, the Institute changed its name to Portland Bible Institute (PBI) to reflect some of these changes in emphasis and to give simpler geographical referencing in its name.<sup>187</sup>

Overall Mott appears to have been well liked and respected by the students. One of his students wrote:

He was quiet and deliberate, erect and dignified, he never smiled broadly or laughed loudly. His eyes gave away his amusement and he chuckled in his mirth. He was serious and strict yet I as a student felt that he sympathetically understood my youthful attitudes better than some of the women members of the faculty.<sup>188</sup>

Another of his students wrote:

It wasn't his voice, nor imposing appearance, but it was the message that held the man. This man held your attention because he had something new and fresh to say. I often marveled how he could take the simplest thing and bring a great truth out of it.<sup>189</sup>

Another student said, 'He was an outstanding Christian gentleman and was a real example of Godly living and a pattern for students who looked to him for leadership.'<sup>190</sup>

Eight years after his arrival the Board of Trustees passed the following statement, 'We

---

<sup>185</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 13.

<sup>186</sup> See Victor Phillips, *A History of Choral Literature at Cascade College: 1918-1964* (Unpublished paper, Cascade College, 1965). Archive located at Seattle Pacific University Archives, Box labeled, 'SPU Archives Cascade College Box 383 of 840'.

<sup>187</sup> NPEI Trustee Minutes, September 26, 1930. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417' file labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'. Townsend, *Our College*, 12, claims 1929 as the year for this change.

<sup>188</sup> Roscoe E. Plowman, Questionnaire form filled out for Keister, *Edward Mott*, 12.

<sup>189</sup> Fred B. Baker, Questionnaire form filled out for Keister, *Edward Mott*, 11-12.

<sup>190</sup> Esther M. Winters Klages, Questionnaire form filled out for Keister, *Edward Mott*, 11.

desire as a committee to reaffirm our utmost confidence in the President of the school, Rev. Edward Mott, in his planning and management of the school, in its financial economy and educational and spiritual interests.’<sup>191</sup>

Mott never wavered in his belief that quality education started and ended with the Bible: ‘This leads us to observe the fact widely recognized that there is no study which trains the intellect and develops mental powers, as does systematic and thorough-going Bible Study.’<sup>192</sup> Although, in Mott’s first year the doctrinal points of the Institute decreased from eighteen to nine, this appears to have been an entirely pragmatic effort at simplification without losing any of the essential points of biblical literalism, supernatural Christ, depravity, original sin, atoning work of the cross, justification, trinity, sanctification and pre-millennialism.<sup>193</sup> While Pacific College was adding degrees in the social sciences during the 1920s (economics, sociology, psychology and education),<sup>194</sup> coursework at PBI continued to emphasise prophecy, millennialism, the Doctrine of Holiness and systematic theological and personal evangelism.<sup>195</sup> Although PBI had no desire to be a liberal arts college, it did offer an array of courses outside of the typical biblical exegesis staples. However, a careful analysis of the courses descriptions shows

---

<sup>191</sup> Bulletin Files, op. cit., September 1930. As quoted in Keister, *Edward Mott*, 8.

<sup>192</sup> Bulletin Files, op. cit., September 1930. As quoted in Keister, *Edward Mott*, 4-5.

<sup>193</sup> NPEI Annual 1922. OHSA. Box labeled ‘MSS 1417’.

<sup>194</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 173.

<sup>195</sup> There does not seem to be much, if any, support for speaking in tongues, though. In 1923, there is the first critique of the modern practice of it: ‘In conclusion let me say that the place the tongues holds in the gospel message is that of ancient history; and we can afford to beware of every movement however carefully disguised, which is in any way associated with it.’ See Wilber N Coffee, *The Proper Emphasis to be placed upon Divine Healing And The Gift of Tongues*, first given at a Bible Conference at NPEI in 1923, reprinted in *The Institute Bulletin*, vol 6, no 1 November 1924, p 3-4. OHSA. Box labeled ‘MSS 1417’.

the underlying fundamentalist culture of exclusivity: ‘Psychology’ was taught ‘to show the workings of the mind in line and harmony with divine revelation’; ‘Ethics’ was taught to help ‘discern between good and evil’; ‘Expression’ was taught to improve ‘public speaking’; ‘Non-Christian Religions’ was taught to show Christianity’s ‘unique place’; and the music and choral department was often referred to as ‘evangelistic singing’.<sup>196</sup> ‘Sociology’ was the one typical liberal arts course taught that did not claim a supernatural perspective in its description and it was dropped after 1925.<sup>197</sup>

Mott continued the practice of holding revivals on campus to ensure the spiritual regeneration of students and then sent them out into the community for practical experience in street ministry and evangelism.<sup>198</sup> Despite the school’s emphasis on preparing its students for a life of Christian service,<sup>199</sup> the only evidence we have of this being practiced by the students is through these community revivals, street ministries, filling pulpits, teaching Sunday school and leading singing.<sup>200</sup> There is no record of any comparable socially minded practical experience being encouraged of the students by the school’s leaders.

Aside from the Institute becoming increasingly successful in its own right, there was also awareness, among the staff and students, of its ongoing relationship to Pacific College. Good claims that the early leaders of the Institute always perceived they were

---

<sup>196</sup> NPEI Annual Catalogue 1920-1925. OHSA. Box labeled ‘MSS 1417’.

<sup>197</sup> NPEI Annual Catalogue 1925. OHSA. Box labeled ‘MSS 1417.’

<sup>198</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 24-25.

<sup>199</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 31.

<sup>200</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 25.

filling a need Pacific College had created by default; the need for evangelism training.<sup>201</sup> Ankeny claims that some members of OYM refused to send their children to Pacific College because they believed it did not prepare students for active ministry and that the supreme goal of education was to train young people to win souls for Christ.<sup>202</sup> In February 1925, the Institute took out a full-page advert in the *Friendly Endeavor* stating its objective was to train ‘men and women for Christian work’ and the ‘deepening of spiritual life along the lines of Bible Holiness’. Further showing a spirit of exclusivity, the advert claimed that Bible Schools were ‘The Divinely Appointed Means for Christian Training’.<sup>203</sup> Showing their receptivity to the Institute, the editors of the *Friendly Endeavor* granted, in that same issue, front-page space for an article by Mott and gave free space for an announcement of an open house for the Institute.<sup>204</sup> Not to be outdone, in the next issue of the *Friendly Endeavor*, Pacific College took out its own full-page advert, claiming to be ‘The Friends College of the Pacific Northwest’ and ‘A liberal education, under the best Christian influence, at a minimum expense’.<sup>205</sup> Two months later, both institutions ran side-by-side half-page adverts each claiming to be what the other was not.<sup>206</sup> While Pennington was trying to build a Christian institution that encouraged students to understand and engage with the world around them,<sup>207</sup> Mott was

---

<sup>201</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 57.

<sup>202</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 177.

<sup>203</sup> *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 4, no 2 (Feb 1925): 4.

<sup>204</sup> *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 4, no 2 (Feb 1925): 1 & 3 respectively.

<sup>205</sup> *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 4, no 3 (March 1925): 6.

<sup>206</sup> *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 4, (May 1925): 5 & 7.

<sup>207</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 183.



building a Christian institution that saw the world as damned and needing to be evangelised. Over time, much of the tension in OYM started to take on the guise of a personality conflict between the presidents of the respective institutions, Pennington and Mott.

During the early stages of the conflict, Levi Pennington was on a two year leave of absence directing a programme called the *Forward Movement* (FM). The FM was an intra-denominational entity, acting under the blessing of the Five-Years Meeting (although not officially linked to it), trying to unite several groups of Quakers in America in promoting church growth, missions and raising funds. Perhaps somewhat naively and overly optimistically, its founders hoped to achieve a level of excitement and unity largely absent within the Society and hoped to raise funds to meet the ever growing monetary demands of missions and education (especially with support from YMs, such as Oregon, starting to dwindle). Pennington, feeling like his role in OYM was to help stymie the growing conflict regarding FYM, laboured long over whether or not to take the FM role or to continue his work at Pacific and the YM.<sup>208</sup> Finally, sensing clarity that he should take the FM position, he took full advantage of this opportunity and began to develop his already growing national reputation within Friends as well as other denominations. With a temporary office in Richmond, Indiana,<sup>209</sup> he traveled around the country visiting Yearly Meetings and Monthly Meetings of Conservative, Hicksite and

---

<sup>208</sup> Mark Ankeny argues that due to the widespread movement among Friends against FYM, it 'put Pennington in an awkward position as to whether to accept the directorship of the Friends Forward Movement. If he accepted, his absence might allow the dissenters to gain the upper hand. On the other hand, accepting might give him opportunity to show the dissenters that under his leadership they had nothing to worry about.' See Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 126-127.

<sup>209</sup> A place Pennington referred to as the capital of American Quakerism. See Pennington, *Rambling Recollections*, 84-85.

Orthodox Friends. His name appears in the present list during the annual sessions for nearly every Yearly Meeting in America at one point or another during this time. The FM was heavily enmeshed with the activities of the Interchurch World Movement (IWM), which FYM had recently embraced, raising massive funds for colleges and missions. In its first year of existence, the FM set an ambitious goal of raising \$1,000,000 for operating expenses, and simultaneously, raising another \$3,000,000 for a Friends colleges' endowment campaign.<sup>210</sup> The success of the FM at raising funds and support, however, was equally matched by the suspicion with which Oregon fundamentalist leaning Quakers monitored its activities. In 1920, Taylor writes:

When Levi Pennington was at the Salem Conference he said that after this budget was raised the Five Years Meeting would no longer find it necessary to call upon the various Yearly Meetings for support, but would be largely independent. To the spiritual element in the Five Years Meeting they have been entirely too independent already... If they succeed in raising these funds, which we predict they may, what chance in the world do you entertain to organize the spiritual element throughout the Five Years Meeting and then to wrest from this unbelieving element the reins of Church Government?<sup>211</sup>

Oregon does not appear to stand alone on this issue, as a litany of concerns began to be leveled against the FM:

Almost immediately after the Friends Forward Movement was launched, complaints mounted concerning overhead costs, fears that a united campaign would take away from local meetings, complaints that the monetary goals excessively benefited the colleges (since the original group that launched the movement was dominated by college presidents), and doubts about whether an emphasis on stewardship would result in spiritual gain.<sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup> No author noted, 'Friends in Action at World Survey Conference', *American Friend* vol. VIII no. 4 (January 22, 1920): 91-92, 95.

<sup>211</sup> Taylor, *Our Imminent Peril*, 12.

<sup>212</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 137. Although it was not ultimately approved by Western YM, they did receive a request from their own Westfield QM in 1922 that the executive committee of FYM be

Within two years of its inception the excitement waned, the amount of funds raised was not at the level hoped for and the FM was officially folded into the operations of FYM without a stand-alone director.<sup>213</sup> When Pennington returned to Pacific College as President, he was a suspected modernist with direct ties to the IWM.<sup>214</sup>

Although, over his whole lifetime, his view on orthodoxy never wavered, Pennington was a non-separatist and showed a willingness to work alongside organisations perceived by others to be apostate. Despite previous recognition for his ‘fair manner’, when handling the controversy over Five-Years Meeting as Oregon Yearly Meeting Clerk, he had become identified with a pro-FYM ideology. He was replaced as Clerk, in 1924, by Edward Mott.<sup>215</sup> Just prior to the 1924 sessions, Mott transferred his membership<sup>216</sup> to OYM and was named YM Clerk, a position he held for the next twenty years.<sup>217</sup> According to Pennington’s biographer Donald McNichols, Pennington was

---

censured for its participation in the Forward Movement. See *Western Yearly Meeting Minutes-1922*, m. 48, p. 27.

<sup>213</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 151-152.

<sup>214</sup> The Interchurch World Movement was a broad post-war ecumenical crusade attempting to unite all the benevolent and missionary agencies of American Protestantism into a single campaign for money, people and revival. Much like the Forward Movement, it embarked on an ambitious campaign attempting to raise over a billion dollars. Also, much like the Forward Movement, the Interchurch World Movement was a victim of its own dreams, its indebtedness and was undermined by conservative evangelicals, who were concerned over the prominence of liberal social thinkers in its leadership. By 1922, the IWM ceased operations. See Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1972), 896-899.

<sup>215</sup> *OYM Minutes-1924*, m 16, p. 3. Shows the first year Pennington was not clerk.

<sup>216</sup> During the early stages of OYM’s debate about the Five-Years Meeting, Mott, who had intentionally left his membership in California, seemed to have largely stayed out of the discussion. The 1923 Minutes of OYM show Edward Mott as a member of Long Beach Monthly Meeting. See *OYM Minutes-1923*, m. 4, p. 2.

<sup>217</sup> See *OYM Minutes 1924-1944*.

replaced as Clerk because of a renewed conservatism within the Yearly Meeting.<sup>218</sup> The 1924 minutes do not directly support McNichols' claim, but only because they are silent as to why this change occurred in what had become the longstanding practice of the dual role of the college president. McNichol's use of the word 'renewal' is probably a bit understated given the events of the proceeding years. Pennington later claimed that he perceived his removal from the position of Clerk to be an act of subterfuge and a premeditated 'plan to have me replaced'.<sup>219</sup> The minutes do record that Pennington received a standing vote of thanks and appreciation for his ten years of 'long and faithful service' as Clerk.<sup>220</sup> The change of Clerk from Pennington to Mott represents a significant identity-forming shift for Friends in Oregon and shows how much the overall fundamentalist culture was increasingly able to shape the YM at a corporate level by 1924.

In 1924, two days after Edward Mott was installed as Clerk of OYM, the issue of separating from FYM returned to the Oregon Yearly Meeting sessions. This time, the proposal for separation came from the ever-strengthening Ministerial Association of OYM, many of whom had had Mott as a teacher, either at Cleveland Bible Institute or at Portland Bible Institute. The tide in favour of separation, temporarily held at bay two years earlier, could not be held back any longer. By 1924, fundamentalists sufficiently populated the leadership of the YM and were now in key positions and able to successfully reshape the corporate religious identity of OYM.

---

<sup>218</sup> Donald McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker: Levi T. Pennington* (OR: The Barclay Press, 1980), 94.

<sup>219</sup> Pennington, *Rambling Recollections*, 59.

<sup>220</sup> *OYM Minutes-1924*, m. 16, p. 3. Motion offered by Carl F. Miller.

## Withdrawal of Oregon Yearly Meeting from Five-Years Meeting

On the penultimate day of the 1924 OYM sessions, the Ministerial Association submitted a report on FYM that claimed:

The requests and demands of Oregon Yearly Meeting have not been met to any appreciable degree, except insofar as the action of the Five Years Meeting officially endorsed our historic declarations of faith and caused them to become the published Faith of the Five Years Meeting.<sup>221</sup>

Although no examples are given of FYM's failures to meet the demands as set forth in 1920, the resolution ended as follows:

It is hereby understood that if the policies of the different [FYM] boards are not shaped so as to conform to and consistently sustain the standards that have been approved and endorsed by the authority of the Five Years Meeting by the convening of Oregon Yearly Meeting in the year 1926, the Yearly Meeting will not consider itself any longer an organic part of the Five Years Meeting.<sup>222</sup>

---

<sup>221</sup> *OYM Minutes-1924*, m. 52, p. 17.

<sup>222</sup> *OYM Minutes-1924*, m. 53, p. 18. Normally the Ministerial Association would not be an approved means by which new business could be brought to the YM session, a right reserved in the Discipline to 'reports from the Quarterly Meeting, from the Permanent Board, from the Standing Committees of the Yearly Meeting, from a Special Committee on New Business, and in communication from Five-Years Meeting, and from other Yearly Meetings.' However, there was a caveat within the Discipline that specified, 'Business may also be laid before a Yearly Meeting by any of its members with the consent of the Clerk.' There is no evidence whether such consent was given or sought, but the resolution does immediately follow the report of the Ministerial Association in the official minutes – though they do have different minute numbers (52 & 53 respectively). Because this motion (to withdraw from FYM) was a change possibly effecting Discipline, the YM was obligated by the Discipline to wait at least one day before acting on the recommendation, a rule they did not heed. 'All proposed legislation affecting the Constitution and Discipline, shall be introduced to the Yearly Meeting in writing, and shall not be finally acted upon on the day of its introduction.' See *The Discipline of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church-1902* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1895), 29-30. Hereafter, *Discipline of OYM* followed by respective year & *Discipline of OYM-1924*, p. 59-60. See also *OYM Minutes – 1924*, m. 52-53, p. 17-18.

The resolution called for a ‘judicious committee’ of twelve<sup>223</sup> to study whether the demands had been met and to report back in 1926. The group was named the ‘Committee on Proposed Withdrawal of Oregon from the Five Years Meeting’.

The Committee first met in September 1925, more than a year after the resolution was passed. No minutes remain, but they adopted a resolution supporting withdrawal. After this resolution, Mott finally sent notification to Five Years Meeting of the actions of the YM.<sup>224</sup> The Executive Committee of FYM met to address the matter. They appointed a five member committee<sup>225</sup> to seek a conference with Oregon representatives.<sup>226</sup>

The second meeting of the Oregon Committee on Proposed Withdrawal (April 9, 1926) was mostly marked by acrimony, perhaps suggesting that something less than full consensus had developed from the first meeting. Right from the outset, they debated the purpose of the committee. Chairman Weesner expressed his belief that the 1924 Yearly Meeting action had, in effect, already made the decision to withdraw, if certain conditions were not met, and this committee’s goal was merely to determine if those conditions had

---

<sup>223</sup> *OYM Minutes-1924*, m. 62, p. 29. The membership was L. Clarkson Hinshaw, Lindley A. Wells, Oliver Weesner, Levi T. Pennington, Carl F. Miller, Edgar P. Sims, Frederick J. Cope, Edward Mott, L. Maria Dean, Ezra G. Pearson, William Murphy and J. N. Walker.

<sup>224</sup> Mott claims he delayed in sending the information to FYM for almost a year and half because he was not initially directed as Clerk to do so. His claim is not supported by the 1924 YM minutes, which read, ‘The meeting instructed the Press Committee to send a report of this action to the *American Friend* with the resolution as read, signed by the Clerk.’ For Mott’s claim, see minutes entitled: *Meeting of Oregon Yearly Meeting Committee on Proposed Withdrawal of Oregon from the Five Years Meeting*, April 9, 1926, 1. George Fox University Archives, section SU-2, box labeled ‘Five Years Meeting Controversy’. For the Yearly Meeting’s actions, see *OYM Minutes-1924*, m. 53, p. 17-18.

<sup>225</sup> W. O. Mendenhall, John Lane, Rufus Jones, Allen D. Hole and Stephen Hadley (Ora W. Carrell named as an alternate).

<sup>226</sup> At the same time the FYM Executive Committee also named another five member committee to meet with Kansas Yearly Meeting, which had expressed similar concerns to those of OYM.

been met or not. ‘A majority of Oregon’s committee feels,’ Weesner states, ‘that we are limited to a decision as to whether or not Oregon’s demands are met.’ Pennington quickly offered his ‘lack of unity’ with that statement, suggesting the committee had already done much more in their initial meeting. Mott then offered his conviction that the committee was ‘not here to defend the [Oregon] yearly meeting to this Five Years Meeting...’ Pennington then objected to Mott, claiming, ‘Let’s be consistent. We’ve already adopted a tentatively long document explaining why we did what we did.’<sup>227</sup>

The debate may seem parliamentary, but represented a major dividing line in the discussions. For those who agreed more with Weesner’s claim, then, deciding about whether or not the demands were met or not was one and the same as deciding about the relationship to FYM. A re-reading of the minute adopted in 1924 can easily be interpreted this way. Yet for those who agreed with Pennington, the decision about the demands would only create space for more dialogue about what then to do, if the demands had, in fact, not been met. It was a technical, but significant, debate. Neither argument garnered consensus. Confusion about the role of the committee continued up to the Yearly Meeting sessions in June 1926 when the committee made its final report. In the meantime, the ensuing three hour debate about the purpose of the committee was summed up by the Recorder in the minutes only as follows: ‘There was much discussion. Such expressions were made as these: “We don’t want to get into a two day’s argument which would bring us no nearer together.”’<sup>228</sup>

---

<sup>227</sup> Minutes entitled: *Meeting of Oregon Yearly Meeting Committee on Proposed Withdrawal of Oregon from the Five Years Meeting*, April 9, 1926, 1. GFUA. Section SU-2, box labeled ‘Five Years Meeting Controversy’.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*

After breaking for lunch, the committee was joined for a prearranged joint session with the named representatives of the Executive Committee of the Five Years Meeting, who had travelled to Oregon.<sup>229</sup> During the rest of the afternoon, the two groups met with both sides trying their best to explain their side of the controversy and to propose solutions. The primary charge against Five Years Meeting was that OYM did not want to be associated with the liberal, non-orthodox, leadership of FYM. Mott summed up the argument as follows: ‘We can’t possibly accommodate the orthodox and the liberal. Oregon wants to be free from entangling alliances. The Five Years Meeting is trying to get all together on a basis of love and unity.’<sup>230</sup> In response, the representatives of FYM asked for specific names of individuals about whom OYM was concerned, which OYM did not divulge. Exchanges, such as what follows, are common in the minutes:

Mott: ‘Put the leadership of the Five Years meeting in the hands of people of unquestioned orthodoxy.’

Lane: ‘We don’t know who they are, and you don’t know who they are. We ask you and you don’t tell us. We would like to know who our leaders are who are not orthodox.’

Mott: ‘We would not have the nerve to name individual men.’

Pennington: ‘But we do have the nerve to find fault and to threaten to withdraw if those who are unsatisfactory to us are not removed?’<sup>231</sup>

Later that evening, without the presence of the FYM’s representatives, the committee renewed its commitment to the statement of withdrawal adopted at the first meeting. At this time Pennington offered a substitute motion recommending, ‘we remain

---

<sup>229</sup> Only three of the five originally named representatives were in attendance: W. O. Mendenhall, Stephen M. Hadley and John I Lane. Ellison R. Purdy also attended.

<sup>230</sup> *Minutes of Proposed Withdrawal Committee*, April 9, 1926, 6.

<sup>231</sup> *Minutes of Proposed Withdrawal Committee*, April 9, 1926, 8.



in such a connection with the Five Years Meeting as to have a voice in its councils and some authority in influencing its policies.’ Pennington’s substitute motion ‘died for lack of support’, but, ‘as a matter of personal privilege’ for Pennington, the motion was recorded along with the Committee’s report, which was to be submitted to the Yearly Meeting sessions.<sup>232</sup> The committee then re-adopted the report from their first meeting, with Pennington ‘casting the only negative vote’.<sup>233</sup> That no one on the committee, other than Pennington, had reservations about the separation resolution shows an increasingly widespread anti-modernism attitude developing within the YM, which is, in turn, indicative of its growing fundamentalist culture.

Immediately following the second meeting of the committee, a series of three conferences was held to discuss the matter and to review the proposed resolution with the larger Yearly Meeting. The first two conferences were held at Newberg Friends (April 11, 1926 and April 25, 1926). During the first conference, it appears that the FYM’s representatives were present and most of the comments were made in favour of staying in unity with FYM, or were general statements about wanting to make a wise decision given such a difficult choice. Towards the end of the conference one attendee asked, ‘Can someone give us good reasons for going out?’<sup>234</sup> No one responded.

During the second conference, a similar theme developed concerning retaining a relationship with FYM and Edith Minchin finally asked, ‘I heard only one side, let’s hear

---

<sup>232</sup> *Minutes of Proposed Withdrawal Committee*, April 9, 1926, 12.

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>234</sup> *Minutes from Conference at Newberg Friends Church on Tentative Report of Committee on Oregon Yearly Meeting’s Relation to the Five Years Meeting*, April 11, 1926, 3.GFUA. Section SU-2, box labeled ‘Five Years Meeting Controversy’.

the other side today.’<sup>235</sup> This time, two somewhat negative statements about FYM were made. As a whole, it seems that the people were starting to tire of the debate. In a not too veiled statement, Elwood Johnson claimed, ‘If Cleveland would withdraw some of her ministers in Oregon, the fuss would stop. If our preachers would keep still about it, the fuss would stop.’<sup>236</sup>

The third conference was held in South Salem Friends Church and, this time, pre-arranged ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ speakers were set to bring their respective sides. The individual set to speak in favour of withdrawal (I. Gurney Lee) failed to appear, however, so Carl Miller spoke on his behalf. This time the conference represented a balanced spectrum of opinions, but then drifted into a long discussion about what the purpose of the committee was in the first place and whether or not they had overstepped their bounds.<sup>237</sup>

In June, 1926, the ‘Committee on Proposed Withdrawal of Oregon from the Five Years Meeting’ presented a lengthy resolution to the Yearly Meeting sessions which ultimately recommended, ‘that Oregon Yearly Meeting... does now cease to co-operate with its [Five-Years Meeting] departments on work and to send delegates to its sessions.’<sup>238</sup> Pennington again submitted his substitute report and it again failed to garner

---

<sup>235</sup> *Minutes from Conference at South Salem Friends Church on Tentative Report of Committee on Oregon Yearly Meeting’s Relation to the Five Years Meeting*, May 2, 1926, 2. GFUA. Section SU-2, box labeled ‘Five Years Meeting Controversy’.

<sup>236</sup> *Minutes from Conference at South Salem Friends Church on Tentative Report of Committee on Oregon Yearly Meeting’s Relation to the Five Years Meeting*, May 2, 1926, 6. Johnson is mostly referring here to her concern that the more separatist element within the ministerial association had come from Cleveland Bible Institute – a strong fundamentalist and anti-modernist academy for Friends.

<sup>237</sup> *Minutes from Conference at Newberg Friends Church on Tentative Report of Committee on Oregon Yearly Meeting’s Relation to the Five Years Meeting*, April 25, 1926, 2. GFUA. Section SU-2, box labeled ‘Five Years Meeting Controversy’.

any support. With no discussion recorded in the minutes, the official committee report was approved by means of a vote.<sup>239</sup>

As Clerk, Mott elected to use a novel voting process whereby he garnered consensus in a plenary session and then had each delegate's vote weighted towards the number of members who were in that respective Quarterly Meeting. A decade later Pennington argued that Mott's handling of the voting process was, 'the most un-Quakerly and unparliamentary proceedings that I ever saw or heard of in an American yearly meeting.'<sup>240</sup> In his own defence, Mott wrote a letter to Pennington and explained the reasoning behind his decision to use this method of voting:

I regard the method I used as more Quakerly than a count of the eyes and nose [*sic*] of the meeting; a method I know to be contrary to all precedent as compared with the origination of our methods. If I had made the decision on "the weight of the Meeting" I would have been criticized on the ground of bias, therefore felt it necessary to have something else to aid me in reaching a decision as to the will of the Meeting.<sup>241</sup>

Mott also claimed that the Discipline said nothing as to how the Clerk was to obtain the sense of the meeting, leaving it up to the Clerk's discretion.<sup>242</sup> Pennington's

---

<sup>238</sup> *OYM Minutes-1926*, m. 11, p. 5-10.

<sup>239</sup> Voting as a form of decision making is not common amongst Friends when conducting business. See both 'Clerk' and 'Minute' in the Glossary at the end. Mott appears to have employed the practice, however, on a few occasions. Hamm records the earliest use of voting among Friends as a means of decision making to have been in Ohio YM in 1886, when the YM voted to uphold toleration of the ordinances by a vote of 198-183. FYM also used voting as a means of decision making when deciding to include the contentious 'not to be regarded as constituting a creed' clause in 1912. See Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism*, 136. See also, *Full stenographer's report of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends in America-1912*, 127.

<sup>240</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter to Chester A. Hadley dated October 25, 1939. GFUA Levi Pennington Collection. Box 4 labeled 'Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Other Addenda 1930's 1940's'.

<sup>241</sup> Edward Mott, undated personal letter to Levi Pennington. GFUA. Section FA-4, file labeled 'Edward Mott'.

<sup>242</sup> *Ibid.*

argument against Mott's lack of a punctilious methodology seems petty in one sense. Mott's decision to use any sort of voting process did not vastly differ, at least in principle, from the voting manner Pennington used as Clerk, in 1920, when the same matter was being discussed at those Yearly Meeting sessions. Likewise, regardless of whether the YM voted or not, had there been widespread disagreement or outspoken opponents of the plan, it would probably not have passed under any discernment process. The truth is that, by 1926, Friends either tired of the debate, or feared speaking up against the rising fundamentalist leaders or agreed with the action, and, in the end, did not speak up, thus granting their approval through silence.

For Pennington, however, the decision by the Yearly Meeting to withdraw was particularly personal. He not only argued for remaining within Five Years Meeting from an ideological position, but he himself was active in this organisation. In addition to his position in the Forward Movement, he served as a Clerk of FYM and sat on the Executive Committee of FYM.<sup>243</sup> McNichols claims that, 'The Five Years Meeting like Oregon Yearly Meeting and Pacific College was also a part of his personal identity. For OYM to withdraw from FYM was unthinkable for Pennington.'<sup>244</sup>

Despite the schism between the two agencies, however, it is interesting that OYM never changed the theological foundation of its Discipline afterwards in any way in order to differentiate its theology from the theological doctrines of FYM. In 1902, OYM accepted the same Uniform Discipline as all the other Gurneyite YMs that agreed to

---

<sup>243</sup> McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker*, 86.

<sup>244</sup> *Ibid.*

come under the headship of FYM.<sup>245</sup> FYM made minor revisions to its Discipline in 1924,<sup>246</sup> which Oregon accepted, though it did add the aforementioned Supplement on ‘Queries for Ministers, Elders and Evangelists’.<sup>247</sup> After OYM separated in 1926, it did not pursue developing its own Discipline, essentially operating under the same Discipline published by FYM in 1924. The next OYM Discipline did not come until 1934 and then it, too, was an almost verbatim copy of the FYM Discipline from ten years earlier on critical issues of theology and the church (both of which were generally copied from the Richmond Declaration of Faith and George Fox’s Letter to the Governor of Barbadoes).<sup>248</sup> Declarations on issues such as justification, sanctification, the fall of man, the Holy Scriptures, the Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ, the resurrection, the final judgment, baptism, peace and worship are generally unchanged from one Discipline to the next. Certainly there were changes in the polity and bureaucratic pragmatics due to not being organisationally tied to FYM anymore, but, otherwise, the ‘Historical Statements’, the Rules and Discipline’ and the ‘Church and Its Denominations’ sections within Oregon’s Discipline are all carried over from the Discipline of FYM.<sup>249</sup> While this lack of change in the Discipline may not make sense given the amount of acrimony OYM expressed against the perceived lack of orthodoxy within FYM, it does make sense, if we realise that fundamentalists, as a whole, did not disagree with the basics of Bebbington’s

---

<sup>245</sup> *Constitution and Discipline for the American Yearly Meetings of Friends-1902*, GFUSC.

<sup>246</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1924*, 14.

<sup>247</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1924*, Supplement 95-98.

<sup>248</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1934*.

<sup>249</sup> While this did not impact theology, there was one change in the 1934 Discipline, in the Church and Its Denominations section, whereby OYM discussed the process of deposing unorthodox ministers – an issue not covered in the 1924 Discipline. See *Discipline of OYM-1934*, 55.

quadrilateral. Similar to what happened in broader Protestant fundamentalism, then, we see no significant proof that fundamentalists in OYM in the 1920s strove to develop a new evangelical theology, but rather that they were far more interested in preserving an existing theology they believed was being threatened. For broader fundamentalists, no threat was greater to the preservation of their theology than the perceived inroads made by modernism. In OYM, then, anti-modernism campaigns can better explain the intellectual impetus for separation. OYM had no reason to change the theological contents of its Discipline as they were protesting more against a perceived change elsewhere (accepting modernism), than attempting to initiate a new change themselves.

After the 1926 separation, anti-modernism crusades continued throughout the YM. Those who held the fundamentalist mindset against modernism were now well positioned within the YM's corporate identity and their rhetoric increasingly found its way into print in the YM's organ. A three part article, entitled 'Modernism vs. Fundamentalism', published in the *Friendly Endeavor*<sup>250</sup> in 1927, showed the continuing strength of fundamentalist bellicosity. Although the article was written by non-Quaker pastor Chester P. Gates of the Eastside Evangelical Church in Portland, the fact it received wide distribution within the Yearly Meeting is telling. Gates claimed that modernism was primarily based on conjecture and reason:

For them [modernists] the only rule of truth or authority is reason. They admit little and deny the remainder. Prophecy, inspiration and miracle is explained, denied or naturalized. The authority of Scripture they universally deny... There is nothing so sacred but their arrogance profanes it; nothing so holy but their unholy hands defile it. This is Modernism.

---

<sup>250</sup> The title of this periodical changed from *A Friendly Endeavor* to *The Friendly Endeavor* in February 1925.

The article concludes:

As for Modernists it is no new thing, but simply another form of that opposition that in every age Satanic ingenuity hath devised... The ramification of its genius touches with the foul hand of Satanic wit the very Son of God Himself, and in its final consummation it consorts with the ripened degeneration of the last days and enthrones within the temple of God that mysterious sovereign of iniquity, the Lawless one.<sup>251</sup>

Showing no less fervour, a decade later, Oregon Quaker Earl Barker of Portland Bible Institute, published an article in the *Friendly Endeavor* entitled “Why I Never Can be a Modernist”. Barker gives five negative results of modernism; having no Bible, no Christ, no missionary vision, no Father and no hope.<sup>252</sup> That same year, the new OYM Superintendent Chester Hadley<sup>253</sup> (son of Lewis Hadley) wrote of modernism:

The battle still rages... we are living in “perilous times” God’s word is being fulfilled so rapidly that it is breath-taking. Now if ever, is the time to “preach the word.” Salvation through the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ is the only sure remedy for the world.<sup>254</sup>

---

<sup>251</sup> Chester P. Gates, ‘Modernism vs. Fundamentalism’, *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 6 no. 3 (March 1927): 7.

<sup>252</sup> Earl P. Barker, ‘Why I Never can be a Modernist’, *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 17 no 4 (April 1938): 4-5.

<sup>253</sup> Chester P. Hadley (1888 – 1940) was born to Quaker parents in Indiana. As a young man, Chester was active in the Christian Endeavor Society, the Christian Worker’s League and teaching Bible School. Soon after his marriage, he decided to forego his training and promising career as an electrical engineer to enter the ministry. For the next twenty years he served as pastor throughout Oregon at Rosedale, Piedmont and Portland Monthly Meetings. During the same timeframe his name appears on numerous committees and in various leadership roles within the Yearly Meeting, including the board of Pacific College and Superintendent of the Christian Endeavor Society in Oregon. At the age of 42, he accepted the call to be Superintendent of Oregon Yearly Meeting. Hadley represents a bit of a fundamentalist enigma and cannot easily be classified into that category. As is evident in his writings, he clearly holds no appreciation for modernism, but, at the same time, he embraced many of the social responsibilities of evangelical holiness spirituality. From his passion for missionary work in Bolivia to his efforts to start a young people’s conference centre along the Oregon Coast, his attempts at ‘applied Christianity’ brought a slight renewal of holiness spirituality to the Yearly Meeting. Hadley also did not support withdrawal from FYM. Hadley was generally liked by many sides and he often played the role of moderator between the factions.

<sup>254</sup> Chester P. Hadley, ‘Observation by the Superintendent’, *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 17 no. 3 (March 1938): 4-5, 7.

Hadley then used his regular space within the *Friendly Endeavor* to re-publish an 1891 sermon from revivalist Friend Dougan Clark entitled 'A Fervent Plea for Orthodoxy'.<sup>255</sup>

## Chapter Analysis

If corporate identity takes on a systemic life of its own – separate from just the combination of the various individuals and sub-components – then the personality changes in OYM can be cast as part of a slow seven year adjustment period. The shift that started in 1919, temporarily abated between 1922 and 1924 and was then fully embraced in 1926, as fundamentalist leaders achieved greater influence within the YM's corporate structure, successfully pulled the YM away from perceived modernist alliances. McDermott's aforementioned typology of fundamentalist thinking provides an effective model for analysing the events of the 1920s within OYM.

1. Interpretation of Scripture. All seven charges initially leveled against the leaders of FYM in 1919 by those in OYM in favour of withdrawal from it, were either directly, or indirectly, related to issues of biblical authority.<sup>256</sup> In 1920, after the YM

---

<sup>255</sup> Dougan Clark, 'A Fervent Plea for Orthodoxy', *The Friendly Endeavor* vol. 17 no. 3 (sermon originally given at Earlham College in 1891, republished March 1938): 4-5, 7.

<sup>256</sup>

1. That they [FYM] hold and teach the authority of the canonical scriptures... to be questionable;
2. That they deny the necessity for, or merit of, Christ's death on Calvary, or the sacrifice of His Blood for our redemption;
3. That they adhere to the Evolutionary hypothesis of the existence of man and deny the record of creation by God's eternal fiat;
4. That they deny the necessity of every one being born again, or converted in the sense which the Scriptures demand;
5. That they teach the universal fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man with reference to their spiritual relationship;
6. That they reject the doctrine of the trinity
7. That they reject the Bible's testimony concerning future punishment

Taylor, *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, An Affirmative Argument*, 9-13.



elected to continue in corporate relationship with FYM, they still sent in a letter to FYM emphasising their desire for FYM to conform to a more fundamentalist view of biblical interpretation:

We find in our Bible School literature, a liberal interpretation of Scripture tending toward destructive criticism, and recommendation of periodicals and books whose authors are known to hold in question the authenticity, historicity, and integrity of the Bible. With all due respect for the editor and the difficulties under which he labors, we hold that he with his associates is responsible for what is published, and we as a component part of the Five Years Meeting, expect the matter of his literature to conform to the standards of the Five Years Meeting.<sup>257</sup>

That same year the YM passed the newly revised standard for ministers, elders and missionaries, which emphasised belief in the inspiration of scriptures as a pre-requisite to any service.<sup>258</sup> Throughout these years, rampant anti-modernism campaigns targeting higher criticism as a ‘Satanic ingenuity’<sup>259</sup> and a dangerous method of biblical interpretation are evident in the pages of the *Friendly Endeavor*. Thus one shift evident in OYM during this era was a heightened sense of the Bible’s authority and, therefore, a more literal interpretation of it.

2. World-Rejecting. Whereas from its earliest beginnings in 1893 the YM sought to establish a modern educational institution in Pacific College and valued an educated membership, by the 1920s such viewpoints no longer came to the fore. The formation and success of NPEI shows a shifting pedagogical emphasis away from the modern sciences and progressive teachings of the day towards a greater emphasis on biblical exclusivity.

---

<sup>257</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 35, p. 16.

<sup>258</sup> ‘Dost thou believe that the Holy Scriptures were given by inspiration of God...?’ See *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 79 & 105, p. 28-30 & 35-36.

<sup>259</sup> Gates, ‘Modernism vs. Fundamentalism,’ 7.

The coursework at NPEI shows no attempt to engage with the main philosophical disciplines outside of an evangelical rubric. While the YM did not directly oversee the institution, it too displayed some of the same thinking. One of the main concerns expressed by OYM, in the letter to Walter Woodward in 1920, was that he discontinue his disproportionate selection of articles dealing with social and political issues, and instead put greater emphasis on articles leading towards a fuller spiritual life.<sup>260</sup> Thus, world engagement outside of what was perceived as created by God was of decreasing value within the YM.

3. Social Action. This issue comes further to the forefront in the 1930s and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three. Yet, there was already evidence from the 1920s, suggesting a decline in socially-orientated evangelism within OYM. After the Kake Island mission was turned over to the American Friends Board of Missions in 1911,<sup>261</sup> there is no main readoption of another primary mission site for almost two decades. The limited mission work engaged in during this time was more individually initiated than corporately embraced. Rather than supporting the mission work of FYM, of which OYM was an integral part until 1926, the concerns of OYM, with respect to the orthodoxy and selection process of the missionaries chosen by FYM, became a point of contention within OYM. One of the main points, mentioned in 1919 in favour of withdrawal was: ‘The appointment of missionaries and board members who did not hold

---

<sup>260</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 35, p. 16-17.

<sup>261</sup> *Foreign Mission Work of American Friends* (published by the American Friends Mission Board, 1912), 138.

evangelical views, and/or who were directly opposed to it.<sup>262</sup> In 1920, the YM sent a letter to FYM adding:

Further we demand in the recognition of ministers and the selection of missionary candidates, that the meetings and Boards responsible for such action, shall give special attention to the spiritual life and experiences of those who go out to represent us, and all such shall be urged to take their intellectual training in schools which are known to be in harmony with our standards of Scriptural doctrine.<sup>263</sup>

In addition to the concerns of OYM about maintaining orthodoxy within its mission enterprises, there is also a growing trend towards limiting its outreach work to conversion based evangelism. Even the minority party in OYM, which published a competing pamphlet in favour of ongoing collaboration with FYM for the sake of missions, still emphasised conversion as the primary goal of such mission work.<sup>264</sup> Likewise, NPEI's primary mode of engaging its own community was by holding street revivals and doing evangelism. Thus, the behaviour of the YM in the 1920s, with respect to social outreach, suggests a trend that became more pronounced in the 1930s. The one significant anomaly to this nascent pattern was the initial collaborative work between OYM and AFSC, which was also in abeyance by the 1930s and is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three.

4. Separatism. In the section below (Dialogue with Liberals) greater attention will be given to the tendency in OYM to disengage from perceived theologically liberal modernists. In this section, more attention is given to the aforementioned 'double-

---

<sup>262</sup> Taylor, *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, An Affirmative Argument*.

<sup>263</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 35, p. 16-17.

<sup>264</sup> 'It is better to be helping in the *salvation* of heathens in Africa than worrying because some activity of the Five-Years Meeting is being carried out without what we consider proper legal ecclesiastical authority.' [emphasis added] *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, A Negative Argument*, 6.

separation' tendency within fundamentalism.<sup>265</sup> The functional role that NPEI/PBI provided for some Friends in OYM in contrast to Pacific College suggests that any association with modernism, even within an evangelical community, was considered a cause for concern. Pacific College still received students from the YM during these years, and the trust was still legally held by OYM, but support for Pacific College dwindled within four of the five Quarterly Meetings after separation from FYM.<sup>266</sup> Likewise, when Levi Pennington returned from his two-year stint as director of the Forward Movement, it is clear that some sought to diminish his leadership role in the YM. That these leaders had gained sufficient strength to do so, and removed Pennington from Clerkship in 1924, suggests a rising concern over evangelicals who did not make separation a badge of orthodoxy. In replacing Pennington with Edward Mott, who favoured separatism and isolationism, the YM adopted a leader whose fundamentalist way of thinking dominated for the next twenty years.

5. Dialogue with Liberals. The increasing anti-modernist rhetoric being published in the *Friendly Endeavor*, the accusation of 'un-orthodox' teachings by FYM's personnel, the concern over the Forward Movement and the Inter-Church World Movement and the eventual decision to sever ties with FYM, all suggest that discontinuance of any co-mingling with perceived theologically liberal modernists was at the heart of the fundamentalist concern within OYM. In 1927, the *Friendly Endeavor*

---

<sup>265</sup> Separation between evangelical separatists (fundamentalists) and evangelical modernists who refused to separate from perceived apostate churches. See Adrio König, 'Evangelical Theology', in *Initiation into Theology*, ed. Simon Maimela and Adrio König (Pretoria, JL van Schaik Publisher, 1998), 85.

<sup>266</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 265.

published an article, entitled 'Co-Operation Impossible', in which the author summed up the overall stance of the YM, as follows:

Spiritual orthodoxy cannot co-operate with modern liberalism, or destructive criticism, as they are direct antipodes. The success of one means the failure of the other... Yes, co-operation with modern liberalism is impossible; absolutely impossible. To attempt it would mean certain death to all vital spirituality. Liberalism is destructive in character and never constructive. If we permit the promoters of modernism to take all of the super-natural out of our Bible, out of our Christ and out of personal Christian experience, what have we remaining? At the very best, we would have a system of morals and such a claim would be a false claim, because any system of teaching which rejects those influences which make for morality, opens the floodgates to immorality.<sup>267</sup>

That the YM never changed the basic doctrinal contents of its Discipline after separating from FYM, further suggests that fundamentalist Friends in OYM probably saw their anti-collaboration behaviour as part of a necessary defensive hedge against the perception of liberal theologies, rather than any sort of development of a novel theology.

6. The ethos of Christian faith. This issue will also be discussed more below in Chapter Three as the YM's temperance programme becomes more focused on enacting morality laws, like Prohibition, than on social betterment causes, but even in the 1920s there is evidence of a growing religious system of rules and regulations being emphasised within OYM. In addition to the strict behavioural codes expected of the coeds at North Pacific Evangelistic Institute, there is also a growing emphasis on similar lifestyle standards being espoused in the YM's periodical. In the 1920s, the *Friendly Endeavor* ran various front page articles on how Christians should not go to the movies;<sup>268</sup> on the

---

<sup>267</sup> F. J. Cope, 'Co-Operation Impossible', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 6 no. 3 (March 1927): 6.

<sup>268</sup> 'Which Were You?' *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. III no. 5 (November 1920): 1.

dangers of trying to emulate the ‘fashionable’ female dress attire of the day;<sup>269</sup> on the ‘degeneracy’ of jazz;<sup>270</sup> on the importance of avoiding ‘light chaffy talk’<sup>271</sup> and the periodical refused any advertisements for tobacco, Sunday baseball or shows.<sup>272</sup> It is not so much the discussion of such topics that meets the criteria of fundamentalism, but rather the front page emphasis given by the organ’s editors that indicated such behaviours represented the centre of Christian life. Against the backdrop of the roaring-twenties, moral chastity was highly valued as evidence of a redeemed Christian life within OYM.

7. Fissiparousness. The decision to break ties with FYM represents one level of intra-church separation. It would not be accurate to limit the entire discussion within OYM regarding fundamentalism to their debates with FYM, but because the debates with FYM became the epicentre of the conflict and monopolised significant time and thought at the YM level, the decisions regarding unity between the two entities can effectively be seen as an historical microcosm delineating the shifting milieu within OYM. That the YM debated with FYM prior to 1919, but at no point openly contemplated schism at the YM level until 1919, suggests a growing toleration of separation from that point on. The 1926 decision to separate from FYM is a more significant historical marker to indicate the culmination of this shift to fundamentalism within the identity of the YM.

## Chapter Summary

---

<sup>269</sup> S. S. Times, ‘The Up-to-Date Girl’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 4 no. 12 (December 1925): 1-2.

<sup>270</sup> C. M. Merica, ‘Music vs. Ragtime and Jazz’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 4 no. 11 (November 1926): 1-2.

<sup>271</sup> Bertha M. Eichenberger, ‘Conversation’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 6 no. 3 (March 1927): 1.

<sup>272</sup> ‘Our First Ad’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II no. 4 (October 1919): 4.

The data supporting the claim in this chapter centred on two key changes within the Yearly Meeting. The first change is the formation of a Bible School in reaction to the perceived modernist teachings at Pacific College and, the second, the decision to separate from FYM, in 1926, because it was deemed insufficiently orthodox. Interspersed throughout these same years are smaller scale events, such as the arrival of Mott and his rise to Clerk of the Yearly Meeting, that, when all is seen as a whole, become further evidence of the larger sociological shift toward fundamentalism. No organisational identity shift is completely adhered to by all constituents, however, and certainly OYM had a moderate-evangelical contingent (led by Pennington) that did not support the separation or the exclusivity.<sup>273</sup> Such anomalies are in the nature of corporate change and indicate that the fundamentalist group that pushed for change in Oregon was probably not a super-majority in the YM. Due to the lack of extant records showing actual vote tallies and/or individual decision cards, it is not even possible to claim such decisions were the result of a simple majority compared to possibly just a very vocal minority. This chapter, however, showed that, on a corporate identity level, there was a general trend towards fundamentalist thinking embraced within the Yearly Meeting during the 1920s. The next chapter examines how that trend impacted holiness beliefs and practices.

---

<sup>273</sup> Pennington still occupied the Pacific College presidency until the 1940s and served on various committees within the YM, including as Peace Superintendent from 1925-1941 (see the list of committees and Superintendents in the Appendices of the *OYM Minutes* for these respective years). The leaders in the YM, would eventually turn their scrutiny towards Pacific College (and Levi's successor) attempting to eradicate the perceived modernist influences at the college (see Chapter Four).

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE ALTERED ETHOS OF QUAKER HOLINESS

#### Introduction

In 1929, The Religious Society of Friends in America gathered for an All-Friends Conference in Oskaloosa, Iowa. For the first time in nearly a century, Friends from all persuasions (Liberal Hicksites, now united under Friends General Conference, Gurneyite Friends, united under Five-Years Meeting, Conservative Wilburite Friends, and those Friends from American Independent YMs) all came together at William Penn College. Much to Edward Mott's surprise, he was asked to deliver the opening address.<sup>1</sup> After much prayer and discussion with members of the Ministerial Association of Oregon Yearly Meeting,<sup>2</sup> Mott felt divinely led to talk on the essential Orthodox nature he believed should underlie all Christian fellowship:

We can in the very nature of the case have no sympathy with any effort to substitute for the Gospel a so-called gospel, and co-operation in spiritual service with those who advocate such a substitution is, in the nature of the case, impossible... If we fellowship on a Christian basis those who deny Christ as presented in the Gospel we do violence to those very principles which lie at the heart of spiritual advancement.<sup>3</sup>

Overall, Mott concluded the entire experience was not worthwhile and that further attempts at joint fellowship should not be undertaken:

The holding of such conferences is therefore, not only useless, but positively injurious since the attempt to promote fellowship on the basis of

---

<sup>1</sup> Edward Mott, *The Friends Church in the Light of Its Recent History* (OR: Loomis Printing, 1935), 98.

<sup>2</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 99.

<sup>3</sup> Speech given at the 1929 gathering of all Friends in Oskaloosa, Iowa. Reprinted in Mott, *The Friends Church*, 113.



a common understanding where there can, in the very nature of the case, be none, must be unsuccessful.<sup>4</sup>

Mott's sounding of the alarm against joint fellowship would set the tone for the 1930s with regard to the outlook of OYM on collaboration with other Friends. Nowhere did this new sectarian corporate mentality of fundamentalists reveal its impact on church orthopraxy more than in regard to the opinions and actions of the YM regarding humanitarian outreach and social services. While those Friends who were engaged in social gospel types of enterprises became increasingly suspect and perceived by OYM as liberal (as will be discussed below), many fundamentalist Friends began to limit their evangelistic expressions primarily to soul-harvesting rather than risk association with dangerous theologies. Although it was heir to a holiness tradition which included a broad continuum of outreach services,<sup>5</sup> in the 1930s, OYM increasingly began to single-out conversion based evangelism as its primary world-engaging outreach tool. This slow decline in 'temporal warfare' in favour of more salvation activism mimics the larger trend in broader Protestantism at the time<sup>6</sup> and will be analysed in this chapter.

The evidence for the claims in this chapter centres on the separation of Oregon Yearly Meeting from the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC).<sup>7</sup> OYM elected to sever ties with AFSC because they perceived AFSC was insufficiently grounded on the

---

<sup>4</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 102.

<sup>5</sup> See *Holiness* in the 'Terminology and Historical Context' section of Chapter One. See also, the section on 'History of Oregon Yearly Meeting' in Chapter One.

<sup>6</sup> See the discussion on the impact fundamentalism had on social action within conservative evangelical traditions in *Fundamentalism* in the section on 'Terminology and Historical Context' in Chapter One.

<sup>7</sup> A fuller history of AFSC is offered below, but for now, suffice it to say that AFSC was an American based organisation started by a small group of Quakers during the Great War. Its purpose was to provide relief and reconstruction work for war-torn communities in Europe as well as an outlet for American Quakers looking to honour their pacific ideology during a compulsory draft.

evangelistic ideology that moral behaviour came through a regenerative experience and transformation in Christ. Since OYM questioned the orthodoxy of AFSC, they, in turn, rejected their social outreach as merely a system of morals not founded on perceived biblical truths.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to separation from AFSC, further evidence of this corporate change is presented with regards to OYM's own mission work and temperance programmes. As a whole, the Yearly Meeting's main mission site during the 1930s can be seen as focused on the same singular evangelistic conversion-based impulse, with scant evidence of humanitarian or social concern as motivating factors. Likewise, the temperance programme shifts dramatically during the 1930s away from attempts at building a Christian civilisation through social betterment to an almost exclusive focus on legislated morality laws instead. The Yearly Meeting can be seen in this chapter, then, to be continuing the trend of ecumenical insularity and evangelical protectionism analysed in Chapter Two. One of the major impacts of that trend, which will be analysed in this chapter, is the impact on the YM's social action programmes.

This chapter starts with a brief history of American Friends Service Committee following WWI, followed by that agency's transition into more of a domestic social service agency in the 1930s, and finally discusses the growing perceptual differences between the leaders of AFSC and OYM on the purpose of social service. This section is

---

<sup>8</sup> The argument of this chapter is not that the historic Quaker Peace Testimony was in decline in OYM (though certainly staunch pacifism was viewed as less of a mandatory expression of that testimony within the Society as a whole by this time), but rather, that in emphasising evangelism and conversion over and above community ethical obligations, the YM was altering how it expressed its evangelical theology. Hamm contends that while almost all Quakers today still hold to the vision that war and fighting are wrong, pacifism as an absolute standard of the Peace Testimony has been in general decline within the Society from about the American Civil War onwards and that its relative decline was equal throughout all branches of the Society. See Thomas Hamm, *The Quakers in America*, Columbia Contemporary American Religion Series (NY: Columbia University Press, 2003), 161-168.

then followed by a discussion on the theological outlook held by AFSC leaders with respect to social service as compared to that of OYM leaders. This chapter then describes the events occurring around the official separation between the two agencies in 1938, which was debated again in 1940. In addition to discussing the relationship between OYM and AFSC, this chapter includes a section on the YM's own mission and temperance programmes. It then concludes with an overall chapter analysis.

### **American Friends Service Committee: A Brief History**

The AFSC was originally formed by concerned Quakers in response to the First World War. Exactly 'twenty-four days after the United States entered the World War, a group of fourteen Friends met together in Philadelphia... to discuss what should be done in a crisis which would affect every Quaker man of draft age.'<sup>9</sup> These fourteen Friends strove to unite Quakers of all persuasions to join together for the common good and the Quaker stand against this new war.<sup>10</sup> Following Quakers in Great Britain, who had already established the Friends War Victims Relief Committee for relief work,<sup>11</sup> AFSC was to be the pragmatic expression of the faith of the Religious Society of Friends

---

<sup>9</sup> Rufus M. Jones, *A Service of Love in War Time: American Friends Relief Work in Europe, 1917-1919* (NY, The Macmillan Company, 1920), 8; Mary Hoxie Jones, *Swords Into Ploughshares: An Account of The American Friends Service Committee 1917-1937* (CT, Greenwood Press Publishers, 1937), 13.

Since their inception in the middle of the seventeenth-century in England up to the American Civil War, Quakers in America had a long-standing practice of anti-war beliefs and active pacifism, which was adhered to by a majority of its members. Friends had a long history through several centuries of wars in rejecting military service (even enlisting for alternative non-combative service was still ultimately considered assisting the agents of war). Friends defended this right in previous conflicts with their lives, imprisonment and financial punishment. The most comprehensive historical examination of the Friends Peace Testimony is Peter Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony: 1660 to 1914* (York, Sessions Book Trust, 1990).

<sup>10</sup> Hoxie Jones, *Swords Into Ploughshares*, 13.

<sup>11</sup> Jones, *A Service of Love*, 4.

offering humanitarian relief within a spiritual framework. Rufus Jones was selected to serve as Chairman of the Board,<sup>12</sup> despite the dissatisfaction over his previous roles as chair of the Business Committee of the Five-Years Meeting and editor of the *American Friend*.<sup>13</sup> According to Marie Hoxie Jones,<sup>14</sup> the choice of Rufus for this role stemmed from his connection to, and acceptance by, the various Five-Years Meetings, both sets of Philadelphia Friends and ‘Friends everywhere’.<sup>15</sup>

The work of the AFSC originally centred on three primary tasks. The first task was to acquire legal Conscientious Objector (CO) status for Friends. Within months of the declaration of War, Woodrow Wilson initiated the Selective Service Act, which provided allowance in U.S. military law for a draftee to enlist as a non-combatant and take on alternative duties.<sup>16</sup> While this portion of the Act provided some relief to COs, they still had to enlist even if doing non-combatant duties – an anathema to many in the Society.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> *AFSC Board Minutes, June 11, 1917*. AFSCA. Box, “AFSC Minutes 1917-1921, Folder, ‘AFSC Minutes General Meeting 1917’.

<sup>13</sup> A post he had only officially relinquished that year – see Chapter Two.

<sup>14</sup> Rufus’ daughter, who would later write an interpretive history of AFSC.

<sup>15</sup> Hoxie Jones, *Swords Into Ploughshares*, 4.

<sup>16</sup> Hoxie Jones, *Swords Into Ploughshares*, 14.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid*. While each draftee still complied with a rigorous screening and questioning process from his local draft board, most (but not all) who tried to join AFSC in lieu of military service were successful. Those who were not, such as AFSC Executive Secretary Vincent Nicholson, were either sent to camps or imprisoned. See Jones, *A Service of Love*, Chapter 5. See also, *AFSC Executive Board Minutes, August 1, 1918*. AFSCA. Box, ‘AFSC Minutes 1917-1921, folder, ‘AFSC Minutes Executive Board 1918’. See also, *AFSC General Committee Minutes, August 22, 1918*. AFSC Archives Box, ‘AFSC Minutes 1917-1921, folder, ‘AFSC General Meeting 1918’.

The second task of the AFSC was to engage actively in reconstruction and relief efforts in war-torn Europe. To this end, they quickly joined forces with the American Red Cross<sup>18</sup> and, in the summer of 1917, one hundred Friends<sup>19</sup> volunteered to spend the summer at Haverford College learning how to build roads, plough fields and speak French.<sup>20</sup> By September, these reconstruction workers – dubbed the ‘Haverford Unit’ – journeyed to France and began the work of relief and rebuilding.<sup>21</sup> Many more groups followed.

The third task was to convince Friends in America of the need for such an organisation. Despite long-standing anti-war practices, since the American Civil War, Friends had reinterpreted their peace testimony to include a broader scope of acceptable viewpoints.<sup>22</sup> For some, this allowed for greater tolerance of taking up arms to defend the basic liberties and freedoms enjoyed in the United States. In 1917, in OYM the Peace Superintendent claimed, ‘It is gratifying to note that nearly all our young Friends of

---

<sup>18</sup> During World War I, President Wilson reorganised the American Red Cross to be the ‘militarized’ wing of the war relief work. AFSC, therefore, elected to work alongside, but not officially as part of, the Civilian Department of the Red Cross. Jones’ strong personal connection to the Red Cross’ Director of Foreign Relief Work (who had attended two Quaker colleges) helped establish the joint collaboration. See Jones, *A Service of Love*, 9-10.

<sup>19</sup> Although Friends were given priority, it does appear that AFSC made allowance for members of other denominations with similar beliefs to join, specifically mentioning the Mennonites and the Brethren. See Jones, *A Service of Love*, 17. See also. Hoxie Jones, *Swords Into Ploughshares*, 8.

<sup>20</sup> Jones, *A Service of Love*, 3.

<sup>21</sup> Of these 100 workers, two were from OYM: A. Clark Smith and Meade Elliot. See Jones, *A Service of Love*, Appendix A.

<sup>22</sup> The Civil War involved conflicting interests for Quakers (abolition vs. pacifism) and thereafter individual conscience became more of a determining factor in which ‘peaceable activities’ were allowed rather than any staunch anti-war pacific doctrines or church discipline. See Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 161-168. See also, Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*, Chapter 14.

military age have so far stood firm in the Quaker faith.<sup>23</sup> A year later, OYM reported thirty-four young men as having volunteered for military service, compared to fourteen for reconstruction work in France.<sup>24</sup> In previous conflicts such behavior had resulted in the bearer of arms being disowned for going into military service.<sup>25</sup> Under a new guise of individual conscience, however, no such actions are recorded in OYM minutes.<sup>26</sup>

When the Armistice was signed in 1918, AFSC continued its relief efforts, expanding beyond France. At the request of Herbert Hoover<sup>27</sup> AFSC was asked to undertake the distribution of food to over one million undernourished children throughout Europe.<sup>28</sup> AFSC worked to prevent famine in Russia, feed children in Austria, build homes in Serbia and help combat typhoid fever in Poland.<sup>29</sup> Through AFSC's growing worldwide network and system, young Friends coming into adulthood were able to find an expression for their social ethics and give a helping hand around the globe.<sup>30</sup> For those

---

<sup>23</sup> *Oregon Yearly Meeting Minutes-1917* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1917), minute 34, page 11. Hereafter, '*OYM Minutes*' followed by respective year, minute and page number.

<sup>24</sup> *OYM Minutes-1918*, m. 29, p. 10.

<sup>25</sup> Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 161-168; Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*.

<sup>26</sup> More typical of the American Quaker attitude towards war, by that point in time, is the response of Levi Pennington during his annual Pacific College President's report, 'Some, with conviction that they are following their paths of duty, have gone into military service for their country, and for their fidelity to duty we can only praise'. *OYM Minutes-1918*, m. 94, p. 31.

<sup>27</sup> Hoover was overseeing all the food administration and overseas relief work of the U.S. government during these early post war years.

<sup>28</sup> Irwin Abrams, *The Nobel Peace Prize and the Laureates: An Illustrated Biographical History 1901-2001* (MA, Science History Publications, 2001), 160.

<sup>29</sup> *AFSC Annual Report, 1920*, bulletin 33. AFSCA. Bound volume, 'AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947'.

<sup>30</sup> Henry J. Cadbury, 'The Status Quo of the AFSC,' *American Friend* vol. 17 no. 6 (February 7 1929): 96.

who could not serve themselves, AFSC became a place to donate. Jones says, ‘Without any pressure and with little organized effort contributions of money began to flow into the treasury so that the problem of raising money was one of the least of the problems.’<sup>31</sup> In its first year, AFSC received just over \$500,000 in receipts – with 95% coming from a broad spectrum of Quaker sources.<sup>32</sup> In two years, thanks to Hoover’s infusion of government money for the overseas feeding programmes, that total jumped to over \$3 million in contributions.<sup>33</sup> In 1918, OYM raised \$3,329.70 in funds towards the war relief effort, with most of that going to AFSC.<sup>34</sup> In 1919, that amount increased to \$4,880.18.<sup>35</sup> OYM, like many other Yearly Meetings around the nation,<sup>36</sup> embarked on a massive sewing campaign to make clothes for the thousands of needy children.<sup>37</sup> While AFSC was an autonomous corporation and not a representational body like FYM, Oregon Yearly Meeting (like most other YMs in America) started their own local Service Committee chapter with its own nominated secretary.<sup>38</sup>

Although the Five-Years Meeting was debating issues of correct evangelical orthodoxy in the early 1920s, the issue was largely moot in AFSC. In those early years of

---

<sup>31</sup> Jones, *A Service of Love*, 20.

<sup>32</sup> *AFSC Annual Report 1918*, bulletin 16. p 15. AFSCA. Bound volume, ‘AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947’.

<sup>33</sup> *AFSC Annual Report 1920*, bulletin 33. p 15. AFSCA. Bound volume, ‘AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947’.

<sup>34</sup> *OYM Minutes-1918*, m. 101, p. 39.

<sup>35</sup> *OYM Minutes-1919*, m. 48, p. 19.

<sup>36</sup> Jones, *A Service of Love*, 77-78.

<sup>37</sup> *OYM Minutes-1918 & OYM Minutes-1919*.

<sup>38</sup> Jones, *A Service of Love*, 78.

reconstruction work, AFSC was, for the most part, able to pull together diverse Friends under a common umbrella of humanitarian need. Jones' presence as Chairman of the Board seemed to have little negative influence on pulling in support and volunteers from the more evangelical leaning conservative Yearly Meetings.<sup>39</sup> If there were complaints by individuals or Monthly Meetings during this time, nothing was widespread enough that it reached the Yearly Meeting level. Simply put, the war relief effort unified Quakers. As Jones claimed:

The immense tragedies of world war made it impossible for serious men and women to busy themselves any longer with insignificant and trivial issues. The call for relief and the opportunity to serve, which was now opened to Friends, made a profound appeal to all the members everywhere.<sup>40</sup>

Although AFSC made no explicit attempt at Quaker unification, Friends 'simply found themselves working together in a great cause.'<sup>41</sup>

While the initial support from OYM for AFSC activities can be viewed as contradictory to the claims of this chapter and to the claims of Chapter Two, they make sense if the shift toward fundamentalism within OYM is viewed more as a transition starting in 1919 and culminating in 1926. The initial support for the relief work of AFSC can best be viewed as a continuation of the same pattern within the YM which existed from 1893 to the 1920s.<sup>42</sup> In the early years of the Service Committee's existence, the fundamentalist separatist tendency within OYM was only gestating and had not yet

---

<sup>39</sup> J. William Frost, 'Our Deeds Carry Our Message: The Early History of the American Friends Service Committee', *Quaker History* 81 (Spring 1991): 15.

<sup>40</sup> Jones, *A Service of Love*, 77.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> See the section entitled 'History of Oregon Yearly Meeting' in Chapter One.



matured. Moderate evangelicals still generally occupied positions of authority and influenced YM polity. Fundamentalists were growing in influence, but it took several years for them to take control. Keeping in mind the abatement in acrimony after the conciliatory 1922 FYM, the evangelical separatist movement in OYM would not be able to claim full victory within the YM until 1926. These early years of AFSC coincide, then, with more of a transitional period for OYM, which lasted from about 1919 to 1926. This period of transition, coupled with the emergent nature of the war-relief crisis, probably meant that the theological debates were restrained for a time.

After the crisis concerning war relief work abated, much changed both in AFSC and the world.<sup>43</sup> In 1925, AFSC officially terminated its World War I emergency services and began a discussion lasting several years on what its own purpose ought to be in the future.<sup>44</sup> At a series of conferences held in Philadelphia, AFSC decided to reorganise and re-vision itself into four divisions: 1) Home Service, 2) Peace, 3) Foreign Service and 4) Inter-racial Service.<sup>45</sup> By the late 1920s, AFSC committed itself to a new vision, but it

---

<sup>43</sup> As Europe emerged from the era of post-war construction, the needs abroad, while still present, were not so acute and immediate. AFSC struggled to define its role outside of being an emergency relief agency. Additionally, AFSC struggled to raise necessary fund to cover its ever burgeoning budget. With several branch offices in the U.S., a growing paid staff and relief-centres throughout Europe, AFSC frequently borrowed from its own allocated funds to cover its general operating costs. At the end the 1923 fiscal year, donations to AFSC had fallen to almost \$600,000, but its disbursements for that year were almost \$900,000. See Cadbury, 'Status Quo', 96. See also, No author noted, 'W.K. Thomas Resigns as AFSC Secretary: Questions of Future Place and Function of Service Committee are Considered,' *American Friend* 17, no. 6 (February 7 1929): 95. See also, Clarence E. Pickett, *For More than Bread: An Autobiographical Account of Twenty-Two Year's Work with the American Friends Service Committee* (MA, Little, Brown and Company, 1953), 21. See also, Lawrence McK. Miller, *Witness for Humanity: A Biography of Clarence E. Pickett* (PA, Pendle Hill, 1999), 111. See also, *AFSC Annual Report 1923*, bulletin 58. p 19. AFSCA. Bound volume, 'AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947'.

<sup>44</sup> *AFSC Annual Report 1923*, bulletin 58. p 19. AFSCA. Bound volume, 'AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947'.

<sup>45</sup> Cadbury, 'Status Quo', 96. Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 110. The last division, Inter-racial Service, was discontinued as a separate feature in February 1929. See Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 110.

was going to be accomplished with new leadership. In 1928, Jones retired as chairman,<sup>46</sup> and, less than a year later, Wilbur Thomas, who had been the Executive Secretary for ten years, also resigned.<sup>47</sup>

In 1928, long standing AFSC board member Henry J. Cadbury (1883-1974) became its new chair replacing Jones. Cadbury was born in Philadelphia to parents who were both birthright<sup>48</sup> Quakers with roots stretching back into the seventeenth-century.<sup>49</sup> He studied and taught at both Haverford and Harvard and was well known for both his scholarly acumen and for his commitment to pacifism.<sup>50</sup> Aside from his ideological consistency with AFSC, Cadbury had known the organisation from its inception. Cadbury was one of the original fourteen Friends who formed the organisation and as a founding board member he had worked diligently alongside Jones, Nicholson, Thomas and many others to assist with the war relief effort from the administrative side in the States.<sup>51</sup> Cadbury was AFSC chairman from 1928-1934 and again from 1944-1960.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Jones continued for another ten years as Honorary Chairman and ex-officio member of all AFSC committees. AFSC Executive Board Minutes, June 6, 1928. AFSCA. Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1926-1928, file, 'AFSC Minutes Executive Board 1928'. He would die in 1948.

<sup>47</sup> *AFSC Executive Board Minutes. December 19, 1928.* AFSCA. Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1926-1928, file, 'AFSC Minutes Executive Board 1928'.

<sup>48</sup> At one point in the Society's history only birthright individuals were allowed membership. The rule of allowing only birthright members was officially discontinued amongst Gurneyite Friends with the FYM's Uniform Discipline of 1902, though in practice it had been waning for several decades before that.

<sup>49</sup> Margaret Hope Bacon, *Let this Life Speak: The Legacy of Henry Joel Cadbury* (PN: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 1.

<sup>50</sup> In 1918, at the height of American anti-Germany, pro-war sentiments, Cadbury published a strongly written article in the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* denouncing the war-mongering and America's 'insatiable lust for vengeance'. The Quaker alumni of Haverford were outraged and called for Cadbury's resignation as professor at the college, which they received. See Bacon, *Let this Life Speak*, 44-49.

<sup>51</sup> Through his older sister, Elizabeth, he was also brother-in-law to Rufus Jones.

<sup>52</sup> See AFSC Executive Committee Minutes for respective years. AFSCA.

A year after his new appointment, Cadbury offered the vacant Executive Secretary position to Clarence E. Pickett (1884-1965). Pickett, too, was a birthright Friend from a pastoral tradition,<sup>53</sup> who, after graduating from Hartford Theological Seminary,<sup>54</sup> served as a pastor<sup>55</sup> and later as a professor at Earlham College in Indiana.<sup>56</sup> He, too, had experienced the consequences of being a pacifist in an era when such beliefs routinely received public scorn.<sup>57</sup> Pickett started his Executive Secretary duties part-time in the summer of 1929, going full-time in September, beginning a tenure of twenty-two years in that position.<sup>58</sup> Both Cadbury and Pickett significantly shaped AFSC in the post World War I years as well as led it through World War II.

Despite their long years of service and leadership, an external event helped to re-energise and reshape AFSC. One month after Pickett started working full-time at his new job the stock market crashed initiating what became known as ‘the Great Depression’. The twenties, book-ended by two great disasters, came to an abrupt end. The sudden increase of requests to AFSC for domestic services overtook its entire purpose. In particular, thousands of coal miners were suddenly unemployed, evicted from company

---

<sup>53</sup> Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 2.

<sup>54</sup> Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, Chapter 3.

<sup>55</sup> Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, Chapter 4.

<sup>56</sup> Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, Chapter 7.

<sup>57</sup> While serving as pastor at a Quaker church in Oskaloosa, members of his congregation offered to purchase a war bond for him to prove his loyalty. Later, his parsonage was defaced with large yellow slashes (the color of cowardice) for his refusal to buy war bonds. See Bacon, *Let this Life Speak*, 47. See also Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 75-76.

<sup>58</sup> Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, Chapter 8.

housing, or given reduced wages.<sup>59</sup> Under the guidance of Pickett, AFSC instituted several domestic relief programmes for miners and their families, including emergency supplies, a first of its kind re-education programme and homesteaded many with its subsistence living programme.<sup>60</sup> While this was good humanitarian practice, it created certain political strains.

Fair or not, a growing majority of the public at the time blamed the ongoing depression on the failed policies of Republican President (and Oregon Quaker) Herbert Hoover. When the Democratic Party got Franklin Roosevelt into the White House in 1933, it was primarily on the 'New Deal' platform designed to end the depression. Once in office, Roosevelt immediately turned to AFSC (and other humanitarian-minded service agencies) for advice on how to resolve the crisis.<sup>61</sup> Pickett, who had already been to the White House to visit Hoover regarding domestic relief services,<sup>62</sup> was given a private audience with the new president and his advisors.<sup>63</sup> This new found visibility led to great

---

<sup>59</sup> Pickett, *For More than Bread*, Chapters 1 & 2. The over-production of coal from the First World War had led to a burgeoning need for coal miners. The employment fall-off after the war, followed by the mechanisation of the industry, left thousands of coal miners displaced. Pickett, *For More than Bread*, 20. See also, Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 129.

<sup>60</sup> Pickett, *For More than Bread*, Chapters 1 & 2.

<sup>61</sup> Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 129; Pickett, *For More than Bread*, Chapter 3.

<sup>62</sup> Pickett, *For More than Bread*, Chapter 21. See also, Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 130.

<sup>63</sup> Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 129. Also instrumental in thrusting AFSC into the national limelight as a domestic social agency was the work of the First Lady. Eleanor Roosevelt had been moved to compassion by the conditions of the families living in the mining camps, having been invited by the Quakers to visit, and began a nationwide campaign to bring effective solutions and improvement to their plight. Through her efforts, and funding, the very first coal-miner subsistence homestead project was formed in the Appalachia area of West Virginia. Mrs. Roosevelt kept the issue in the forefront of her husband's docket, and the national conscience, for a long-time. By August of that first year Roosevelt was in office, Pickett was offered the governmental position of Assistant Director of the Subsistence Homesteads Division, which he accepted and proceeded to divide his time between this post and serving as AFSC Executive Secretary See Eleanor Roosevelt, *The Autobiography of Eleanor Roosevelt* (MA: Da Capo Press, reprinted 1992) 177-180; and, also, see Pickett, *For More than Bread*, Chapter 3.

success for AFSC and a massive infusion of funds. Due to government relief money, as well as private donations, AFSC budget jumped from roughly \$100,000 per year, to over \$400,000 per year within the first few years of Pickett's tenure.<sup>64</sup>

For more conservative-leaning Friends, such as those in OYM, most of whom had Republican leanings,<sup>65</sup> AFSC's activities became increasingly difficult to accept. In Newberg, the location of Oregon Yearly Meeting's denominational offices, President Hoover was considered a favourite son. Hoover still officially held membership in the Yearly Meeting and had garnered overwhelming support from Newberg and OYM in both his successful election and in his defeat by Roosevelt four years later.<sup>66</sup> With Roosevelt and AFSC closely tied together, AFSC's public adoption of a more Democratic ideology and the emphasis on domestic 'social' programmes, the writing was on the wall for imminent dissension from those more evangelical fundamentalist-leaning Yearly Meetings. Nothing, however, came to disrupt the relationship between OYM and AFSC more than the growing theological disparity between the two agencies regarding the underlying foundation for engaging in social service at all.

### **Social Service vs. Christian Service**

Jean Miller Schmidt's work, *Souls or the Social Order: The Two-Party System in American Protestantism*, identifies an important schism, which developed within

---

<sup>64</sup> Pickett, *For More than Bread*, 1-22. In 1934 alone, the First Lady herself personally donated over \$18,000. Mrs. Roosevelt continued to give the entirety of her earnings garnered from commercial radio work to AFSC. See Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 136. See also, Roosevelt, *Autobiography*, 136.

<sup>65</sup> Ralph Beebe, *A Garden of the Lord: A History of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church* (OR, Barclay Press, 1968), 79.

<sup>66</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 80-81.

American Protestant Christianity at the beginning of the twentieth-century, between social gospelers and conservative evangelists.<sup>67</sup> On one hand, says Schmidt, were those evangelicals who thought the primary role of the church was to push for individual regeneration of souls and that the elimination of sin was humanity's greatest need. For this group, individualistic campaigns aimed primarily at Christological healing were the epitome of church missions.<sup>68</sup> In contrast, were those adherents of the social gospel, who had an ever-expanding view of the concept of 'evangelism', which included all activities that might bring people in touch with organised Christianity. For this group, political, social, labour, health, education and a variety of similar sub-categories were important conduits for bringing Christ to humanity.<sup>69</sup> As mentioned above, prior to 1900, these two groups shared an alliance, as both groups adopted the centrality of Jesus and the teachings of the Bible as core foundational beliefs and there were many moderates who did not see any dialectic between these two viewpoints.<sup>70</sup> Even in the uneasy years, 1900-1920, within Protestant Christianity, as the intra-denominational disputes increased, most conservative church leaders and evangelical liberals worked together for the sake of the larger good.<sup>71</sup> By 1912, the Federal Council of Churches had both a Commission on Evangelism and a Commission on Social Service;<sup>72</sup> a bureaucratic structure, argues Schmidt, reflecting both the pre-war unity within the American churches and the

---

<sup>67</sup> Jean Miller Schmidt, *Souls or the Social Order* (Brooklyn, NY: Carlson Publishing Inc., 1991).

<sup>68</sup> Schmidt, *Souls or the Social Order*, 134 & 219.

<sup>69</sup> Schmidt, *Souls or the Social Order*, 146-151.

<sup>70</sup> See *Social Gospel* in the 'Terminology and Historical Context' section of Chapter One.

<sup>71</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 141.

<sup>72</sup> Schmidt, *Souls or the Social Order*, 131-136.

developing schism over what constituted appropriate redemptive methodologies.<sup>73</sup> By the 1920s, though, a major shift occurred in the social gospel arena in America. White and Hopkins argue that, prior to WWI, the Social Gospel Movement was populated with evangelicals who made the person and work of Jesus Christ central,<sup>74</sup> but, after the war, modernistic liberals came to the forefront within social gospelism. For them, Jesus was important only because he illustrated universally relevant truths and values.<sup>75</sup> Thus, for this new breed of social gospelists, ‘Jesus might be psychologically helpful, but he was not usually thought to be logically necessary for the highest experience of God in human life.’<sup>76</sup>

Similar patterns of thinking can be found among the leaders of AFSC, and probably no person came to epitomise this emerging theological liberalism more fully than AFSC Chairman, Henry Cadbury. Although he himself would refer to the Service Committee as the ‘lengthened shadow’ of Rufus Jones,<sup>77</sup> in one way or another, Cadbury influenced and guided AFSC from its pre-inception years before WWI all the way until the last years of his life as Honorary Chairman of the Board in the 1970s.<sup>78</sup> Cadbury was influenced by the Social Christianity of earlier Quakers,<sup>79</sup> but instead of seeing an

---

<sup>73</sup> Schmidt, *Souls or the Social Order*, 155.

<sup>74</sup> Ronald C. White, Jr. & C. Howard Hopkins, *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America* (Philadelphia PN: Temple University Press, 1976), 245.

<sup>75</sup> White and Hopkins, *The Social Gospel*, 248.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>77</sup> Cadbury’s telegraphed words, which were read at the service held for Jones upon his passing in 1948. See Bacon, *Henry Cadbury*, 151.

<sup>78</sup> Bacon, *Let This Life Speak*, 204.

evangelical holiness thread, Cadbury adopted a morality and ethically-based philosophy not necessarily tied to divine absolutes. Very early in his life, he began to question the concept of sudden Christological transformations and the idea of salvation by faith and, instead, held obedience to the example of Jesus to be the prime goal of life.<sup>80</sup> Cadbury then devalued the supernatural character of Jesus, which conservative evangelicals held firm convictions about, and, instead, elevated the ethical message of the gospels:

No doubt earlier generations were much more interested in religion as miracle or divine fiat or as sudden unprepared conversion than in any psychology of religion which resembled the slow evolutionary process of nature. Mark's parable of the seed growing secretly seems to stress the element of progress by stages, the automatic character of change. When one adds the parables of the mustard seed, of the sower, of the wheat and the tares, or the fruitless fig tree, or the rich young fool with his full barns, and three parables of vineyards or vineyard workers, not to mention the less obviously biological parable of the leaven, we seem to get in the parables a rather important recurrence of the element of growth and fruition.<sup>81</sup>

For Cadbury, the 'growth' of a religious life, lived entirely in the absence of a divine master, would lead to a progressive display of ethics. The culminating message of the Gospel, then, was not in the master ushering in a new kingdom, but in the attentive farmer, servant, virgin, hired hand, etc. each doing what they needed to do diligently along the way. The ultimate fulfilment of Christian living was effective service to others that moved beyond minimum standards, but there was nothing supernatural to this process. Cadbury, who had life-long agnostic questions on issues important to

---

<sup>79</sup> Bacon, *Let This Life Speak*, 16-24.

<sup>80</sup> Bacon, *Let This Life Speak*, 7.

<sup>81</sup> Henry Cadbury, *Jesus: What Manner of Man* (NY: Macmillan, 1947), 39.



evangelicals,<sup>82</sup> changed the supernatural character of Jesus simply casting him as, ‘the central figure in a religious movement.’<sup>83</sup> Instead, Cadbury espoused a high anthropology and described a psychological process of self-driven actualisation, entirely different from the theological belief in humanity’s fallen nature, generally held by evangelicals. Thus, the ethos of participating in social service became more a matter of inner morality and ethics than part of a process of sanctification. The evangelical sanctification process, outlined in Table 1.1 in Chapter One, no longer applied for Cadbury, and, therefore, the underlying impetus of Christological regeneration no longer provided a basis for humanitarian work. In place of a justification/sanctification system of regeneration, Cadbury espoused an inner, and very human, biological growth process, which was centered on embracing the morality described in the Gospel, rather than being made anew by the Gospel’s central character. This is not to say that Cadbury perceived there were grounds for a social gospel emanating from the pages of scripture, either. Rather, Cadbury felt there were serious limitations in trying to pinpoint intentional broad social teaching from Jesus, as he perceived too many Christian social gospelists of the twentieth-century had done:

There may be reasons for a modern Christian to espouse prohibition, pacifism, socialism or communism as so many liberal Christians do. But to claim Jesus as holding in any explicit, literal or conscious way such a modern philosophy is the grossest of anachronisms.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Such as the existence of God and immortality. See Bacon, *Let This Life Speak*, 24.

<sup>83</sup> Cadbury, *Jesus: What Manner of Man*, 5-7.

<sup>84</sup> Henry J. Cadbury, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1937), 112.

In contrast, Cadbury returned to his idea of each individual figuring out his or her best ethical response in the complicated world of an absent master.

With Jesus' general principles to guide us, these are issues which in this complicated world we must judge as best we can on our own responsibility, and not seek piously to shelter ourselves behind an effigy of Christ, nor conceitedly claim a superior loyalty to him.<sup>85</sup>

For Cadbury then, Christianity was centred on 'a return in part at least to the religious motive, the religious attitude with which [Jesus'] advice is inseparably connected',<sup>86</sup> and Cadbury believed that, in the end, 'Jesus laid down no rules to be universally applied; his teaching was casual and illustrative, *ad hoc*, and particular.'<sup>87</sup> As will be discussed below, over time, from the 1930s on, Cadbury's religion of ethics came to be increasingly foundational to the AFSC's mission.

This is not to say that everyone at AFSC was of the same mind as Cadbury. Clarence Pickett reports that, early in his tenure, board meetings were sometimes divided over which service actions were appropriate for AFSC and which were not.<sup>88</sup> Likewise, AFSC drew volunteers from every genre of YM in America, regardless of the theological divisions. However, both Rufus Jones, as Honorary Chairman of the Board still attending AFSC meetings, and Cadbury, as the actual Chairman of the Board, represented two significant posts of influence. Both these men embraced theological positions which would fall markedly outside the rubric of evangelical theology as defined by

---

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>86</sup> Cadbury, *Peril of Modernizing Jesus*, 118.

<sup>87</sup> Cadbury, *Peril of Modernizing Jesus*, 88.

<sup>88</sup> Pickett, *For More than Bread*, 4.

Bebbington's quadrilateral.<sup>89</sup> As will be discussed more in Chapter Four, AFSC's corporate make-up continued to become more reflective of Jones'/Cadbury's thinking over the next several decades, as a new breed of secularist and humanistic worker was being drawn to the agency. Over time, these changes in AFSC increased the suspicions of already suspicious fundamentalist groups.

It helped matters little when, early in his tenure, Clarence Pickett allowed for a growing alliance to be formed between AFSC and the Federal Council of Churches.<sup>90</sup> Since the FCC was formed and dominated by liberal social gospel thinkers, in many ways it became an organisation that reflected the post-WWI changes towards liberal humanism within social gospelism. Once more theological liberalism became associated with the Social Gospel Movement and the FCC after WWI,<sup>91</sup> particularly as the movement became more shaped by a radical humanistic liberalism,<sup>92</sup> concerns arose from fundamentalists who believed the FCC was espousing a teaching that viewed the kingdom of God as something separate from redemptive society.<sup>93</sup> The relational link being formed between AFSC and the FCC, in conjunction with the perceived unorthodox teachings of Jones and Cadbury, increased tensions for conservative evangelicals.

For conservative evangelicals in America, even for those individuals not swayed much by the militancy of fundamentalism, this new liberal approach within social

---

<sup>89</sup> Although Cadbury and Jones would both share a high anthropology and would come to some of the same conclusions about the Christological supernatural nature of Jesus, Cadbury never embraced the mysticism that Jones espoused. See Bacon, *Let This Life Speak*, 23, 117.

<sup>90</sup> Pickett, *For More than Bread*, 3-7.

<sup>91</sup> White and Hopkins, *The Social Gospel*, 248.

<sup>92</sup> Robert T. Handy, *The Social Gospel in America 1870-1920* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1966), 7.

<sup>93</sup> Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (Paris: Mouton and Co. 1963), 10.

gospelism was more than just a nuanced position within orthodoxy. Rather, it was seen as more and more heterodoxical to their beliefs. Although OYM actively supported AFSC in the 1920s, by the 1930s, AFSC became the new target for charges of apostasy. In order to understand the change within OYM from active support of AFSC to eventual organisational separation, it is helpful to understand first how the YM's thinking on humanitarianism differed. And no person came to epitomise the corporate mentality of OYM during the 1930s with respect to social service better than its Clerk, Edward Mott.

In 1935, Edward Mott wrote a book focused on the theology of the Friends Church.<sup>94</sup> In his book, Mott provided a rather positive description of the social Christianity of early Quakers: 'Throughout our history as a denomination we have given to the world an excellent exemplification of the moral and social principles of the Gospel.'<sup>95</sup> Yet, Mott is clear that he believed all such service to be contingent upon it having the correct spiritual foundation:

In our social service we must, not, therefore, get the idea that we can, by bettering physical conditions, usher in correct moral and spiritual conditions. First things must be given first place, a proper order and sequence must be followed; then the desired results.<sup>96</sup>

Mott cited George Fox, William Penn, Elizabeth Fry and John Woolman as excellent examples of individuals who sought to remedy social problems<sup>97</sup> and he cast them all as being far more concerned with spiritual salvation than with humanitarian solutions:

---

<sup>94</sup> Edward Mott, *The Friends Church in the Light of Its Recent History* (OR: Printed, 1935).

<sup>95</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 56.

<sup>96</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 57-58.

<sup>97</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 56-57.

Their service was primarily spiritual, and the actuating principles animating them were drawn and developed from spiritual conceptions. They did not base their pleas on material and ethical grounds only, but ever and uppermost in their fervid exhortations was the thought of the direction of the finger of God, the leading of the Spirit. Theirs was truly a Gospel ministry, not a humanitarian program of service merely. They exemplified the fact that social activities in Christian living and achievement must be properly related to the great mission of the church, the preaching of the Gospel to every creature, for no need of the race can be at all comparable to its spiritual need; the temporal necessities are clearly of less importance than the spiritual, for the first have a relation to time only, while the latter have to do with eternity.<sup>98</sup>

For Mott, who claimed to value highly the necessity of maintaining the Quaker Peace Testimony and was a staunch pacifist himself, such a testimony started and ended with salvation. There would be no peace programme outside the power of Christ:

Only as men's hearts are brought under the influence and power of Christ can there be real peace among men. To the degree human hearts are freed from sin will hate, the cause of war, be removed. Mere denunciations of the military procedure of government will get us nowhere; we must present a positive message of love, good will and kindness which shall take the place of hatred and cruelty. The Gospel of full salvation is our only hope for relief from the terrible conditions which confront us.<sup>99</sup>

In general, Mott's thinking on social service was entirely consistent with the evangelical perception of holiness described in Chapter One.<sup>100</sup> Mott saw the impetus of Christ's transformative work in the regenerate as paramount and then one possible consequence of that sanctification was social outreach. For Mott, social outreach void of this impetus was 'a humanitarian program of service merely.'<sup>101</sup> Rather, Mott emphasised, 'First things must be given first place, a proper order and sequence must be followed; then the desired

---

<sup>98</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 57.

<sup>99</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 63-64.

<sup>100</sup> See, in particular, Table 1.1.

<sup>101</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 57.

results.<sup>102</sup> In December 1930, Mott preached a sermon to Portland QM in which this exact process was outlined:

As the believer walks with God he finds that a still more gracious experience awaits him as the very God of peace who met him in justification now sanctifies him wholly.... He now devotes himself to compliance with the scriptural injunction to follow peace with all men and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord.<sup>103</sup>

Thus, we find in Mott's thinking, the foundation of two important trends that would become evident in OYM in the 1930s. First, that all humanitarian and relief work was to be done in the name of Christ and had to include conversion as a necessary foundation. The second then results from the first, the start to a salvation-first doctrine, whereby recipients of the YM's goodwill had to be brought into the light of Christ and accept salvation before they were given social services. This policy can be seen particularly in the YM's mission work highlighted below.

The growing battle between fundamentalists and liberal theologians, however, was not so much about fundamentalists calling for a wholesale rejection of humanitarian service by the church, rather such behaviour became an unfortunate consequence of a much deeper conflict. For fundamentalists, the larger concern was in instilling the idea that service flowed exclusively out of a supernatural regenerative experience in Christ and not from any humanistic ethical grounds. For conservative evangelicals, service performed outside of the experience of the cross was looked upon as futile because it did not get to the perceived root causes of the problem. And, because of the heightened

---

<sup>102</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 57-58.

<sup>103</sup> Edward Mott, 'Righteousness-Peace', sermon originally preached at Portland Quarterly Meeting in December 1930, reprinted in *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 10 no. 1 (January 1931): 3-4.

defensiveness already present within the culture of fundamentalism, the perceived attack on the supernatural basis of Christianity, which came from liberal theologies, exacerbated tendencies and the fundamentalists were unable to admit humanitarianism even as a possible gateway activity within the Great Commission. For OYM, a pattern of ecumenical separation, similar to that which occurred in relation to FYM, soon ensued, fuelled by its concerns over the perceived secularisation of AFSC.

### **Oregon Yearly Meeting Disbands its Service Committee**

In 1937, Quakers in Oregon Yearly Meeting sent a small representational contingent of their leaders to the first World Conference for All-Friends. Along with the Penningtons,<sup>104</sup> Oregon sent a group of soundly evangelical ministers.<sup>105</sup> The formation of Friends World Committee for Consultation resulted from this conference. On the way home from the conference, the five Oregon representatives (not the Penningtons) stopped unannounced and, supposedly, ‘incognito’ at AFSC homestead projects in West Virginia and eastern Ohio. What they found left them dismayed. Upon his return home, Milo Ross wrote a letter to Clarence Pickett regarding his findings:

We spent two days there going over the ground, interviewing children, business men, railroad men, miners, council men, and even the mayor. Almost without exception the community is ‘down’ on the Quakers. We were met with such gibes as ‘Communist,’ ‘nudist Colony,’ ‘college boys,’ and ‘rich men’s sons.’ The work which took over two months with a crew of 20 at Dillon, plus county machinery, could easily have been done in a week, or ten days, we were told...

---

<sup>104</sup> Both Levi and his wife, Rebecca.

<sup>105</sup> Superintendant Chester Hadley, Milo Ross, Clark Smith and Edward Harmon. Another unnamed person from OYM was also in attendance.

I heard Rufus Jones say at the Conference that we are more than a social organization, we are yet a religious body. But from what I saw we are not doing a good job of either. I am very discouraged with the whole affair, and at present my mind doesn't want to believe anything which the A.F.S.C. puts out...

I fear that cooperation will not be forthcoming from our people here, after our reports of the conference and our looking over these two service projects.<sup>106</sup>

Ascertaining motivation for attending this conference in the first place becomes a bit problematic. Certainly the purpose of the conference was to improve ecumenical relations within the various factions of the Religious Society of Friends. What is unclear is whether the Friends from OYM attended with this hope in mind, perhaps indicating a lessening of the isolationist spirit within the YM. This is certainly a plausible option, especially considering national trends within the fundamentalist movement by that time. However, this understanding becomes less acceptable in light of the two-day junket to an AFSC work-camp at which the Oregon Friends were, admittedly, 'incognito'. The tone of Ross' letter further suggests that separatism was still an underlying impulse for OYM. It seems more plausible, then, that with the possible exception of the Penningtons,<sup>107</sup> the other five OYM attendees viewed their role in attending the FWCC conference to be as independent representatives of an independent OYM, as opposed to being stakeholders in the larger Religious Society of Friends. What they found in their role as OYM representatives, especially on the way home, became fodder for further isolationist

---

<sup>106</sup> Milo Ross, personal Letter to Clarence Pickett dated December 17 1937. AFSCA. General Files 1937 'complaints'.

<sup>107</sup> This claim is based on the facts that a) Levi and Rebecca Pennington did not go on the trip to the AFSC work-camp and b) arguments made by Levi Pennington soon after about wanting to stay connected to AFSC. Levi Pennington himself does not make any reference to his time or experience at this founding FWCC conference.



tendencies. Within a year, a proposal was submitted to the YM which recommended severing ties with AFSC.

On the penultimate day of the 1938 annual sessions of Oregon Yearly Meeting, the report of OYM Service Committee stated that:

After studying the reports of the American Friends Service Committee and having seen the results of its work, we believe that it places a wrong emphasis on the work of salvation, ignoring the soul need, which we hold to be of primary importance. Therefore we recommend that the department [Service Committee] be dissolved and the committee be discharged.<sup>108</sup>

The report was ‘respectfully submitted’ by J. Allen Dunbar, Ward L. Haines, and A. Clark Smith.<sup>109</sup> Technically, the recommendation was only to disband the OYM Service Committee, but this is because, in a sense, Oregon had no binding influence over AFSC, which was a non-representational entity. Unlike FYM, Oregon was not in any organic or legal affiliation with AFSC, but like every other YM, the collaboration was entirely based on shared denominational identity. What Oregon did here was essentially to disband their internal committee; the entity which provided the relational connection. This action would of course fail to address the bigger issue of whether or not individuals or Monthly Meetings could, on their own, still collaborate with AFSC, but that debate was less than two years away.

In Oregon there was no clear consensus in the discernment process of the YM regarding AFSC; there was considerable dissent.<sup>110</sup> After some discussion of the minute

---

<sup>108</sup> *OYM Minutes-1938*, m. 105, p. 43.

<sup>109</sup> Three of the four members on OYM Service Committee.

<sup>110</sup> George Thomas, *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting and the American Friends Service Committee* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Pacific College, 1941), 9, Archive in author’s possession. See also Chester Hadley’s comments in the *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board*

offered, Yearly Meeting Clerk, Edward Mott (now in his fourteenth year as Clerk), had those representatives present at the session vote on the proposal.<sup>111</sup> According to Pennington, the measure barely passed with only a quarter of the delegates in the room actually voting. Another attendee at the sessions, Ward Silver, supported Pennington's claim, saying that at least half the delegates abstained. Although the final action is not officially recorded in the minutes, the measure did pass and became official.<sup>112</sup> However, as Superintendent Chester Hadley later verified, 'The action of the yearly meeting was not unanimous.'<sup>113</sup>

For Pennington (now in his twenty-eighth year as President of Pacific College), the decision felt ill-advised. As with Five-Years Meeting, Pennington held AFSC in high regard.<sup>114</sup> At the time, in addition to being President at Pacific College, he also served as Peace Superintendent of Oregon Yearly Meeting<sup>115</sup> and he had mentioned nothing about any concern with AFSC in his previous lengthy annual Peace Report, read just the proceeding Friday. In his report, Pennington encouraged the ongoing 'cooperative work with other organizations such as the National Council for Prevention of War, the Peace Association of Friends in America, the peace section of the American Friends Service

---

*Minutes-Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939. GFUA. Section FB-3, file labeled 'Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board'. Newberg, Oregon.

<sup>111</sup> Thomas, *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting*, 13.

<sup>112</sup> *OYM Minutes-1938*, m. 105, p. 43.

<sup>113</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes- Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939. GFUA. Section FB-3, file labeled 'Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board'.

<sup>114</sup> Donald McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker: Levi T. Pennington* (OR: Barclay Press, 1980), 86.

<sup>115</sup> A role he held from 1925-1941. See the list of committees and Superintendents in the Appendices of the *OYM Minutes* for these respective years.

Committee, the National Peace Council, etc.’<sup>116</sup> Pennington, somewhat given to ideological stubbornness and anger at times, would not let the issue go easily. In a letter to Clarence Pickett, he sums up all his feelings on the matter with the statement, ‘I am ashamed of the action of Oregon Yearly Meeting – not now for the first time.’<sup>117</sup>

Other than what is mentioned above, no other motivation behind this recommendation is given in the Yearly Meeting minutes and no documentation from the original proceedings of OYM Service Committee survives. Although no official details of the YM’s discernment surrounding this issue were kept, Pennington, in his usual style, kept detailed records of what was said, which he later chronicled in a letter to Pickett. Also, in 1941, Pacific College student, George Thomas, wrote his undergraduate thesis on the relationship between OYM and AFSC.<sup>118</sup> Thomas claims to have personally interviewed fourteen of the key people involved in the AFSC decision and its aftermath.<sup>119</sup> His paper verifies much of what Pennington wrote to Pickett in terms of the rationale and actions behind the decision. Between the two sources, three primary reasons for the separation from AFSC become evident.

First there were the reports brought back from Oregon Quaker men who worked with, and were part of, AFSC. The general feeling in these reports was that AFSC placed its emphasis on the physical needs of re-building and was not attending to the spiritual

---

<sup>116</sup> *OYM Minutes-1938*, m. 63, p. 20-22.

<sup>117</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter to Clarence Pickett dated June 17, 1938. AFSCA. Box labeled ‘General File 1938’, file labeled ‘Society of Friends Yearly Meetings’.

<sup>118</sup> Thomas, *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting*.

<sup>119</sup> Raymond Booth, Gervas Carey, Walter Cook, Mrs. Milo Elliot, Cyrus Wilbur Field, Emmett Gulley, Edward Harmon, Virgil Hinshaw, S. Laughlin, John Magee, Carl Miller, Levi Pennington, Joseph Reece, and Clark Smith. See Thomas, *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting*, ‘personal interviews’ appendix.

needs of the people it served.<sup>120</sup> Much like the concerns expressed about the Five-Years Meeting, the perception was that AFSC did not actively evangelise in the name of Christ and that this violated both perceived Quaker principles and the ultimate Christian mission – to bring souls to redemption. Of the fourteen interviewees in Thomas’ paper, we know for sure that at least five had volunteered with AFSC as relief workers (Haines, Hinshaw, Magee, Smith and Gulley<sup>121</sup>).

The second reason was the belief among some in the Yearly Meeting that AFSC was connected to, and working with, Socialists and Communists.<sup>122</sup> On the floor of the 1938 YM sessions, Clark Smith called one of the leaders of AFSC a ‘communist who receives his salary directly from Moscow.’<sup>123</sup> It was a bold claim to make on the floor of the YM session and, although Smith said he could provide evidence to support the accusation, he never did. It was offered without substantiation and without moderation. Smith later privately retracted the statement, yet the fact his accusations went unchecked is telling of a growing sentiment towards AFSC in the 1930s.

The third issue for separation is the claim by some that AFSC set up local meetings within the geographical confines of Oregon Yearly Meeting without its consent and, therefore, not in accordance with proper Friends procedure.<sup>124</sup> Although AFSC

---

<sup>120</sup> Thomas, *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting*, 11.

<sup>121</sup> Thomas, *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting*, 4-5.

<sup>122</sup> Thomas, *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting*, 11.

<sup>123</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter to Chester A. Hadley dated October 25, 1939. GFUA Levi Pennington Collection, box 4 labeled ‘Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950’, file labeled ‘Other Addenda 1930’s 1940’s’.

<sup>124</sup> Thomas, *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting*, 10.

would not bring an official branch office to Oregon State until the 1940s,<sup>125</sup> they had taken on the role of providing guidance and leadership to some small independent Monthly Meetings. In particular, a Monthly Meeting in Seattle, Washington had recently split and one of the factions essentially asked AFSC to serve as its organisational head.<sup>126</sup> OYM took particular umbrage at this action, however. They claimed that AFSC intentionally and knowingly split the church apart, trying to set up an alternative YM in an area that, in their minds, belonged to them. Although Pickett was fully aware of the negative impact this action had on some in Oregon (as the same action had had similar on some Friends in Philadelphia), he did try to clarify to Oregon that it was not his intention to split the YM:

It is not quite fair to say that the Fellowship Council [of the AFSC] sets up Meetings. It recognizes the existence and the right to accept members of bodies that have been Meetings for a considerable time... It is the definite purpose of the Fellowship Council to try to tie these groups into Yearly Meetings as soon as the groups are willing to be tied in.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> 'Friends Unit Locating Here – Emmett Gulley to Be Secretary', *Oregonian* (June 19, 1947), 22.

<sup>126</sup> In 1905, several Quakers established a local meeting house in Seattle, which was an official part of Indiana Yearly Meeting and not in any way tied to OYM. In the late 1930s, the church comprised two fairly distinct groups of Quakers – each group reflected the larger divisions within the Society (those more evangelical and those more liberal-modernist). In an act of separation, which was marked with openness and understanding uncommon to church divisions, the two groups eventually separated and formed their own respective meetings. The more evangelical leaning group of Friends eventually left Indiana YM and joined OYM. The liberal faction of Friends, however, did not have any natural immediate YM affiliation. Pacific Yearly Meeting – which would be more aligned with the idea of the Hicksite organisation of Friends General Conference and make up California, Oregon and Washington – had not officially come into existence (although discussions were underway). In the meantime, AFSC agreed to provide helpful oversight and leadership to the liberal Friends in Seattle and served as their kind of umbrella YM. It had been doing so elsewhere around the country with small independent monthly meetings (Philadelphia and Cambridge). Under its guidance the meeting in Seattle flourished and for a while AFSC helped them create and operate the Friends Center in Seattle. For a more detailed history see, Richard H. Hendricks, *An Historical Look at Friends Memorial Church* (privately printed with no date listed), 1. Document located at North Seattle Friends Church, Seattle Washington.

<sup>127</sup> Clarence E. Pickett, personal letter to Levi T. Pennington dated June 27 1938. AFSCA. General File 1938.

As the Pacific Coast Association of Friends, precursor to the Pacific Yearly Meeting, which was comprised of Hicksite type Monthly Meetings, continued to grow in size and strength along the West Coast, the actions of AFSC in supporting a liberal Monthly Meeting was perceived by some in OYM as infringing on their territory and as subterfuge. Even Pennington expressed his lack of satisfaction with the situation:

Your explanation of the attitude of the American Friends Service Committee toward the establishment of new meetings would not be satisfactory to many of the members of Oregon Yearly Meeting; and frankness would demand I say it is not completely convincing to me... I was given to understand very definitely at the time that the service committee was not merely recognizing a meeting already established, but that your committee exercised much of the initiative in the matter of organizing that new meeting.<sup>128</sup>

In the end, no real resolution was ever reached on this debate regarding the Friends in Washington and what role AFSC played in supporting the new meeting in Seattle. The 1938 separation essentially mooted the need for resolution between the two organisations. To what extent all these issues exercised the minds of OYM attendees in 1938, is not clear. Due to the acrimony caused by the conflict, it is hard to distinguish how much of the debate centred on appropriate humanitarian and/or soteriological methodologies, rather than a fear of un-holy alliances, or simply just long-standing personality conflicts. What is clear is that, on a corporate level, OYM was becoming less involved in social and humanitarian work and was now rejecting alliances with the very Quaker agencies that specialised in such work (the mission work of FYM and the relief work of AFSC).

The case for claiming a decrease in the social action or humanitarian emphasis of the YM cannot be made simply on the basis of OYM severing its ties with these two

---

<sup>128</sup> Levi T. Pennington, personal letter to Clarence E. Pickett dated July 2 1938. AFSCA. General File 1938.

entities, although the actions do provide significant evidence for ongoing fundamentalist separatism. If the YM then resumed expression of its orthopraxy via compulsory expressions of social outreach within a different programme or simply on its own, then such claims could not be made. There was nothing sacrosanct about being in ecumenical collaboration with other Quakers that would make the claim inherently viable or otherwise. For now, the claim is only that OYM was clearly severing ties with agencies that did not appear to be conducting their social outreach within an evangelical framework. The next section reviews the possibility that OYM could have rejected the perceived modernist bent at FYM and AFSC, but still have maintained a high expression of social outreach through other programmes.

### **A Change in Christian Ethics<sup>129</sup>**

As the fundamentalist mindset became more pervasive throughout OYM, the slow decrease in humanitarian-minded programming more commonly found in the YM prior to the onset of fundamentalism, became evident. Ralph Beebe disagrees with this idea, however. While he acknowledges that the splits from FYM and AFSC were primarily over issues of perceived ‘theological liberalism’<sup>130</sup> and an ‘intensified evangelistic emphasis’<sup>131</sup> within the YM, he also claims there was ‘little relaxation of the

---

<sup>129</sup> The term ‘Christian Ethics’ is defined herein in accordance with Harry J. Huebner, as the ‘thoughts and actions that spell out the practical import of Christian convictions on daily life’, ‘the social embodiment of Christian convictions within individuals, communities, and traditions’, and the ‘product which results from the relationship dynamics of experience and criticism operating on life and sacred texts’. See Harry J. Huebner, ‘Introduction’ in *An Introduction to Christian Ethics: History, Movements, People*, ed. Harry J. Huebner (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012) 1-2, 4.

<sup>130</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 55.

<sup>131</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 71.

humanitarian emphasis’<sup>132</sup> and he says there was no reduction in efforts towards ‘social progress’,<sup>133</sup> historically typical of Quakerism. His position contrasts so much with the claims in this work that further discussion on it is warranted.

Some of the differences in the two claims are related to the dates covered in the two works. This work focuses on the years from 1919 to 1947. Beebe’s work, however, covers a much longer period – starting many years before the YM was formed, in 1893, and essentially not picking a stopping point other than his publication date (1968).

Important variations within the Yearly Meeting’s corporate identity and theology, which might otherwise be cast as moderate shifts within the span of Beebe’s work, become highlighted in the more condensed and focused span of time covered in this work.

Beebe’s fourth chapter (The Second Quarter Century – 1918-1943) encompasses what is almost the entire extent of this work. In trying to generalise the entire era, his date selection for this same general timeframe (1918-1943) allows him to use some of the initial, aforementioned, early collaboration between OYM and AFSC as one of the primary pieces of evidence to support his broad claims.<sup>134</sup> Likewise, the support OYM gave to their Conscientious Objectors during WWII is also used to support his claim<sup>135</sup> (an issue discussed more in Chapter Four of this work, which focuses on the 1940s).

However, what Beebe underexamines is the era in the middle and its dearth of humanitarian work. Instead, he stakes his claim of ‘little relaxation of the humanitarian

---

<sup>132</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 82.

<sup>133</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 71.

<sup>134</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 71-72.

<sup>135</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 78-79.



emphasis',<sup>136</sup> on minor pieces of data from the 1930s, for example, the Yearly Meeting signing a petition asking the United States to affiliate with the World Court,<sup>137</sup> the contents of the annual report of the Yearly Meeting Peace Superintendent<sup>138</sup> (Levi Pennington) and AFSC relief work of Oregon Friend Emmett Gulley.<sup>139</sup> These were all important events in the YM's history, but there are not many of them to point to in the 1930s. If anything, they support the overall claim of this work, that while such theological shifts were adopted corporately in OYM, there were other anomalies and factions within the YM that reveal competing interests. It would be accurate to say that some Oregon Quakers (perhaps even a large percentage of individuals) held an orthodox view within their evangelical framework which compelled them more towards efforts classified as humanitarian – social – ethical. It would also be accurate to say, though, that such behaviour was not normative in the YM's corporate identity during the 1930s.

Beebe also elected to highlight more positive (and youthful) elements within OYM as definitive in shaping the identity of the Yearly Meeting during this era. He gives broad space within his particular chapter to describing the development of a young persons camp along the Oregon coast (and similar camps in Idaho and Washington) used for Christian camping and spiritual renewal.<sup>140</sup> He talks extensively about the formation and growth of the YM's organ – *Friendly Endeavor* – mostly started and operated by

---

<sup>136</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 82.

<sup>137</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 74.

<sup>138</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 74-77.

<sup>139</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 72-73. Gulley was the President of Pacific College following Pennington, who would be ousted because he was perceived to be too modernist – see Chapter Four.

<sup>140</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 59-64.

young Friends.<sup>141</sup> He gives several pages to detailing the work of the Christian Worker's League and its emphasis on Christian fellowship and education for young people.<sup>142</sup> The difficulty with using such events as categorical evidence is that Beebe fails to establish how these wildly popular programmes were humanitarian rather than evangelistic. In Beebe's own words, the 'major purpose of the camps was to promote the *evangelistic emphasis* of Oregon Yearly Meeting.'<sup>143</sup> *Friendly Endeavor* was formed when, 'A number of Friends began to feel a concern for a publication that would better represent the *evangelical interests* of Oregon Yearly Meeting.'<sup>144</sup> And, the Christian Worker's League was, 'established to provide fellowship and education for young people who felt called of God for Christian service and *to develop a mechanism for evangelism*.'<sup>145</sup> In the end, these instances, during the 1930s, come more to emphasise evangelicalism over humanitarianism.

What Beebe does highlight, though, is a growing movement among young Friends in Oregon which was moderately more engaged with the world than the current fundamentalist corporate structure of the YM as a whole in the 1930s. It is not hard to see how, as these young Friends moved into more dominant leadership roles within the Yearly Meeting during the 1940s, they would bring some of this world view with them and provide a moderating corrective force to the fundamentalist culture of the 1920s. For example, Chester Hadley, who served as Superintendent of OYM Christian Endeavor

---

<sup>141</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 64-66.

<sup>142</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 57-59.

<sup>143</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 60. Emphasis added.

<sup>144</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 64. Emphasis added.

<sup>145</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 59. Emphasis added.

Society in the 1920s, later became YM Superintendent.<sup>146</sup> However, in the 1920s and 1930s, this group was still not a normative force within the YM leadership and the changing of the guard was yet to occur.

In addition to the aforementioned programmes, there are two other programmes Beebe highlights as evidence for a distinct humanitarian emphasis, but which, upon further analysis, prove rather poor examples to validate anything except that the YM was primarily focused on evangelism during the 1930s. The first is the ongoing temperance movement and the second is the new YM mission to Bolivia.

As stated in Chapter One, the Yearly Meeting's commitment to the cause of temperance was cast as stemming from a humanitarian social-betterment impulse and was used in this study to provide one piece of the evidence for the claim that the pre-WWI YM identity balanced the tendencies within the Holiness Movement and the Social Gospel Movement. After 1914, though (the year that Oregon, Washington and Idaho all voted to go 'dry'), there is a slow shift in the ideology of the temperance department of OYM. No longer do the annual reports include an emphasis on the underlying social motives for the department's existence in the first place. Rather than seeing the control of liquor traffic<sup>147</sup> as a means of eliminating social ills such as poverty, limited education, crime, etc., there is now almost a singular focus on simply controlling the liquor traffic

---

<sup>146</sup> Hadley's quick rise to YM Superintendent at the age of forty-two seems to have come about somewhat by default. After L. Clarkson Hinshaw resigned from the role in 1926, there was a four year gap in which the Pastoral, Evangelistic and Church Extension Board fulfilled the various duties of Superintendent by committee. During this time, two other people were suggested for Superintendent, both of whom refused the call. In 1930, the name of Chester Hadley, who was serving as pastor at First Friends in Portland, Oregon, was recommended and approved. Given the various YM committees Hadley served on, including Vice President of the Evangelistic and Church Extension Committee, it seems possible that it was his relative youth, more than anything else that might have hindered his move into this position. The call was unanimously approved by the Board, suggesting that, despite his relative youth, he was well liked and respected as a rising leader. See *OYM Minutes-1930*, m. 43, p. 16.

<sup>147</sup> And by now the temperance scope also included cigarettes.

through political measures and regulation. In place of education and persuasion, we find coercive reform seeking primarily legislative action. Like many Protestants across America, once their socially-minded temperance programmes ran their course, they turned to Prohibition.<sup>148</sup> As a result, after national Prohibition was passed in 1919, the temperance department appears to take a relegated role within the YM's ideology.<sup>149</sup>

In 1920, the only item listed in the temperance report, other than a chart of statistics, was the story of how the local temperance committee in Oregon had been successful in signing a petition to remove a local prosecuting attorney from office, if that attorney did not attend to prosecuting a citizen found with intoxicants.<sup>150</sup> In 1921, 1922 and 1923, the focus of the temperance report appears to be more on the prohibition of cigarettes and tobacco than on that of liquor traffic. For those respective years, the primary item listed in the temperance report was about the destructive nature of tobacco on young people, 'We are thankful to our Heavenly Father for the victories that have been won over the Liquor Traffic, and our prayer is that we may realize that we have a great foe to fight in the Tobacco Trust.'<sup>151</sup> From 1924-27, the temperance reports became extremely brief in nature, mostly just giving statistics (with sparse narrative) related to how many pieces of temperance literature were distributed and how many related

---

<sup>148</sup> Schmidt suggests that, as a whole, temperance programmes in America enjoyed widespread support from both conservative and liberal Protestants, but that after Prohibition, liberal organisations like the FCC left the cause to conservative evangelicals, who generally used coercion-based temperance programmes as a substitute for their social gospel. See Schmidt, *Souls or the Social Order*, 198-199.

<sup>149</sup> With the success of the Volstead Act, the primary motive was somewhat lessened.

<sup>150</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 84, p. 31.

<sup>151</sup> Reference from *OYM Minutes-1921*, m. 90, p. 29. See also *OYM Minutes-1922*, m. 104, p. 35. See also *OYM Minutes-1923*, m. 90, p. 32-33.

sermons were given.<sup>152</sup> Starting in 1928, particularly as the national discourse began to show some concern over Prohibition, the temperance issue starts to rise again within the YM's consciousness. However, this renewal of interest in the issue of temperance was far more of a politically charged campaign, strikingly similar in attitude to the broader militant fundamentalist culture within the YM as a whole, than any sort of expression of building Christian social mores constructively. Generally, gone is the original conviction within the temperance movement<sup>153</sup> that sought for a good social order as an extension of the larger historical Quaker social justice testimony. In 1928, the YM passed two resolutions on prohibition laws. The first was a call for OYM members to only support candidates for public office 'who are clearly committed to the strict enforcement of the eighteenth Amendment', because 'these anti-prohibition forces are concentrating their forces in an effort to place in public office as many men as possible who are unsympathetic to the prohibition movement.'<sup>154</sup> The second resolution was a letter to be sent to the federal government calling for stricter enforcement of prohibition laws among the Indians on the Klamath Reservation – specifically citing their concern that liquor allowed to be consumed on the reservation led to an increase in co-habitation.<sup>155</sup> With the Volstead Act waning in popularity on a national level,<sup>156</sup> the latter years of the 1920s demonstrate increased political rhetoric within the YM as it focuses all of its time and

---

<sup>152</sup> *OYM Minutes-1924*, m. 67, p. 32-33. *OYM Minutes-1925*, m. 75, p. 26. *OYM Minutes-1926*, m. 84, p. 41. *OYM Minutes-1927*, m. 76, p. 33.

<sup>153</sup> See discussion of temperance programme pre-1919 in the section in Chapter One entitled 'History of Oregon Yearly Meeting'.

<sup>154</sup> *OYM Minutes-1928*, m. 88, p. 42-43.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>156</sup> Prohibition was repealed in America in 1933.

energy related to temperance on enforcing governmental liquor regulations. The *Friendly Endeavor* warned, 'It is well that Christian people keep themselves posted as to the activities of those who are trying to get this amendment repealed or modified.'<sup>157</sup> By 1932, the periodical was making the protection of Prohibition not only a matter of Christian responsibility, but also of patriotism:

The pages of history tell of the many times that men have been called upon to defend their country. Today the United States is threatened by an enemy as terrible as any that ever trod the battlefield; an enemy which is insidious in that it strives to poison the minds of people instead of fighting mortal combat. I refer to the agitation for repeal of the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment.<sup>158</sup>

Frequently during these years attempts were made to regulate societal rules by sending in protest letters to various government and political agencies, supporting only 'dry' candidates for office and campaigning against the 'wet' interest. From the beginning of WWI until the end of a stand-alone temperance programme in 1940, there is scant reference within the annual temperance reports concerning the underlying social structures, humanitarian concerns, or community problems the YM was trying to affect though their temperance efforts. Occasionally, there was a reference in the reports to 'sin' or 'moral conditions', but the issues of poverty, crime, health, and illiteracy largely disappeared and were replaced with political rhetoric. Although crime gets the occasional mention, such as in reference to organised crime, it is usually expressed as a consequence of the much bigger liquor problem, which became known as 'Public Enemy No 1'.<sup>159</sup> The

---

<sup>157</sup> 'The Eighteenth Amendment', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 6 no. 7 (August 1927): 6.

<sup>158</sup> Walter P. Lee, 'The "Wet" Deception', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 11 no. 10 (October 1932): 1.

<sup>159</sup> *OYM Minutes-1937*, m. 37, p. 10.

report of 1935 is a representative example of the ideology of the broader temperance movement in OYM by that point:

The 18<sup>th</sup> Amendment closed 177,000 salons, ushering in an era of unprecedented prosperity. Repeal opened more than 700,000 saloon-taverns. These ‘hotbeds of iniquity,’ encouraged by faithless Government leaders and a metropolitan press devoid of conscience, rob their patrons of character and money, diverting them from fields of usefulness to careers of crime.... Let us make this a year of action. Let us mobilize all our resources then, beneath the banner of the cross, let us rush forward in a united and determined offensive against the arch-enemy of our homes, our country and our God. I believe that time has arrived when petitions for local option elections should be circulated in every county; also a movement initiated to reenact state constitutional dry amendments... If church members and other good citizens would unite, for political action, in a party committed to prohibition and its enforcement, the liquor problem would be settled for good.<sup>160</sup>

The years following the repeal of Prohibition show an almost exclusive desire for its reinstatement at either the national or the local level. In 1940, the temperance programme was expanded so that it could be used to ‘deal with other harmful uses and practices’ and it was renamed the Department of Public Morals,<sup>161</sup> but, as is discussed in Chapter Four, the new department was still largely focused on legislated morality as opposed to actual social betterment.

While the Department of Temperance started in the nineteenth-century was more indicative of the blending of the Holiness Movement and the Social Gospel Movement – a view that continued up to the first World-War – there is a significant shift after the war towards legislated morality and political campaigns with little evidence of any programmes or efforts aimed at helping individual people struggling with addiction. In

---

<sup>160</sup> *OYM Minutes-1935*, m. 42, p. 12-13.

<sup>161</sup> *OYM Minutes-1940*, m. 41, p. 12-13.

the 1920s and 1930s, the temperance programme fails to provide sufficient evidence to meet Beebe's claim of a humanitarian impulse within OYM throughout these years. Rather, in merely emphasising rules and behavioural codes, the YM can be seen as fundamentalist. Similar then to the student code at NPEI /PBI and the stress upon moral chastity being espoused by the *Friendly Endeavor* in the 1920s,<sup>162</sup> we can see in the 1930s temperance programmes an ongoing tendency of world-rejecting disengagement among OYM fundamentalists. These various actions of codified morality all became means by which Oregon Friends tried to set themselves apart as a peculiar people and tried to exemplify their own sanctification.

The second programme Beebe cites as evidence for his claim is the new mission work in Bolivia. After the Alaska mission on Kake Island was turned over to the American Friends Mission Board (AFMB) in 1911,<sup>163</sup> there was a gap of almost twenty years in which no official site was listed by the YM as their adopted mission site.<sup>164</sup> Donations for mission work were mostly sent to the AFMB, and missionaries within OYM seeking an outlet for their calling were likewise referred to the same.<sup>165</sup> In 1930, however, the management of a five year old missionary site in La Paz, Bolivia was

---

<sup>162</sup> See 'Chapter Analysis' section of Chapter Two.

<sup>163</sup> No author noted, *Foreign Mission Work of American Friends* (published by the American Friends Mission Board, 1912), 138.

<sup>164</sup> This almost twenty-year gap is partly explained in that, up until 1926, OYM was still organically attached to FYM and had joint missionary activities with the larger structure. Even so, there does not appear to have been a clear-cut adopted site that captured the YM's convictions in the same way as past efforts in Alaska did, or future efforts in Bolivia would. Rather, we find a myriad of interests and sporadic funding efforts. See *OYM Report of Board of Foreign Missions*, as found in the YM minutes for the respective years.

<sup>165</sup> See *OYM Report of Board of Foreign Missions*, as found in the YM minutes for the respective years.



offered to Oregon Yearly Meeting.<sup>166</sup> The work had been started by the Friends Mission in Chiquimula, Guatemala, but had outgrown their limited resources.<sup>167</sup> By 1930, the work already consisted of a Monthly Meeting of about seventy Indians of the Aymara race (and a few of the Cholo Class), a small Bible training school, a night school, a Bible depository and a small medical department.<sup>168</sup> OYM agreed to take over the management of the mission as it was 'sound in doctrine,' and 'evangelistic in spirit'.<sup>169</sup> During the following day's YM session, the YM instituted a guideline that all missionaries from OYM, 'meet the same requirements in doctrine and Christian experience as now apply in the recording of ministers and in the calling of pastors.'<sup>170</sup> By 1931, they had sent Carroll and Doris Tamplin as their new missionaries to La Paz.<sup>171</sup> In 1932, Helen Cammack, previously dean of women at North Pacific Evangelistic Institute,<sup>172</sup> was also sent as an official OYM missionary to Bolivia.<sup>173</sup> While the motives of OYM clearly show a desire to help, and the YM responded sacrificially to the financial needs of the new mission field whenever asked, the early years of the mission work appear almost entirely focused on evangelism and a salvation-first doctrine. The first *Annual Report of the Work of the*

---

<sup>166</sup> *OYM Minutes-1930*, m. 69, p. 29.

<sup>167</sup> Clair E. Lund, *A History of Missions in Bolivia of the Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends* (Unpublished MA thesis, Western Evangelical Seminary, 1954), 24. Currently held at GFUASC.

<sup>168</sup> *OYM Minutes-1930*, m. 69, p. 29.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>171</sup> Approved by the YM in 1930, the Tamplins arrived onsite in Bolivia on February 27, 1931. The Tamplins had both already served four years in Central America under the auspices of California Yearly Meeting. See *OYM Minutes-1930*, m. 78, p. 31. See also, Lund, *A History of Missions in Bolivia*, 28.

<sup>172</sup> Lund, *A History of Missions in Bolivia*, 33.

<sup>173</sup> *OYM Minutes-1932*, m. 65, p. 24.

*Board of Foreign Missions of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends in Bolivia* reported, ‘Bible reading and family worship, as well as regular attendance upon the regular services of the church and evangelistic efforts in the surrounding communities, being above average.’<sup>174</sup> Carroll Tamplin also wrote that, ‘evangelism is the heart and soul of the Aymara Church’ and that ‘this little mission... is already one of the greatest evangelizing forces at work in Bolivia.’<sup>175</sup> That first year, the ministry in Bolivia was entirely focused on preaching the gospel and altar calls.<sup>176</sup> During the second year, the YM set aside special funds to create an ‘Evangelistic Fund to provide for the expense of journeys out onto the altiplano to take the Gospel to otherwise unreached Indians’.<sup>177</sup> In 1935, the missionaries started house-to-house visitation giving out tracts and spreading the Gospel.<sup>178</sup> In 1936, 10,000 more tracts were given out.<sup>179</sup> By 1937, the YM purchased land in La Paz large enough to construct a new three hundred seat chapel, with some of the workers taking time off from construction to work on evangelism in their local community.<sup>180</sup>

None of this is to say that OYM’s missionaries only did evangelistic work. In addition to educating youth through the grade school, Helen Cammack offered services in the small medical clinic. Nevertheless, it is hard to classify the primary goal of the

---

<sup>174</sup> *OYM Minutes-1931*, m. 65, p. 23.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>176</sup> *OYM Minutes-1931*, m. 65, p. 21-27.

<sup>177</sup> Lund, *A History of Missions in Bolivia*, 31-32. See, also, *OYM Minutes -1931*, m. 65, p. 26.

<sup>178</sup> Lund, *A History of Missions in Bolivia*, 40-41.

<sup>179</sup> Lund, *A History of Missions in Bolivia*, 41.

<sup>180</sup> Lund, *A History of Missions in Bolivia*, 42-44.

Bolivian missionaries in the 1930s as anything other than soul-harvesting, since all the other ‘humanitarian’ services offered were entirely conditional upon ‘salvation first’.

Although the Aymara Indians in Bolivia were largely illiterate, the mission schools were set up primarily for ‘the children of believers’,<sup>181</sup> with the goal that these children would later be trained to become Christian workers themselves, or, ‘the fountain of native workers from which the thirsty fields may drink in the near future.’<sup>182</sup> Likewise, the medical clinic also appears to have been set up ‘to care for the needs of the believers’.<sup>183</sup>

The failure to address the social structures and government regulations within the Bolivian culture, which created institutional barriers towards helping the indigenous people move beyond oppression, became a major failure of the early missionary work of OYM. Prior to the 1952 revolution, the indigenous Aymara Indian population in Bolivia had no rights to vote or own land and instead lived in slave-like conditions to the Spanish conquerors and were subject to the government and landowners. The situation cried out for the application of the historic social justice testimonies of the Religious Society of

---

<sup>181</sup> This author could find no direct evidence of this being formed as an exclusive policy decision, but the annual reports of the Bolivian mission make repeated references to the schools being for the benefit of the ‘children of believers’. See, in particular, *OYM Minutes-1931*, m. 65, p. 25; *OYM Minutes-1934*, m. 74, p. 29; *OYM Minutes-1936*, m. 61, p. 29. Also, Lund verifies this practice, saying, ‘The primary purpose of this school is to enable the children of believers to be taught to read and write, and later trained to become Christian workers themselves.’ Lund, *A History of Missions in Bolivia*, 35. Two other quotes directly from the missionary reports also verify this claim. The first is in reference to the work of the medical clinic: ‘We have been limited, as to resources, but even so have been able to contribute considerably to the health and comfort of our believers.’ And the second, with respect to the schools, ‘While we do not consider the grade schools of the first importance, still in the midst of such ignorance, our organization would be woefully incomplete without this department. Definite instruction in the way of salvation is given daily to all the students of the grade schools. It is our desire and purpose that these schools contribute stalwart, intelligent, spirit-filled workers to this great field in the course of time.’ For both quotes see Carroll G. Tamplin, ‘Second Annual Report of the Field Superintendent of the Board of Foreign Missions of Oregon Yearly Meeting’, reprinted in *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 11 no. 10 (October 1932): 3.

<sup>182</sup> *OYM Minutes-1934*, m. 74, p. 29.

<sup>183</sup> *OYM Minutes-1936*, m. 61, p. 30.

Friends and lent itself well to structural interventions. Instead, Carroll Tamplin made light of their missionary efforts in the field of education as a false and empty promise, if they did not first receive salvation:

According to the educator of the country, there has never been such a need or such a demand for the education of the Aymara as at the present. Every newspaper finds among its columns a call for contributions and professors for the education of the Aymara. Everywhere the missionary goes he is beset with the demands from the Indians for education... The Aymaras, feeling the weight and injustice of their present condition, look to education to lift them up to the pedestal of social and racial equality with their oppressors. Their soul cries out for something to fill the great emptiness in their lives. Misguided, they look to mental enlightenment to heal their moral and spiritual wounds. You and I know what they need! That soul-cry is a cry for God.<sup>184</sup>

A similar line was added by Helen Cammack a few years later:

The problem of lifting the Indian from his apathy and poverty is not only a question of giving him education; it is fundamentally a question of how to light the spirit that is within him... Education which develops the physical and mental life are needed, but these must wait until the deep spiritual transformation which lights the spirit, has taken place.<sup>185</sup>

To the extent that the local people were educated, it seems to have been done almost entirely with the goal of training local ministers to replicate the evangelism efforts in their own community. Carroll Tamplin proudly reported a quote from one locally trained minister who said, 'It is now time that the Friends, with their doctrine of salvation, should go throughout the "Altiplano", down into the Yungas and throughout this republic.'<sup>186</sup> While too much of the burden for an entirely difficult systemic problem can be placed unfairly on the shoulders of individual missionaries caught in between their

---

<sup>184</sup> 'The Soul Cry of the Aymara', *The Soul Cry of the Aymara*, vol. I, p. 2 (September, 1937): 2.

<sup>185</sup> Helen Cammack, 'Light for the Soul', *The Soul Cry of the Aymara*, vol. IV no. 4 (December 1939): 3-4.

<sup>186</sup> *OYM Minutes-1933*, m. 61, p. 29.

perception of unregenerate sinners and the structural sins of governments, these first missionaries from OYM seemed to almost disregard the need for work which addressed the latter. The big financial request in the first year of the mission work was for funds needed to purchase mission-owned land because the current mission was ‘cramped and unsanitary’.<sup>187</sup> The new purchase was not primarily to benefit the locals, but rather to ‘allow some privacy of family life’<sup>188</sup> for the missionaries and to help them ‘separate ourselves from the filth of our neighbors.’<sup>189</sup> During the brutal, almost four-year war between Bolivia and Paraguay (1932-35), partly caused by competing oil interests in the region, no work being done by the Quaker missionaries specifically to protest at, or resolve the matter of the war in line with their testimony against war and OYM’s official Discipline of the time, was documented.<sup>190</sup> Likewise, after the war, though many in the country were devastated by the conflict, we find no documented war-relief work being done by OYM missionaries outside of providing assistance for their own believers.

---

<sup>187</sup> *OYM Minutes-1931*, m. 65, p. 25.

<sup>188</sup> *OYM Minutes-1931*, m. 65, p. 25-26.

<sup>189</sup> *OYM Minutes-1931*, m. 65, p. 26.

<sup>190</sup> OYM had revised its Discipline in 1934 and the section on Peace was still largely unchanged from the original 1895 Discipline, stating, ‘We feel bound explicitly to avow our unshaken persuasion that all war is utterly incompatible with the plain percepts of our divine Lord and Law-giver, and the whole spirit of His Gospel, and that no plea of necessity or policy, however urgent or peculiar, can avail to release either individuals or nations from the paramount allegiance which they owe to Him who hath said, “Love your enemies.” (Matt. V. 44, Luke vi. 27) In enjoining this love, and the forgiveness of injuries, He who has brought us to Himself has not prescribed for man precepts which are incapable of being carried into practice, or of which the practice is to be postponed until all shall be persuaded to act upon them. We cannot doubt that they are incumbent now, and that we have in the prophetic Scriptures the distinct intimation of their direct application not only to individuals, but to nations also. (Isaiah ii. 4, Micah iv. 1) When nations conform their laws to this divine teaching, wars must necessarily cease. We would, in humility, but in faithfulness to our Lord, express our firm persuasion that all the exigencies of civil government and social order may be met under the banner of the Prince of Peace, in strict conformity with His commands.’ See *The Discipline of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church – 1934* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1934), 36. Hereafter, *Discipline of OYM* followed by respective year and page number.

Instead, we find in the annual missionary reports, a hope that, upon the close of war, the Lord would ‘thrust forth laborers into His harvest’<sup>191</sup> and ‘look upon the yet unevangelized [*sic*] sections.’<sup>192</sup> In 1936, the missionaries in Bolivia asked OYM to pray that they ‘may more fully understand the viewpoint and life of the people so they may know better how to present the Gospel to them.’<sup>193</sup> Although they were all well aware of the conditions in the country in which they worked, humanitarianism did not seem to motivate the missionary’s efforts:

We live in the midst of such overwhelming need. Dirt, sickness and poverty abound, but in the midst of it all we see the worse condition of the soul, the pride of carnality, the love of pleasure, the rule of passion, and the selfishness which hunts for personal gain... As ambassadors sent from the court of heaven to this people we gladly and eagerly proclaim, “I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.”<sup>194</sup>

A change in missionary emphasis in Bolivia started to emerge towards the end of the 1940s, correlating with the shift toward neo-evangelicalism, but, in the 1930s, the Bolivian mission provides insufficient evidence for any sort of humanitarian work outside of the emphasis on conversion based evangelism. In 1937, the mission started publishing its own organ (*The Soul Cry of the Aymara*), with Carroll Tamplin serving as editor. The inaugural issue made clear to what the Friends’ mission work there in Bolivia was dedicated:

1. Making Christ known where he has not been preached.

---

<sup>191</sup> *OYM Minutes-1937*, m. 64, p. 36.

<sup>192</sup> *OYM Minutes-1937*, m. 64, p. 37.

<sup>193</sup> *OYM Minutes-1936*, m. 61, p. 30.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*

2. Propagation of Scriptural Holiness on the sound principles of Biblical interpretation characteristic of orthodox Friends.
3. The organization of evangelistic centers in preference to the more popular educational methods.
4. The preparation of national workers and a strong native church.
5. The evangelization of the Aymara Indians of Bolivia.<sup>195</sup>

That the new mission was so well supported in the first place is commendable given the effects of the Great Depression on the American economy, but that first decade in Bolivia better reflects what Beebe does accurately classify as part of a ‘reemphasis of the historic concern for the spiritual welfare of mankind and for the primary role of the Holy Spirit.’<sup>196</sup> The two major social programmes operated by the YM (temperance and the Bolivian Mission), thus, provide little actual evidence of any attempts at social reform except with a prior emphasis on individual salvation.

In the end, however, the decrease in humanitarianism in OYM can be seen merely as a symptom. As the YM continued to try to ensure its social work was done in proper orthodox order and sequence and to avoid affiliation with the perceived liberalism of agencies such as FYM and AFSC, we find a corresponding decrease in social service as a casualty of this conflict. A similar trend was unfolding in OYM as that which Marsden and Carpenter both astutely pinpoint as happening in the larger American Protestant world.<sup>197</sup> Although there was nothing inherently threatening in Holiness Christians

---

<sup>195</sup> ‘Interesting Data’, *The Soul Cry of the Aymara*, vol. I no. 1 (September 1937): 8.

<sup>196</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 81.

<sup>197</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 86. See also, Joel Carpenter, ‘Introduction’, in *Fighting Fundamentalism: Polemic Thrusts of the 1930s and 1940s*, ed. Joel A. Carpenter (NY: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1988), not paginated.

performing morality based service work as a consequence of their sanctification, the larger fundamentalist/modernist controversy so overshadowed the conflict that defending issues of theology trumped practice. Thus, conservative evangelicals, such as those in OYM, perceived that the liberal theologies associated with social gospelism had so altered the ethos of holiness that engaging in similar practices to those espoused by social gospel leaders was tantamount to endorsement of their beliefs. In the end, a hyper-focus on conversion and evangelism became a safe refuge instead.

### **No Peace among Friends**

In the two years following the decision of Oregon Yearly Meeting to separate from American Friends Service Committee, the worldwide context changed quickly. Increasingly, many became aware of the high possibility of international conflict. The Second Sino-Japanese War was ongoing. In 1939, Germany invaded Poland, marking what many historians consider to be the beginning of World War II. Even though the official entry of the United States into the war was still another two years away, young Quaker males asked how they might respond if they were conscripted. In 1939, the government officially recognised AFSC as the only organisation in which COs could find relief work.<sup>198</sup> Pickett himself had the ear of the U.S. President.

Increasingly, Quakers in the Northwest recognised the difficulty they might have in finding alternative service having severed ties to the one Friends' organisation with such a mechanism. In September 1939, the Newberg Monthly Meeting put forth a request to Superintendent Chester Hadley asking for a called meeting of the Permanent Board to

---

<sup>198</sup> Pickett, *For More than Bread*, Section 4, Chapter 1.



deal with the growing concern.<sup>199</sup> In response, letters were sent to every member of the Permanent Board with a petition to be signed, if they desired the Clerk to call such a meeting. Only five returned petitions were required to trigger the called meeting, but 25 (over half) came back signed.<sup>200</sup> In addition to the Permanent Board, the invitation said, ‘every interested Friend is invited to attend.’<sup>201</sup>

On October 5, 1939, just one month after German soldiers invaded Poland, the Permanent Board (and concerned Friends) met for a called meeting.<sup>202</sup> S. Lewis Hansen, Clerk of the Permanent Board, started the session with prayer and a time of silence. Hadley, serving in his tenth year as General Superintendent for the Yearly Meeting, was the first primary speaker and outlined the general situation as he saw it. Hadley also introduced a compromise proposal at that point that took a nuanced position on the OYM’s relationship to AFSC. The Recorder writes of Hadley’s idea:

[OYM] should make some move to relieve the tension of meetings or individuals that desire to contact the American Friends Service Committee, [but] he did not believe it wise to bring up the matter of joining the Service Committee by the yearly meeting.<sup>203</sup>

Pennington followed Hadley’s comments, giving his description of how this particular called meeting came about in the first place. Pennington spoke of the efforts of

---

<sup>199</sup> Chester Hadley, ‘Permanent Board Called To Meet’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 18 no 9 (October 1939): 3.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>202</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939. GFUA. Section FB-3 file labeled ‘Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board’. A ‘called meeting’ is an unscheduled meeting of a committee usually to discuss a specific issue that is either more urgent or needs more allotted time than would normally be allowed by waiting until the committee’s regularly scheduled meetings.

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*

the Newberg Friends to push for a day of prayer, while at the same time the Peace Committee was strategising about a day of conferences to work through the present crisis. Pennington explained how, in connection with the work of the larger Yearly Meeting, consensus eventually developed around the idea of asking the Yearly Meeting for a called meeting of the Permanent Board specifically to re-address the matter of OYM's relationship to AFSC.<sup>204</sup>

Once these two stalwarts had spoken, many Friends (Myrtle Russell, Joseph Reece, Loyde Osburn, Ward Silver, Gervas Carey, Frank Michener, Clark Fields, Olive Elliot and 'others') participated in the general discussion. It became clear to the Recorder that a general consensus was building towards some renewed form of official connection to AFSC. The Recorder wrote, 'The proposal that the Permanent Board take action which would renew Oregon Yearly Meeting's connection with the American Friends Service Committee until next yearly meeting was by this time definitely before the conference.' The Recorder added, 'Numerous remarks were made favorable to that action.'<sup>205</sup>

Surprisingly silent to this point, or at least not recorded in the minutes thus far, were Ward Haines and Clark Smith, both present at the meeting and both named as members of the Oregon Service Committee who, back in 1938, had recommended the discontinuation of the relationship with AFSC. Each man had his own personal history intertwined with AFSC. Haines was a conscientious objector during WWI and later went to serve with AFSC in the reconstruction effort.<sup>206</sup> Despite this, by the late 1930s, Haines

---

<sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>206</sup> Jones, *A Service of Love*, Appendix A.

felt like AFSC had become exclusively focused on the social aspect of its work to the detriment of the evangelical emphasis.<sup>207</sup> Haines was the first of the two men to rise and speak at the called meeting. He explained the way the initial decision of the Service Committee came about in 1938, acknowledged that only three of the four members were in favour of that decision, and claimed to not have any ‘grievance on the war relief work of saving instead of destroying life.’<sup>208</sup> Clerk Hanson asked Haines to better clarify what he thought the Permanent Board ought to do in the present situation.<sup>209</sup> Haines said he thought the group could gather his wishes from what he said and then simply added, ‘I have always been in favor of their [AFSC] war relief work. I still am.’<sup>210</sup> Haines ended his short speech by suggesting Smith speak on the subject.

A. Clark Smith was also a conscientious objector during WWI. He was part of the first group of AFSC reconstruction workers (a member of the original 100 in the ‘Haverford Unit’) that went to France for AFSC.<sup>211</sup> After his return he became a pastor in several Friends Churches throughout Oregon Yearly Meeting, often called to bring revival to small, rural churches that were ready to fold.<sup>212</sup> When Smith finally rose to

---

<sup>207</sup> The extent to which this ideological shift was initiated from direct personal experience, or from reports by others, is unknown. It had been twenty years since Ward served with AFSC.

<sup>208</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939.

<sup>209</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>211</sup> No author noted, ‘Revised List of the Unit’, *L’Équipe (The Unit) American Friends Reconstruction Unit No. 1* (August 14 1917). GFUA. Section FA-4, file labeled ‘Conscientious Objectors World War I – Friends Reconstruction Service’.

<sup>212</sup> Handwritten obituary for A. Clark Smith. GFUA. Section FR-3, file labeled ‘People - Clark Smith.’

speech he showed none of the moderate ambivalence of Haines. His first recorded line is, 'I am not willing to give the American Friends Service Committee as good a blanket as some seem to do.' He quickly added, 'The American Friends Service Committee is not a Christian organization.'<sup>213</sup> Smith went on to describe the struggles he had while serving for a year and a half as a volunteer for AFSC, including learning to smoke cigarettes, play cards and drink his first beer.<sup>214</sup> Whether or not these suspect activities were condoned under the auspices of AFSC, is unclear. Initially, most reconstruction workers were young men away from home for the first time. Despite the heavy regiment, there were extended periods of boredom and drudgery while in training, waiting for papers to come through, traveling in a foreign country and doing monotonous work.<sup>215</sup> Furthermore, British and Irish Friends, who entered the war relief work years earlier, had battle-hardened veteran relief workers already on site; and, according to Frost, some of them smoked, drank, swore and did not attend Sunday evening service.<sup>216</sup> Young, enthusiastic, idealist, conservative American boys, like Smith, were probably horrified.

For most of the rest of Smith's speech he further detailed how AFSC did not have 'one thing from a spiritual standpoint which we can use' and how 'spiritually, the American Friends Service Committee is rotten.'<sup>217</sup>

---

<sup>213</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>215</sup> Frost, 'Our Deeds', 14-23.

<sup>216</sup> Frost, 'Our Deeds', 20.

<sup>217</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939.

Smith's contribution sparked a slew of questions and comments from the other attendees in defence of AFSC and/or, at least, in defence of the value AFSC now held for the young men in light of the pending war. Even Haines commented, 'That Clark Smith's comments were true, but no organization was perfect... the American Friends Service Committee has value; that it will not cause faith in Christ, but will help in other ways.'<sup>218</sup> After another round of questions and speeches from various attendees, Smith spoke again, this time acknowledging the difficult choice faced by many to either work with AFSC, or to leave their young pacific men with few options. This time round Smith softened his stance, claiming that AFSC would 'be of spiritual help to our young people if it helped them to avoid legalized murder.'<sup>219</sup> At the end of his speech, Smith supported Hadley's proposition allowing individual people and Monthly Meetings to work directly with AFSC, but he, too, felt strongly that no connection should be made at the Yearly Meeting level.

Whether or not Hadley's compromise proposal was viewed as true consensus or a necessary way to get through the impasse, is unclear. Other than Smith, no one else is recorded in the minutes of the meeting as being against rejoining AFSC. Pennington would later report, in a personal letter to a friend, that only four people present at the meeting were not in favour of renewed connection, but rather that, 'there were many speeches in favor or renewing our connection with the American Friends Service Committee.'<sup>220</sup> While many expressed their concerns about the apparent lack of Christo-

---

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid.*

centricity in AFSC, of those recorded, most expressed willingness to work through that and find common ground in the areas of peace initiatives and providing viable solutions for COs.<sup>221</sup>

Yet the group still changed course and now developed unity around Hadley's suggestion. Grace Conover, wife of a reconstruction worker herself, brought a rationale to Hadley's compromise, saying it was, 'best for Oregon Yearly Meeting, because it seemed the more Friend-ly way in view of the fact that there is disagreement among us.'<sup>222</sup> She was concerned not just about maintaining some semblance of unity within the current meeting, but also about the potential backlash from the larger Yearly Meeting should a more permanent decision be made. Conover went on to suggest everyone think more about it until the next Yearly Meeting sessions.<sup>223</sup>

Pennington expressed his reservations and concerns about the compromise plan, claiming the ones who would pay the price for this decision were not those present at the meeting, but the young men in the yearly meeting who would find themselves in a bind when war came.<sup>224</sup> Even Hadley voiced reservations about his own compromise solution,

---

<sup>220</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter addressed to J. W. Harvey Theobald, dated October 6, 1939. GFUA Levi Pennington Collection, box 4 labeled 'Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Other Addenda 1930's, 40's, 50's'.

<sup>221</sup> Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting, October 5, 1939.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>223</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939. See also, Levi Pennington, personal letter addressed to J. W. Harvey Theobald, dated October 6, 1939.

<sup>224</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939.

Although it is not recorded in the minutes, Pennington latter claimed he countered Hadley's compromise with a recommendation that they (OYM) rejoin AFSC (at least until the next Yearly Meeting sessions) and that they name a representative from the Yearly Meeting to work with AFSC. Whether

suggesting, ‘it would be far more difficult for Friends outside of the American Friends Service Committee to deal with the government authorities than if we were all united in the organization.’<sup>225</sup> He also acknowledged that, in many ways, the problem was of their own making, ‘We [OYM] are out of this central organization by our own action. If that means suffering, we ought to suffer, because we have brought it on ourselves.’<sup>226</sup> Despite his reservations, he did not push for any other alternative solution, perhaps sensing his solution was the only way forward at the time.

After the committee had debated the topic at hand, everyone was asked to leave the room except the actual members of the Permanent Board. The Board then proceeded to act on the last, and most contentious, issue of the called meeting – what to do about the Yearly Meetings relationship to AFSC. It was not stated in the minutes what, if any, dialogue occurred behind those closed doors, but they emerged from the meeting having acted favourably upon Hadley’s proposal (to revisit the question at the 1940 YM).<sup>227</sup>

That there was growing opposition to the separatist tendencies within the YM in the first place shows that the evangelical, non-separatist forces within the YM were starting to show some ability to reshape the actions of the YM. That group lost this round of the conflict, but as the 1940s continued, this group became the catalyst for a new evangelical (neo-evangelical) identity.

---

Pennington actually made this recommendation before or after Smith’s speech, or did so at all, is not documented in the meeting minutes, which are extant and detailed. See Levi Pennington, personal letter addressed to Clarence E. Pickett, dated October 24, 1939. GFUA Levi Pennington Collection, box 4 labeled ‘Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950’, file labeled ‘Other Addenda 1930’s, 40’s, 50’s’.

<sup>225</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939.

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*

Two days later the actions of the committee were reported in an *Oregonian*<sup>228</sup> article entitled ‘Friends Vote Peace Pledge’.<sup>229</sup> The article detailed how the group had renewed its opposition to bearing arms, pledged loyalty to the U.S. and further supported the arms embargo. The article went on to state that, ‘sentiment among the conferees was strong to rejoin the aid committee, from which the Oregon meeting withdrew in 1938, but it was decided to give all congregation and members freedom to act individually in re-establishing connections.’<sup>230</sup> The *Friendly Endeavor* ran a similarly upbeat article basically restating the above.<sup>231</sup> The article ended, ‘The meeting was pervaded with a spirit of helpful Christian fellowship and adjourned conscious that the Master of assemblies was in the midst, giving aid to the reaching of conclusions.’<sup>232</sup>

While the action of the Permanent Board received good press, it by no means resolved the issue. Within weeks of the called meeting, Pennington wrote a personal correspondence to Hadley expressing dissatisfaction not just with the final outcome, but with Hadley’s behaviour. ‘I probably do not need to tell you that I was surprised at the proposition which you made, and which was finally adopted by the Permanent Board’, Pennington wrote, ‘I understood that your first suggestion to me was that we consider reentering the American Friends Service Committee, at least until the yearly meeting

---

<sup>228</sup> Oregon State’s largest newspaper at the time.

<sup>229</sup> ‘Friends Vote Peace Pledge; Anti-war Stand Renewed at Meet’, *Oregonian* (October 7, 1939), 3.

<sup>230</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>231</sup> S. Lewis Hanson and Rebecca Smith, ‘Peace Position of Friends Reaffirmed’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 18 no 10 (November 1939): 2.

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*



session next June.’<sup>233</sup> Pennington, never one to hide his emotions even when wisdom suggested otherwise,<sup>234</sup> was quite direct and personal in the letter. He strongly suggested Hadley told him one thing about what his intentions were prior to the called meeting, but then did something different when the meeting took place.

Before the called meeting, Pennington was under the impression Hadley had agreed to meet with individuals around the Yearly Meeting, particularly those in favour of the 1938 decision, and do some discernment in order to open the way for a full Yearly Meeting reconnection with AFSC.<sup>235</sup> Pennington felt strongly that Hadley had told him that this work had been done and that a way forward would be open at the called meeting. Pennington felt misled by Hadley. He concluded his letter with, ‘The action which you originally suggested to me, or at least which I understood you were suggesting, would have been better than the action which you proposed and which was taken.’<sup>236</sup>

Aside from the personal rebuffs in his correspondences, Pennington predicted a potential problem with this new course of action with regard to AFSC. Having given permission for individuals and/or Monthly Meetings to collaborate and work with AFSC, Pennington feared the action created a double standard; the Yearly Meeting both asserted the unchristian nature of AFSC, while at the same time allowed its members to participate with it. Pennington saw this as an act of disunity:

---

<sup>233</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter to Chester A. Hadley dated October 25, 1939. GFUA Levi Pennington Collection, box 4 labeled ‘Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950’, file labeled ‘Other Addenda 1930’s 1940’s’.

<sup>234</sup> McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker*, 54 & 88.

<sup>235</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter addressed to Clarence E. Pickett, dated October 25, 1939. GFUA Levi Pennington Collection, box 4 labeled ‘Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950’, file labeled ‘Other Addenda 1930’s, 40’s, 50’s’.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*

The action that was taken, as I understand it, makes of our yearly meeting a disunited body, so far as our relation to the American Friends Service Committee is concerned, and opens the way for what may be more serious disunity than appears likely on the surface.<sup>237</sup>

Pennington also laid a fair amount of the blame for the whole ordeal on the shoulders of Clark Smith:

I was especially sorry to see this action taken when it cannot but appear that it was influenced by the speech of Clark Smith. As you know, the action in withdrawal in 1938 was started by Clark Smith's attack on Kirby Page.<sup>238</sup> He declared publicly that Kirby Page is a communist, that he admitted this in Boise, Idaho, where he was "hooted out of town", and that he is supported by funds from Moscow. Every one of these three statements was false, and yet they influenced Oregon Yearly Meeting, to some extent at least, into taking the action which it took.<sup>239</sup>

Pennington, a prolific letter writer, repeated many of the above statements about Smith and Hadley in other correspondences that month with some parts duplicated from one letter to the next.<sup>240</sup>

---

<sup>237</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>238</sup> Kirby Page was a Disciples of Christ minister who had developed a career as a 'social evangelist', speaking and writing on the topic of pacifism within a social gospel framework. Appelbaum says Page's theology was typical of 'liberal Protestant pacifism', combining an elevated social ethic, a high view of humanity and a respect for the historic life of Jesus. In the particular instance mentioned above, Page was speaking on behalf of the American Friends Service Committee in 1937. See Patricia Appelbaum, *Kingdom to Commune, Protestant Pacifist Culture between World War I and the Vietnam Era* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 51-55.

<sup>239</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter to Chester A. Hadley, dated October 25, 1939.

<sup>240</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter addressed to J. W. Harvey Theobald, dated October 6, 1939, and Levi Pennington, personal letter addressed to Clarence E. Pickett, dated October 24, 1939.

It was as if the whole ordeal occupied his mind and played out in many writings. He wrote a front page article in the November issue of the *Friendly Endeavor* about the threat of war and how Quakers should respond. He also wrote to the President of the United States (one of the many times over his lifetime), encouraging him to 'take the lead in a move of the neutral power which shall bring about the end of the war now raging in Europe.' See Levi T. Pennington, 'The Present Crisis – What Shall We Do?' *Friendly Endeavor* 18, no 10 (November 1939), 1, 3, 4. See also, Levi Pennington, personal letter addressed to 'The President', dated October 18, 1939. George Fox University Archives Levi Pennington Collection, box 4 labeled 'Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Other Addenda 1930's, 40's, 50's'. Newberg, Oregon.

In addition to Pennington's actions, the Peace Committee of Portland Quarterly Meeting passed a resolution, in June 1940, which was forwarded to the Yearly Meeting for consideration, about developing a form of limited cooperation with the American Friends Service Committee. The resolution stated, 'The Peace Committee feeling it extremely important that definite action be taken without further delay to help our youth in the event of war'.<sup>241</sup> Their proposal included two clear recommendations:

First – That we work with the American Friends Service Committee in recording names and pertinent personal data of all our youth that would like to accept alternative work in the event of war.

Second – That we urge our youth to use care in the finding of work now that would cause the draft board to question their sincerity as a conscientious objector in the event of war.<sup>242</sup>

The original copy of this document had a third proposal that read: 'In order to expedite this program we recommend that a definite relationship to the American Friends Service Committee be resumed.' Pennington, although he was not part of Portland Quarterly Meeting, was in attendance, and claims this was his suggestion and that the last proposal was only left off at the end by a narrow vote.<sup>243</sup>

This growing internal tension within the YM correlates with national fundamentalist/neo-evangelical trends within many other Protestant denominations by 1940. As indicated in Chapter One, the extreme militancy of fundamentalism was falling from favour within evangelical circles in America and fundamentalists and neo-

---

<sup>241</sup> *Portland Quarterly Meeting Peace Committee Minute*. George Fox University Archives, section FA-4, file labeled 'Peace Correspondence'. George Fox University Archives, Newberg, Oregon. See also, *OYM Minutes-1940*, m. 8, p. 4.

<sup>242</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid.*

evangelicals were showing greater internal strains after the 1930s. The Oregon Yearly Meeting sessions of 1940 were shaping up to be a time of debate, with a possible power shift unfolding in the YM. With both sides deeply entrenched, the well-liked Superintendent Hadley seemed like the unknown element in the decision making process. Hadley clearly had a fine line to walk. He had opposed the original withdrawal from FYM back in 1926,<sup>244</sup> but he understood well the various factions within his YM and usually sought for unity above all. He also embraced much of the work of AFSC. He was a CO himself, and just in the last year, had organised a visit for Pickett to come and talk to as many Friends in Oregon as possible. Although the planning seems to have been done deliberately in order not to upset people who might otherwise be upset by an AFSC visit (i.e. moving Pickett to Thursday instead of Sunday), he seemed to be encouraging their message and creating space for dialogue to occur. Hadley had also been the one to recommend a compromise solution to the AFSC crisis – one that allowed for individual collaborations with the organisation *sans* any broader YM connection.

Just eight days before the Yearly Meeting commenced, though, Hadley suddenly died of heart failure while walking out of the door to his car. He was 52 at the time.<sup>245</sup> His unexpected and sudden death overshadowed the week. Whatever energy was being stored up for the AFSC battle was gone as OYM Quakers mourned Hadley's demise. Pennington wrote:

Yearly Meeting will be pretty gloomy because of the passing of Chester Hadley, for ten years general superintendent, and probably the most

---

<sup>244</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 141.

<sup>245</sup> Chester Hadley Memorial written by Melvin W. Kenworthy. GFUA. Section FR-1, file labeled 'People – Chester A. Hadley'.

important single character in maintaining whatever measure of unity the yearly meeting enjoys.<sup>246</sup>

Near the end of the sessions, Hadley's compromise AFSC proposal was again presented and was again approved.<sup>247</sup> Whether or not those present felt more allegiance to the plan now as a tribute to the man who suggested it, had simply lost the will to fight, or actually perceived some form of consensus toward the idea, is uncertain. The fact that Hadley himself did not entirely agree with his own compromise solution was lost on the outcome.

After this official minute, the Yearly Meeting records show that a suggestion was made that they should at least dialogue about reconsidering the YM's relationship to AFSC given the growing international crisis.<sup>248</sup> In one of the thousands of private letters Pennington wrote to his daughter Mary over the years, he claims that the recommendation had little chance to start with:

There was much desire on the part of the opponents of The American Friends Service Committee that the matter of Oregon Yearly Meeting's relationship to the American Friends Service Committee should not be considered. But it will come up in the report of the Permanent Board – though Edward Mott wants to keep it out. The clerk of a yearly meeting trying to keep out a report of the Yearly Meeting's Permanent Board – can you beat it?<sup>249</sup>

By this point, Pennington and Mott's power struggles were increasingly personal and steadfastly polarised, even though they both shared the same evangelical theology and

---

<sup>246</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter to Mary (daughter) dated June 6, 1940. GFUA Levi Pennington Collection, Box 4 labeled 'Date Range: 1920-1950', file 'Jan.-June 1940'.

<sup>247</sup> *OYM Minutes-1940*, m. 56, p. 18.

<sup>248</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>249</sup> Levi Pennington personal letter to Mary (daughter) dated June 13, 1940. GFUA Levi Pennington Collection, Box 4 labeled 'Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Jan.-June 1940'.

their ‘views were more closely aligned than acknowledged’.<sup>250</sup> The primary difference was not on issues of orthodoxy, but rather in their view of the world. Pennington, who constantly argued for unity within the Gurneyite expression of the Society of Friends, ‘believed that renewal could best come through making the world a better place: free from injustices, war, poverty, drunkenness, hatred and tyranny.’<sup>251</sup> Mott viewed any relationship to perceived modernists as devitalising to the fundamental Quaker message and sought for renewal primarily through evangelism.<sup>252</sup>

Although the recommendation did come up, the action even to talk about their relationship to AFSC was not approved, again by ‘vote of the meeting’, and no further discussion of an ongoing or limited official collaboration between OYM and AFSC was to be considered for the time being.<sup>253</sup> For this round of debates, any sort of YM corporate shift towards ending its separatist tendencies was not to occur, although the start of that shift was only a year away and is discussed in Chapter Four. That there was significant debate in getting to the final decision shows, however, that the underlying currents were already moving in that direction.

## **Chapter Analysis**

The central claim of this chapter was that, in the 1930s, particularly as a culture of fundamentalism solidified in the conscience of the YM, a general decrease in humanitarianism and social action followed. This change did not occur so much because

---

<sup>250</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 265.

<sup>251</sup> Ankeny, *Levi T. Pennington*, 260-261.

<sup>252</sup> Mott, *The Friends Church*, 36-37, 113, 142-144.

<sup>253</sup> *OYM Minutes-1940*, m. 56, p. 18.

of a growing intolerance towards social service in itself, but, rather, was due to the increasing polarisation between fundamentalists and theologically liberal modernists. Whereas fundamentalists viewed all social work as an exclusive *ipso facto* consequence of the full salvation and second blessing of Christ – a belief unchanged within OYM from its inception in 1893 onward – liberals allowed for more varied motives for their social crusades. Since social gospelism was increasingly populated by modernist and liberal theologians, conservative evangelicals abandoned political and social causes *en masse* in the 1930s rather than risk contamination by association. This pattern was clearly displayed in the case study herein, particularly with regard to the YM's affiliation to FYM and AFSC.

Certainly some individuals and sub-groupings within the YM put a high value on world engagement and humanitarian work as essential to their orthodoxy, but due to the rejection of the humanitarian work of the Service Committee, in conjunction with its failure to form similar missionary expressions, OYM can be classified as being dominated by a fundamentalist culture in the 1930s. If the YM had found another outlet or alternative means of social outreach outside of AFSC, the separation with AFSC would only constitute weak evidence for fundamentalism in the YM. However, after reviewing the YM's other expressions of social outreach (mainly its mission in Bolivia and its temperance programme), it becomes apparent that no other method or organisation is used to honour the social obligate portion of holiness, other than evangelism. Paradoxically then, in their attempts to avoid anything that resembled liberalism, the YM overemphasised evangelism as its primary humanitarian thrust and consistently failed to offer a cup of cold water to those in need. Therefore, the cumulative

conclusion, after examining the YM's entire outreach programmes in the 1930s, is that there is evidence of a slow decline in community and socially-orientated expressions. That this change occurred in conjunction with the spirit of fundamentalist separatism, discussed in Chapter Two, is no great revelation.

It is important to clarify, however, that there was a parallel change during this era within the broader Religious Society among more liberal factions that exacerbated the conflicts. Although early pre-1900 Gurneyite leaders were still largely interested in humanitarian work as a consequence of their regeneration and sanctification in Christ,<sup>254</sup> later generations moved away from this position attempting to alter the ethos of Quaker holiness from where the Gurneyite wing had settled at the turn of the century.<sup>255</sup> Neither Rufus Jones' liberal modernism<sup>256</sup> nor Henry Cadbury's secularisation of ethics would fit within the evangelical rubric, as defined by Bebbington's quadrilateral, and, in turn, fundamentalists in OYM rejected both as apostate.

Using the data from this chapter and from Chapter Two, Table 3.1 (page 244) shows a broad comparative analysis of the five categories offered in Chapter One for the

---

<sup>254</sup> See statement adopted on Social Christianity by the Conference of Friends in America in 1897: "We hold that the Gospel of Christ is the remedy for the ills of mankind and that it is wide-spread in its application and far-reaching in its results. It is facilitated in reaching men by the removal of the multitudinous barriers that surround them. Human society in all its interests needs its transforming power and Christians should be unremitting in every effort that will aid its work. We therefore feel a deep interest in true Christian Sociology, and we distrust all the movements in this new science that are divorced from faith in Christ." *Conference of Friends – 1897*, 38.

<sup>255</sup> See Richmond Declaration of Faith, adopted at the 1887 Conference of All-Friends. *Proceedings of the Conference of Friends of America – 1897* (Indianapolis, IN: Published by Direction of the Conference, 1898), 24-43.

<sup>256</sup> Although Jones was far more mystical in his religion than Cadbury, they both shared a similar high anthropology, and they both rejected the supernatural tenets of the evangelical Quakerism of their day. Guy Aiken argues that Jones, 'did in fact take the necessity and ontological uniqueness of Christ out of his mystical vision of Quakerism, and he replaced Christ with a divine-human Inner Light.' See Guy Aiken, 'Who Took the Christ out of Quakerism? Rufus Jones and the Person and Work of Christ', *Quaker Religious Thought*, no. 116-117 (December 2011): 48.



**Table 3.1, Comparing OYM 1893-1919 to OYM 1919-1940**

	<b>OYM 1893-1919</b>	<b>OYM 1919-1940</b>
<b>Mission Work</b>	<p>Stressed the importance of improving the quality of life for those inhabitants served in the mission field.</p> <p>Demonstrated a shared moral responsibility between the missionary and the communities being served.</p>	<p>Primarily centred on fulfilment of the Great Commission. Conversion based evangelism main strategy adopted.</p> <p>Most social services offered were generally limited to a 'salvation-first' policy.</p>
<b>Temperance Goals</b>	<p>Focused on the betterment of humanity and a vision of Christian civilisation through creating good social order. Use of alcohol seen as indicative of social/individual sickness.</p>	<p>Legislated morality campaigns centred on enacting or maintaining Prohibition type laws. Use of alcohol, and other drugs, seen as sinful and evil.</p>
<b>Peace Initiatives</b>	<p>Widespread peace initiatives focused on promulgating the Quaker Peace Testimony.</p>	<p>Demonstrated enthusiastic support for the work of AFSC during the post-war humanitarian crises. In the years following, rejected the work of AFSC because it did not stress conversion. No major peace initiatives during these years, but did maintain a high value on pacifism.</p>
<b>Educational Purposes</b>	<p>Valued an educated membership in modern thinking and science. Believed modern education was a means to continue the ways of the Society through the best and brightest of the future.</p>	<p>Saw the primary goal of education as to train the mind in biblical staples and stressed evangelism as they key vocation in life.</p>
<b>Intra-Denominational Ecumenism</b>	<p>Worked with a variety of Friends in broad service goals. Joined FYM and supported AFSC.</p>	<p>Severed all ties with perceived liberal associations including FYM and AFSC and expressed concern regarding the Forward Movement.</p>

years 1893- 1919,<sup>257</sup> showing the change within each category during the two decades of fundamentalist hegemony.

## **Chapter Summary**

The 1930s saw further strengthening of the fundamentalist culture of isolationism, which started in the 1920s and there is also specific evidence showing a trend in the decline in humanitarianism. This claim is based on evidence showing a changing Christian ethic within OYM moving primarily towards evangelism. The evidence for the claims in this chapter centred, mainly, on the separation of Oregon Yearly Meeting from the AFSC. Along with this, the YM's other socially-orientated programmes, such as temperance and missions, become far more focused on conversion based evangelism and legislated morality during the 1930s. The Yearly Meeting can be seen in this chapter, then, to be continuing in the trend started in the 1920s; a trend that is embraced corporately, but not unilaterally. In the next chapter we will see both the final stand of fundamentalism, as it turned its eye inward towards eradicating modernist impulses at Pacific College, and then, by 1947, the rise and establishment of neo-evangelical forces influencing the YM more towards a world-engaging approach and a moderate renewal of social service.

---

<sup>257</sup> See section in Chapter One entitled 'History of Oregon Yearly Meeting'.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEO-EVANGELICAL QUAKERISM**

#### **Introduction**

In 1959, Everett Cattell (President of Malone College, formerly Cleveland Bible Institute) presented a conciliatory paper at a conference of evangelical Friends in Newberg, Oregon. In the paper, he highlighted two major shifts within the evangelical Friends mid-century ethos. The first shift was a hope that evangelicals would distinguish between liberals who simply differ with their evangelical brethren on matters of Scripture and those who deny Christ as Saviour, and, the second was that evangelicals take the time for wider consultation, calling upon all Friends (liberal and evangelical) to:

Be very tender with each other's consciences and consult together with hearts as open to truth as they are firm in truth and as open to each other as should be true of brethren in Christ. At the same time let each be prepared to grant full freedom to the other circle to work together in such organizations as each may see fit to establish for the implementation of their concerns.<sup>1</sup>

Though Cattell's speech was future oriented at the time, his words highlighted an important shift already underway among evangelical Friends in America; the nascent impulses of which we find starting within the Oregon Yearly Meeting in the 1940s.

With various competing interests, the decade of the 1940s saw something that both fundamentalists and emerging neo-evangelicals could claim as success within OYM. It is only in seeing the events in a larger overview of three decades that we can make the central claim of this chapter, which is, that, by 1947, staunch fundamentalism as a

---

<sup>1</sup> Everett L. Cattell, 'Passion for Unity: A Critical Survey of Contemporary Quakerdom'. Speech given at the 1959 gathering of the Association of Evangelical Friends in Newberg, Oregon. Reprinted in *Concern*, vol. I no. 3 (Fall 1959): 18.

corporate identity within OYM had run its course and was being replaced by a new, neo-evangelical worldview.

The evidence for this claim is based primarily on two attitudinal changes. First, the initiative demonstrated by Friends in Oregon to seek out ecumenical allegiance with other Friends, as they spearheaded the efforts to form a more inclusive alliance of evangelical Friends. Although evangelical Quakers across America continued to reject the ideology of theologically liberal modernist Quakerism, the various independent YMs came to define themselves less and less through their isolation and protest against that ideology, and more and more by their common identity and shared theological interests. As broader ecumenical collaboration unfolded across evangelical Quakerism, evangelical modernism became a more tolerated viewpoint and those with theological leanings in that direction were no longer considered apostate. Second, was the slow increase in humanitarian social action and world engagement within their evangelical expression. This change is represented by a renewal of mission work not primarily based on soul-harvesting and in an expansion of peace work that goes beyond a salvation first doctrine.

However, these steps in one direction did not happen without first some seemingly offsetting steps in the other direction. After having severed connections with both Five-Years Meeting (FYM) and American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), the Yearly Meeting turned its eye inward seeking to purge its own Pacific College of any residuum of modernism. Although fundamentalism was waning as a corporate identity, it still held sway in YM behaviour through most of the 1940s and was successful at ousting Levi Pennington's hand-picked successor.

This chapter begins with a further examination of Portland Bible Institute in the 1930s, and then shows how the same mentality of scourging modernism, which produced the original impetus to form the PBI, was then transferred toward Pacific College in the 1940s. This is followed by an update on the various social and humanitarian programmes engaged in during the 1940's: notably the peace initiatives, temperance programme and mission work. Discrete sections are then given to discussing the formation of the Association of Evangelical Friends, the ongoing debate with American Friends Services Committee and the reshaping of Quaker colleges around the U.S. This chapter then concludes with an analysis of the neo-evangelical typology described by this author in Chapter One and its applicability to the events of the 1940s in OYM.

### **The Beginning of the End for Portland Bible Institute**

In 1933, Edward Mott retired from the Presidency of Portland Bible Institute, continuing as a teacher for several more years.<sup>2</sup> Clarence J. Pike, a Methodist minister, who had served as Business Manager at the Institute for the previous two years, replaced him as President.<sup>3</sup> Ray Beardsley claims:

Under the administration of C.J. Pike, the school advanced immeasurably, both physically and academically, and firmly established itself as an institution of higher learning in the Pacific Northwest.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> North Pacific Evangelistic Institute Trustee Minutes, June 6, 1933. Oregon Historical Society Archives (OHSA here-after). Box labeled, 'MSS 1417' file labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'. Located in Portland, Oregon – geographical reference left off hereafter.

<sup>3</sup> North Pacific Evangelistic Institute Trustee Minutes, July 1, 1933. OHSA, Box labeled, 'MSS 1417' file labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'. See also Sophia Townsend, *Our College, A History of Cascade College from 1918-1957* (Portland, OR: Privately printed, 1957), 15-16.

<sup>4</sup> Ray Beardsley, *The Expansion Years: A History of Academic Growth, Cascade College, 1939-1949* (1963 Cascade College History Seminar Paper for Dr. Lee Nash) 6. Seattle Pacific University

With the transition from Mott to Pike, though, a more subtle, but significant change started to occur at the Institute. It became viewed as less of a Quaker institution. Although PBI was always intended to be a multi-denominational revivalist school, and not exclusively Quaker, it still held strong psychological ties to the denomination and more specifically to Oregon Yearly Meeting. There is some circumstantial evidence for this in that, by 1920, the administration was responding to frequent questions from outsiders as to, ‘Why not unite with Pacific College, and have all the educational work together?’<sup>5</sup> Further evidence of the Institute having strong original ties to the Society, despite its claim of being interdenominational, can be found by tracing the denominational ties of its personnel. Its first Dean (Lewis Hadley) was an OYM Friends minister, its first President of the Board (Lurana Terrell) was an OYM Friends minister, one of its first board members (Marion George) was also an OYM Friends minister at Sunnyside Friends.<sup>6</sup> Two other early board members were George’s nephew<sup>7</sup> and a local Quaker Dentist, Bryon Morris.<sup>8</sup> The first treasurer and registrar was Oregon Friends Minister W. Lloyd Taylor.<sup>9</sup> Many of the faculty came from Friends’ churches. The

---

Archives, Box labeled, ‘SPU Archives Cascade College Box 383 of 840. Located in Seattle Washington – geographical reference left off hereafter.

<sup>5</sup> ‘Progress and Prosperity’, The Institute Bulletin, January 1920, vol 1, no 2. p. 1. OHSA, Box labeled, “MSS 1417’.

<sup>6</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 1-2.

<sup>7</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 2.

<sup>8</sup> Lyle Douglas Good, *The Founding and Early Years of North Pacific Evangelistic Institute* (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Oregon, 1969), 20.

<sup>9</sup> W. Lloyd Taylor was the author of two fundamentalist-leaning pamphlets at the height of the debates within OYM as to whether or not to separate from FYM. W. Lloyd Taylor, *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, An Affirmative Argument*, (No publisher noted, 1920).

Institute was housed in Piedmont Friends Church, and, initially, students who did not have another denominational affiliation were required to attend Sunday morning services there.<sup>10</sup> Additionally, Edward Mott served as PBI President while also serving as Clerk to OYM. In 1930, one PBI faculty member acknowledged:

It has long been a source of satisfaction to the friends of P.B.I. that our President, Edward Mott, is not only the staunch defender of the faith, but is the recognized leader in his denomination against the inroads of modernism and pseudoscience.<sup>11</sup>

Unlike Pacific College, however, PBI had no legal connection to OYM, and also unlike Pacific College, there were no regulations governing the make-up of the board. Thus, it legally could, and did, drift away from its Quaker roots. With the change in leadership from Mott to Pike, the Institute began to move from its denominational mooring. Although Friends still held faculty posts and sat on the Board and Quaker families still sent students there, the shift started with the hiring of Pike. Pike, a Methodist minister, was the first non-Quaker to serve as President.

In addition to a leadership change, there were other factors transforming the educational landscape across the country in the 1930s. By then the difficulties in operating an unaccredited Bible Institute in the midst of the Great Depression became hard to manage. With more students electing to do what coursework they could afford at

---

George Fox University Archives (GFUA hereafter), section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'. Located in Newberg, Oregon. Geographical referencing left off hereafter. *Our Imminent Peril: An open letter with special reference to the educational movement, the Forward Movement and Inter-Church World Movement as related to Friends of Oregon Yearly Meeting and The Five Years Meeting* (no publisher or date noted), 22. GFUA. Section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'

<sup>10</sup> Good, *Founding and Early Years*, 28.

<sup>11</sup> Donald M. Keister, *Edward Mott: The Influence of his Presidency on the Development of Cascade College* (March 1967, Cascade College History Seminar for Dr. Lee Nash) 2. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled, 'SPU Archives, Cascade College, Box 384 of 840'.

four-year accredited colleges, as well as with more and more denominations requiring four-year degrees for their ministers, enrolment at PBI became static.<sup>12</sup> In response, the faculty sought changes to the Institute, believing their students would be better served by an ‘interdenominational college with high scholastic standards and an adequate spiritual program.’<sup>13</sup> The board soon concurred that they could become a liberal arts college.<sup>14</sup> In 1939, under the suggestion of President Pike, the name of Portland Bible Institute was changed to Cascade College, ‘a name which did not narrow the school to any denomination or locality.’<sup>15</sup> It was Pike’s, and the Board’s, hope to remain strictly an Arminian pre-millennial school, but to enlarge the curriculum to meet the growing need of the larger society.<sup>16</sup> By 1940, the four-year programme was approved conditionally by the Oregon Board of Education, to be reviewed every two years,<sup>17</sup> and, eventually, Cascade College was given full accreditation.<sup>18</sup> The new college quickly added faculty and courses in science, history and literature to their existing fields of study, built a new

---

<sup>12</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 22.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 23.

<sup>16</sup> ‘The said Board of Trustees, Executive Committee, and Faculty shall pledge themselves to a course of action such as will cause to develop for the Northwest, in a more auspicious way even than heretofore, an interdenominational holiness school whose major emphasis shall be such that, as it serves the student body, its constituency, and this lost and needy world, multitudes around us shall learn of God’s free grace as set forth in our Arminian teachings, that this same host shall, through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, become holy in heart and life, and that the premillennial hope shall become the day star to many troubled souls in this tumultuous, seething, weary world.’ The official resolution statement adopted by the Board, concerning the change of name and focus of the institute when it became a college. Portland Bible Institute Trustee Minutes, May 15, 1939. OHSA. Box labeled ‘MSS 1417’ file labeled, ‘Trustee Minutes: 1929-1939’.

<sup>17</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 23.

<sup>18</sup> Beardsley, *The Expansion Years*, 1.



administrative office and added a new gymnasium.<sup>19</sup> Over the next twenty years Cascade College appeared to follow the trend of many other Bible Schools around the nation at the time – becoming similar to the liberal-arts institutions as an alternative to which they were initially formed.

For theologically conservative Friends in Oregon, the sense of loss and of no longer having a Bible Institute free of modernism and liberalism started with the retirement of Mott and culminated, in 1939, with PBI's change to a four-year liberal arts college. Probably the most significant result of this shift was the renewed vigour with which a group within the Yearly Meeting turned their attention to scourging modernism and liberalism from its own Pacific College; an institution they did legally oversee.

### **Scourging Modernism from Pacific College**

In 1941, Levi Pennington's thirty-year tenure as head of Pacific College ended with his retirement. The retirement appears to have been completely voluntary and Pennington reports a wish, which was granted, to continue raising funds for the college as President Emeritus.<sup>20</sup> However, these two events (the creation of Cascade College and Pennington's retirement) created an opening for a group of conservative-leaning members of the Society to try to reshape Pacific College into the conservative bastion they thought PBI was. Beebe argues, that during Pennington's tenure, OYM and Pacific College had drifted apart, claiming that Pennington's 'resignation in 1941 resulted in a

---

<sup>19</sup> Townsend, *Our College*, 24-30.

<sup>20</sup> Levi Pennington's Letter to the Board and Faculty of Pacific College, dated March 1, 1940. George Fox University Archives (GFUA hereafter), section SL-2, booklet labeled 'Pacific College Board Minutes June 12, 1925 to March 24, 1942'. Located in Newberg, Oregon – geographical referencing left off hereafter.

renewal of support from Oregon Yearly Meeting, spearheaded by evangelical leaders.’<sup>21</sup>

Beebe also claims that this evangelical faction influenced Pacific College so that it

‘would immediately return to a more Bible-centered, orthodox position.’<sup>22</sup>

Pennington’s hand-picked successor and good friend, Emmett Gulley (1894-1981), suffered the burden of this new hope. Gulley was a product of Pacific College (both student and faculty). He had attended the school from 1912-1917, was student body president, editor of the campus newspaper (*Crescent*), baseball player and captain of the school’s basketball team.<sup>23</sup> After Pacific, Gulley went on to receive his Master’s degree from Haverford, was a missionary in Mexico, field secretary for New York Yearly Meeting and, eventually, became a teacher and coach at Greenleaf Friends Academy in Idaho. In 1928, he returned to Pacific and spent the next eleven year as faculty in economics, sociology, Spanish and physical education.<sup>24</sup> During his time at Pacific, Gulley took a leave of absence to coordinate AFSC’s work in Spain during the Spanish Civil War (working with children and families from both sides of the conflict) and later to work with the Jewish refugees in Cuba.<sup>25</sup> In 1941, Gulley was named the fifth President of Pacific College.

Gulley was like Pennington in that they were both far more pastoral than academic presidents. Neither man could be classified as a theologian in an academic

---

<sup>21</sup> Ralph Beebe, *A Garden of the Lord: A History of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church* (OR: The Barclay Press, 1968), 136-137.

<sup>22</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 137.

<sup>23</sup> No author noted, ‘Former College President Dies’, *Newberg Graphic* (March 4, 1981): 16.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> George Thomas, *The Relation of Oregon Yearly Meeting and the American Friends Service Committee* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Pacific College, 1941), 14.

sense, and, it is difficult to pinpoint either man's perception on modernism – in particular higher criticism.<sup>26</sup> Unlike Pennington, who kept a massive collection of his own notes and has two scholarly works written about his life, Gulley left scant records.<sup>27</sup> Only his one autobiographical book of ruminations remains.<sup>28</sup> While Gulley does not comment on modernism or higher criticism in particular in his work, he suggests that, like Pennington, his association with modernism was primarily through the social gospel. Between his formative years as a student at Pacific College and his later time acquiring a Master's degree at Haverford, he attended Hartford Seminary.<sup>29</sup> Gulley, raised in Idaho during the growing epoch of fundamentalism within the YM, was acutely aware of the divided tensions within Friends at that time:

Great emphasis was being laid on sound doctrine. Naturally sound doctrine is necessary, but this was becoming a weapon to strike down other Friends and anything along the line of Service was considered a sign of unsoundness and a step toward the 'Social Gospel' which to them was a negation of the true Gospel. Such carping and criticism aroused in me a strong desire to get out from under the influence of such thinking and I welcomed the opportunity to attend Hartford.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Higher Criticism is used herein as one of the key defining characteristics of modernism and is also the defining characteristic which garnered the single largest amount of consternation from those within the YM who felt that modernism was apostate. Pennington, in particular, seemed to 'take the high road' when challenged on issues of Higher Criticism claiming, 'We cannot preserve the Word of God while we violate its spirit.' Levi T. Pennington, 'The Canon of the Scriptures and Its Preservation', Manuscript of the speech. 1923. Pennington Papers. GFUA.

<sup>27</sup> The most complete collection that exists is found in the Pennington Collection, as Levi saved both incoming and outgoing correspondence.

<sup>28</sup> Emmett W. Gulley, *Tall Tales by a Tall Quaker* (no publisher noted, 1973).

<sup>29</sup> Gulley, *Tall Tales*, 37.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

At Hartford, Gulley ‘welcomed the opportunity’<sup>31</sup> to expand his worldview and he soon concluded that, the ‘true and satisfactory path to follow is that which encompasses the first and second commandments.’<sup>32</sup> Gulley had already visited Rufus Jones once, in 1917, to see about joining AFSC, but delayed that choice to go, instead, to Hartford.<sup>33</sup> After just a year at the seminary, Gulley left to become a missionary in Mexico.<sup>34</sup> After serving in Mexico, Gulley received a full scholarship to attend Haverford where he sat under the tutelage of Rufus Jones, whom Gulley referred to as ‘the outstanding Quaker of this generation.’<sup>35</sup> Though Gulley claimed great respect for Jones, it is not likely he was of the same opinion as Jones on issues of evangelical orthodoxy. Gulley rather, consistently stressed the necessity of sound doctrine.<sup>36</sup> Yet, clearly, he valued the social ethic and world-engaging tendencies he found in the likes of Jones and AFSC.<sup>37</sup> In classifying Gulley, then, it is more likely he (like Pennington) viewed his humanitarian impulse as indicative of his orthodoxy. Due to the diminishing opportunities of humanitarian work for fundamentalist Friends in Oregon, Gulley possibly saw AFSC as a viable option within the Society for fulfilling this calling. Gulley’s close association with that organisation worked against him, however, during a time of renewed evangelical concern

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> Gulley, *Tall Tales*, 40.

<sup>35</sup> Gulley, *Tall Tales*, 57.

<sup>36</sup> Gulley, *Tall Tales*, 37.

<sup>37</sup> Gulley felt that AFSC was part of ‘a movement destined to take Friends into many nations and many parts of the world and do more to make the Quakers favorably known than any other thing that has ever happened.’ Gulley, *Tall Tales*, 37.

within the college community. He was too new in his position to claim some of the stature Pennington might have had against the forces of fundamentalism. In the minds of those within the YM, who held staunchly separatist worldviews, Gulley was guilty of modernism through association with the social gospel.

Within two years of Gulley's tenure, the Yearly Meeting voted to reinstate a 1908 bye-law allowing for the Yearly Meeting to appoint half the members of the College Corporation and to maintain power of veto over all admissions to the Board.<sup>38</sup> Although the provision had always been in place and was unchanged since 1908, the actual practice of monitoring such ratios had fallen off over the years. In 1942, no one was appointed in the Yearly Meeting minutes to the Pacific College Corporation, although by default many of those already on the Board were associated with, or an integral part of, OYM. In 1943, after the reapproval of the 1908 minute, the YM named seventy individuals, all to start at once, to the Pacific College Corporation.<sup>39</sup>

Gulley claimed that, in the winter of 1944, while he was away on a trip, the new members of the College Corporation 'severely criticized' his method for selecting faculty and voted to require all Pacific College faculty to sign a questionnaire, 'allegding [sic]

---

<sup>38</sup> *Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Official Minutes-1943* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1943), minute 47, page 24-25. Hereafter, '*OYM Minutes*' followed by respective year, minute and page number.

<sup>39</sup> *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 70, p. 43. The following year the Board offered a somewhat tempered proposal back to the YM suggesting: 1) That the membership of the Corporation be limited to fifty; 2) That five members be nominated each year by the Yearly Meeting Nominating Committee, three members by the Board of Trustees and two by the Alumni Association, each to serve five years; 3) That the President of the Board of Trustees shall preside at the corporation meetings; and 4) That the names of the members be submitted to the Yearly Meeting for its approval. This new proposal was also approved by the YM. See Pacific College Board and Executive Committee Minutes, June 8, 1944. GFUA. Section SL-2. Folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'. See also, *OYM Minutes-1944*, m. 92, p. 49.

full agreement with the doctrinal stand of Oregon Yearly Meeting.’<sup>40</sup> Whether or not this actually happened is up for debate. Other than Gulley’s personal letter to Levi Pennington, there is no other record of such an action and the action is not recorded in the College Board Meeting minutes, although the records for the Corporation do not appear to be entirely complete.

The growing conflict between Gulley and the new Board came to a head over an entirely unrelated incident. At the end of the 1944 school year, Gulley and the Board embarked on a campaign to rid the institution of its indebtedness, which stood at \$50,000.<sup>41</sup> The plan was for the Board to raise \$25,000 on its own, outside of the Yearly Meeting, and then to borrow the other \$25,000 from the YM.<sup>42</sup> The proposal was submitted to the YM’s Representatives. They initially adopted a resolution in favour of the loan idea, partly because they thought it would be ‘an effective method of bringing about closer cooperation between the Yearly Meeting and Pacific College.’<sup>43</sup> Their resolution was sent to all the Monthly Meetings throughout the YM with the hope they would respond with feedback or questions. Twenty-two Monthly Meetings responded favourably, with only one MM statement disapproving of the loan outright. Of the remaining affirmative responses, however, over 50% gave conditional approval contingent on an ‘accelerated trend in spiritual programming’ and ‘a change in

---

<sup>40</sup> Emmett Gulley, personal letter to Levi Pennington dated January 18, 1945. GFUA, Levi Pennington Special Collection, box 33, labeled ‘Bulk Range: 1922; 1942-1964’, file labeled ‘Gulley 45-49’.

<sup>41</sup> Pacific College Board and Executive Committee Minutes, May 12 1944. GFU Archives. Section SL-2. Folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.

<sup>42</sup> *OYM Minutes-1944*, m. 24, p. 9.

<sup>43</sup> *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 62, p. 31.

administration at the college.’<sup>44</sup> Whatever sense Gulley had of the committee’s pending report is not clear and the final report was not to be given until June, 1945. On March 10, 1945, he suddenly submitted his resignation to the Board of Pacific College.<sup>45</sup> No reason was given for this action, but, after ‘a full discussion’, Gulley was asked to withdraw his resignation for a year. At the same time, the Chairman of the Board was asked to ‘appoint a committee to study the relation between the college and the Yearly Meeting, looking toward better cooperation in the future, and to report back to the Board.’<sup>46</sup> By the time the 1945 Yearly Meeting sessions arrived, however, the conflict with the Yearly Meeting over the administration of Pacific College appears to have only intensified.

After the committee reported the above findings to the Yearly Meeting sessions (which still continued to recommend the loan), they also recommended that, ‘The Board of Managers [of Pacific College] having thus obtained the majority opinion of the Meetings will move in line with the desires of the Yearly Meeting.’<sup>47</sup> This was a subtle way of acknowledging the more primary concern that Pacific College needed to return to being a more Bible-centred school. Later in the week, during a called meeting of the Pacific College Board of Trustees, it was decided that the entire proposal for the loan scheme would be withdrawn.<sup>48</sup> While the loan scheme still seemed like a good idea, it

---

<sup>44</sup> *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 62, p. 31-32. One response made prompt repayment of the loan a conditional element, too.

<sup>45</sup> Pacific College Board and Executive Committee Minutes, March 10, 1945. GFUA. Section SL-2. Folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 62, p 31-32.

was apparent that deeper concerns regarding Gulley and Pacific College were held by some and those concerns were monopolising the debate.<sup>49</sup> Afterwards, the Board of Trustees met again for another called session and accepted the resignation of Emmett Gulley.<sup>50</sup> It does not appear that a new resignation was proffered, but rather they were accepting the one given back in March, which was on hold. Gulley claimed he was involved in the decision-making process and, ‘felt that it was the only possible solution.’<sup>51</sup> Interestingly, the board documented in the minutes that, ‘a unanimous vote of confidence was given’ to Gulley.<sup>52</sup>

On June 14, 1945, the *Newberg Graphic* ran a front page article on Gulley’s resignation:

A difference of opinion between two factions of the Oregon Yearly Meeting regarding the administration and leadership of Pacific College was culminated last Friday and Saturday when President Emmett Gulley resigned his position as president of the local institution... It was understood that Gulley’s resignation came at the request of a small group of ministers and others of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends church during recent sessions. While Gulley has stressed the necessity of having a Christian educational institution, some demanded that they make the school even more evangelistic.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Pacific College Board and Executive Committee Minutes, June 8 1945. GFUA. Section SL-2. Folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.

<sup>49</sup> *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 82, p. 48-49.

<sup>50</sup> Pacific College Board and Executive Committee Minutes, June 9 1945. GFUA. Section SL-2. Folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.

<sup>51</sup> Emmett Gulley, personal letter to Levi T. Pennington date June 12 1945. GFUA. Levi Pennington Special Collection, box 33, labeled ‘Bulk Range: 1922; 1942-1964’, file labeled ‘Gulley 45-49’.

<sup>52</sup> Pacific College Board and Executive Committee Minutes, June 9 1945. GFUA. Section SL-2. Folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.



The article also claimed that, ‘Closely following Gulley’s action some four or five members of the college staff have either resigned or voiced their intention of leaving.’<sup>54</sup>

On July 6, 1945, the Pacific College Board of Managers called a special session to consider the appointment of a new president. Whatever discussion took place during the course of the meeting is not documented, but that they reversed course again and emerged from the session with an approved motion to ‘re-elect Emmett Gully as President of the college for a term of five years.’<sup>55</sup> Gulley later claimed that he only reconsidered his resignation

because of a strong feeling of the Board members that there was a strong likelihood that no one suitable could be secured in time to get matters worked out for the beginning of the school year and college might not be able to open at all this fall.<sup>56</sup>

Following this action, the Board sent out a letter to the entire Yearly Meeting saying:

The Board carefully considered the wishes of everyone. Several names were considered to head the college. Some of them were not interested, some were not available and others did not seem to be qualified. The Board was finally united in asking Emmett Gulley to return and serve the college as President for a period of at least five years.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> ‘President Gulley Resigns as P.C. Head: Part of Staff may Quit Now’, *Newberg Graphic* vol. LVI no. 41 (Thursday June 14, 1945) 1.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> Pacific College Board and Executive Committee Minutes, July 6 1945. GFUA. Section SL-2. Folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.

<sup>56</sup> Personal letter from Emmett Gulley to George Moore dated August 1, 1945. GFUA. Section SU2. Box labeled ‘Joseph Reece’ Collection’.

<sup>57</sup> General letter sent by Pacific College Board, dated July 10, 1945. GFUA. Section SU2. Box labeled ‘Joseph Reece’ Collection’.

Despite the appearance of consensus indicated in the report, the action was not supported by all. Just a few weeks later, three members of the Board<sup>58</sup> sent out a ‘minority report’ to the constituents of the Yearly Meeting. In the letter, they claimed the original report of the Board, ‘Did not give all the facts and because it misrepresents the facts in two instances, we, the minority feel that it is our duty to state the facts as we faced them.’<sup>59</sup> The letter goes on to stress that, firstly, in fact other candidates who were qualified and available could have been further considered by the Board.<sup>60</sup> Secondly, the letter argues, that there were at least three members present who voted against retaining Gulley as President; the decision was not ‘united’.<sup>61</sup> The letter concluded:

We do not enjoy division and arguments but when it seems an attempt is being made to gain unity and support through misrepresenting the facts, then we feel we must bring the true facts to your attention, because any support gained on such a basis will bring disaster.<sup>62</sup>

The ‘minority report’ appears to have further exacerbated the division and arguments. On August 6, 1945, Ontario Heights Monthly Meeting of Friends formally ‘expressed its regret with the action taken by the board in regards to putting Emmett Gulley back as President of Pacific College. Before we can wholeheartedly support the college we must see a change in administration.’<sup>63</sup> The Marion Monthly Meeting for

---

<sup>58</sup> Paul Cammack, Joseph Reece and Allen Dunbar.

<sup>59</sup> Typed letter signed by Paul Cammack, Joseph G. Reece and Allen Dunbar, dated August 1, 1945. GFUA. Section SU2. Box labeled ‘Joseph Reece’ Collection.’

<sup>60</sup> Of these ‘other candidates’, Walter Williams Jr. is the only candidate named. *Ibid.*

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> Handwritten letter from Alice Wardlaw ‘on behalf of Ontario Heights Monthly Meeting of Friends’, written to H. M. Hoskins, dated August 6, 1945. GFUA. Section SU2 Box labeled ‘Joseph Reece’ Collection.’

Ministry and Oversight sent a similarly phrased letter of protest to the Board of Managers saying, 'We believe that if a really spiritual man who would be evangelistic in his administration were at the head, there would be more unity and co-operation with the college on the part of Oregon Yearly Meeting.'<sup>64</sup> Several personal letters were written to the College Board reflecting the same general concern, most of which mentioned disappointment with the rehiring of Emmett Gulley. By October of that year, the Ministerial Association sent in a letter saying:

As pastors we find ourselves in the place where young people look to us for counsel and direction. We are called of God not only to be shepherds but to be watchman unto the flocks entrusted to our care. We must be true to that trust. Therefore we ask that you take such steps regarding the school that our confidence shall be established. When we have confidence that the school adheres to the truths that we at Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends hold dear we will support it financially and encourage our young people to attend.<sup>65</sup>

Although Gulley retained his position for the time being, he did not help matters when, during the same meeting the Board gave him a new contract, he attempted to reduce Yearly Meeting control of the College from 1/2 to 2/5, a measure that failed by a vote of 8 to 4.<sup>66</sup> He also tried to abrogate the YM's power of veto over Board members and then had each faculty member sign an oath indicating his or her oath to Pacific College. In the end, though, what appears to have been Gulley's final downfall was the hiring of George Moore as Financial Secretary.

---

<sup>64</sup> Handwritten letter from Madenia McNeal 'on behalf of Marion Monthly Meeting for Ministry and Oversight, dated August 7 1945. GFUA. Section SU2 Box labeled "Joseph Reece" Collection.'

<sup>65</sup> Letter from Ministerial Association to Board of Manager dated October 6, 1945. GFUA. Section SU2. Box labeled "Joseph Reece" Collection.'

<sup>66</sup> Pacific College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. August 10, 1945. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

Moore had been a pastor at Piedmont Friends and had later become a professor at Pacific College. He appears to have had some skill in influencing people, as he had already garnered permission once from the College Board to help follow through on his belief that \$100,000 could be raised from the Monthly Meetings for the College.<sup>67</sup> His efforts were limited to \$7,000, a fact that he attributed to Gulley's failings, 'I travelled in Portland, Tacoma, Salem, Boise, Greenleaf Quarterly Meeting. Everywhere I went, with the possible exception of two new meetings, the first task which confronted me was to attempt to sell you [Gulley] to the people.'<sup>68</sup>

Over time, Moore became a sort of quasi-President for the fundamentalist group within the College Board members and faculty. He had started writing a regular column in the *Northwest Friend* (formerly *Friendly Endeavor*),<sup>69</sup> giving updates to the YM on behalf of the college.<sup>70</sup> Following the Board's action to reinstate Gulley, Moore sent Gulley a nine page epistle in which he accused Gulley of various personal failures as a leader and concluded:

You remember that in Board meeting, I pled with all the earnestness that I could muster, for the election of another to the Presidency for I knew

---

<sup>67</sup> Pacific College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. October 11, 1944. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

<sup>68</sup> Personal letter from George Moore to Emmett Gulley (not dated). GFUA. Section SU2 Box labeled 'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

<sup>69</sup> While the *Friendly Endeavor* always served as a sort of unofficial organ for OYM, it was primarily started and run by the young people involved in OYM's Christian Endeavor Society. In 1942, the YM agreed to elevate the periodical to the 'status of a full Yearly Meeting paper' and the name was changed. See Earl P. Barker, 'Paper to be Called "The Northwest Friend"', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 21 no. 7 (July 1942): 1, 6.

<sup>70</sup> The first of such articles appears in November 1943 in the *Northwest Friend* under the title 'College', without an author named. By December 1943, the articles are entitled 'With Our College' with George H. Moore listed as the author. For the next four years (until February 1947), Moore writes the columns regularly. See *Northwest Friend* for the respective years.

that... you had absolutely no chance of making Pacific a success as the Quaker College of Oregon Yearly Meeting.<sup>71</sup>

Despite the evident acrimony between the two men, the Board still opted to promote Moore to the position of Second Vice President of Financial and Student Solicitations in June 1946.<sup>72</sup> In his new role, Moore was given freedom to travel throughout the Yearly Meeting and the U.S., both raising funds for the College and encouraging students to enrol. Over time his role expanded to include interviewing prospective Ph.D. faculty for openings at Pacific College. Moore also appears to have taken it upon himself to recruit prospective Board members with ‘spiritual insight and with understanding as to the proper relationship between the college and the Yearly Meeting.’<sup>73</sup> As might have been predictable, the overlapping roles of College President and Second Vice President did not work out.

In November 1946, Moore took the opportunity to express to the Board his belief that, if Gulley resigned as President and went back to heading the Spanish Department, the following things could be accomplished:<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Personal letter from George Moore to Emmett Gulley (not dated). GFUA. Section SU2 Box labeled ‘Joseph Reece’ Collection’.

<sup>72</sup> Pacific College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. May 10, 1946. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’. See also Pacific College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. June 14, 1946. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.

Before he accepted the position, though, Moore gave a litany of demands which included: freedom to attend graduate school classes if he raised more than \$50,000 in any one year, being an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee of the Board, being an ex-officio member of the Faculty Committee, and that he be given the title of Second Vice President, all which were approved with only minor modifications.

<sup>73</sup> Personal letter from George Moore to perspective Board Member, John C. Brougher, dated August 16, 1945. GFUA. Section SU2 Box labeled ‘Joseph Reece’ Collection’.

<sup>74</sup> The original impetus for this conversation was that a group of about 55 Pacific College students attended the Board Meeting and requested an increase in the number of Ph.D.’s on staff and that the

Within 60 to 90 days the Board could obtain commitments from five to six Ph. D.'s to augment the Faculty for the next year or the year following, and could get sufficient number of persons to underwrite the cost of raising the salary brackets to \$3000 to Ph. D.'s and \$2,400 for M.A.'s.

Whatever took place next is not recorded, but:

There was considerable discussion of this matter, after which President Gulley tendered his resignation – stating that, if the majority of the Board desired him to vacate the presidency, he would be willing to relinquish his five-year contract. By a vote of six to five his resignation was accepted.<sup>75</sup>

Although it was officially decided, 'that announcement of this action should be withheld until the February Board Meeting',<sup>76</sup> Gulley elected that, 'more damage would be done by not reporting it than by coming right out in the open.'<sup>77</sup> In little over a week the story was front page news in the college newspaper (*The Crescent*):

The action culminated several years of growing concern on the part of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends for a more direct control over the administrative policies and a closer working connection between the church and the college. While progress along many lines has been appreciatively noted during the administration's regime, its leadership has failed to gain the confidence and support of the church constituency, a quality which the board felt necessary.<sup>78</sup>

---

institution move toward a higher accreditation standing. Gulley explained the reciprocal difficulty with such a pursuit was that Pacific College, due to its lack of accreditation, could not afford Ph.D. salaries and, thus, was unable to get accreditation because of the lack of Ph.D.'s on staff. George Moore perceived that the lack of Ph.D. staff was due to the presence of Gulley as President and, thus, recommended his removal. See Pacific College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. November 8, 1946. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

<sup>75</sup> Pacific College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. November 8, 1946. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>77</sup> Emmett Gulley, letter written to Pacific College Board, dated November 12, 1946. GFUA. Section SU2 Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

<sup>78</sup> 'Gulley Resigns', *Crescent*, vol. 30 no. 4. (November 18, 1946): 1.

Along with this article, Moore published his own brief front page article on the ordeal stating:

As financial secretary and on behalf of the faculty committee who are in the area, I am making the following statements:

1. There is no desire to minimize the contributions which President Gulley has made to Pacific College.
2. It is our aim to have a strong Liberal Arts college with as many departments as possible. We do not intend nor want to make it a Bible School or Seminary.
3. We believe it is possible to stress the evangelical note without minimizing or lessening the scholastic standards. ...
4. Pacific College is not “on the rocks.” She is strong...<sup>79</sup>

Moore also used his regular column in the *Northwest Friend* to reiterate many of the aforementioned items.<sup>80</sup>

Two petitions were sent to the Board expressing concern regarding Gulley’s resignation (one from students and one from faculty), both of which were responded to by the Board with thoughtfulness, though no change, of course.<sup>81</sup> Pennington, who had generally stayed out of the fray while serving as President Emeritus, also sent an epistle to the Board claiming his letter was not directly a ‘plea for Emmett M. Gulley’, but rather suggesting it was his ‘conviction’ to write to the Board so that they may avoid the ‘wrong course’. Pennington’s letter, written in his usual overstated tone, mostly focused on how

---

<sup>79</sup> ‘Secretary Reports’, *Crescent*, vol. 30 no. 4. (November 18, 1946): 1.

<sup>80</sup> George H. Moore, ‘With Our College’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 11 (December 1946): 14-15.

<sup>81</sup> Pacific College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. January 3, 1947. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled ‘Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.

such disunity would impact the college's ability to raise funds, and, suggested, in the final analysis:

I have no desire to be harshly critical, though I confess that there have been things that have aroused my hot indignation, as they should have aroused yours. I do believe that one of the chief difficulties in Oregon Yearly Meeting is a tendency toward the Jesuitical attitude that "The end justifies the means." We who are leaders in various parts of the work of the Lord need to pay more heed than some of us have done to the scripture which says, "Shall we do evil that good may come? God forbid."”<sup>82</sup>

Gulley served out the rest of the school year and, within a week of his last day on the job, Gulley was appointed Executive Secretary of the newly-organised Oregon branch of the American Friends Service Committee.<sup>83</sup> Within a month in the new job, he worked to bring the first Oregon AFSC office to Newberg.<sup>84</sup> After his resignation from PC, some financial gifts already promised to the college were withheld by the donors<sup>85</sup> (a figure Pennington estimated at half a million dollars),<sup>86</sup> but others just saw it as a necessary step for the institution to finally be able to move forward. Beebe simply says, 'The impetus which separated Oregon from the Five Years Meeting and the American Friends Service Committee.... had won control of Pacific College.'<sup>87</sup> When he was almost eighty years of

---

<sup>82</sup> Levi Pennington, letter written to Pacific College Board, dated November 25, 1946. GFUA. Section SU2 Box labeled '“Joseph Reece” Collection’.

<sup>83</sup> 'Friends Unit Locating Here – Emmett Gulley to Be Secretary', *Oregonian* (June 19, 1947), 22.

<sup>84</sup> Emmett Gulley, open support letter, dated August 18, 1947. GFUA. Levi Pennington Collection, box 33, labeled 'Bulk Range: 1922; 1942-1964', file labeled 'Gulley, Emmett – 45-49'. The Oregon AFSC office was later moved to Portland.

<sup>85</sup> Pacific College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. January 3, 1947. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953’.

<sup>86</sup> Levi Pennington, *Rambling Recollections of Ninety Happy Years* (OR: Metropolitan Press, 1967), 47.

<sup>87</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 137.



age, Gulley wrote an autobiographical account of some of the events in his life, including:

A group who dominated Oregon Yearly Meeting was seeking to gain control of every part of the Yearly Meeting, including the College. They sought to blacken the good name of members of the faculty, to change the character of the Institution from the solid Quaker school of higher learning to an Institution resembling a Bible School. They did not hesitate to spread false information about me, with no effort to correct their unethical ways and disregard for truth. Two or three members of the faculty, who were in league with this group, made such insidious and false statements about me during the sessions of the Yearly Meeting, that the presiding clerk felt obliged to apologize to me on behalf of the whole Yearly Meeting. It is strange how certain people, who profess almost religious infallibility, can stoop to such unethical practices as character assassination and still profess to be “right” and sit in judgment of others. After it became evident that they would have their way or wreck the school, I felt that it was a waste of time to continue and so, in 1947, after serving six of the best years of my life as president of Pacific College, I resigned.<sup>88</sup>

Staunch fundamentalism largely disappeared in OYM at the corporate level after the Gulley incident in 1947. Although he was just a single person, his resignation becomes a symbolic ending to the intense conflicts of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. In some ways the success of fundamentalism by mid-century justified its demise. As a reactionary force within evangelicalism, fundamentalism had no large scale systemic institution or organization, to which the YM was intimately or organically attached, against which it could react. The YM was safe from modernism via its insularity. However, it would not be accurate to say that, after 1947, there was suddenly a hard shift towards neo-evangelicalism within the YM. Rather, one of the unique differences in the academic environment within OYM as opposed to that in the larger movements within Protestantism at the time is that the fundamentalist grouping cannot be as easily teased out and clearly defined. When Fuller Theological Seminary was formed as the new

---

<sup>88</sup> Gulley, *Tall Tales*, 50.

academic centre of neo-evangelical Presbyterianism, it was with different personnel than those either at Princeton (largely comprised of Presbyterian modernists) or those at Westminster Theological Seminary (largely Presbyterian fundamentalists).<sup>89</sup> Fuller was formed as a protest to both types of thought, and this change in the Presbyterian community allowed for a clearer demarcation between the various groups (fundamentalism, modernism and neo-evangelicalism) in their respective struggles to gain control of the academic sphere for their respective denomination.<sup>90</sup> In Oregon, the change was more nuanced because it was internal. After it became evident that PBI was no longer a bastion of Quakerism, which could be influenced by the YM, the events at Pacific can be seen as both an attempt to scourge the perception of modernism from the YM's own institution as well as a struggle between the evangelical separatists (fundamentalists) and evangelical non-separatists over the intellectual spirit of the college. That both the YM and the board vacillated so frequently on Gulley's resignation (and even the final decision shows a vote of five to six), suggests a growing internal debate over which pedagogical framework was best suited for Pacific. In some ways, both groups (fundamentalists and budding neo-evangelicals) could each claim victory after the events at Pacific. Fundamentalists won because those with perceived modernist leanings were scuttled away from the institute and, therefore, Pacific College could be considered of sound orthodox theology. It mattered not to fundamentalists whether modernists were evangelical or theologically liberal, as both were considered unsound.

---

<sup>89</sup> For a more thorough discussion of the various Presbyterian tensions experienced in the Princeton, Westminster and Fuller schisms, see George Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987).

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*

However, in the end, that Pacific College did not become the insular Bible School the PBI was, testified to the growing strength of moderate evangelicals, who successfully kept the college as a liberal-arts college with an open worldview (discussed in greater detail below). Like the seven year transition period into fundamentalism (1919 – 1926), these rather similar years of internal conflict in the 1940s represent another transition period out of fundamentalism and into neo-evangelicalism. In general though, during most of the 1940s, the YM, as a corporate whole, can still be classified as fundamentalist in its thinking and the Gulley incident is best explained in light of the anti-modernism mentality espoused by fundamentalists.

While the fundamentalists were gaining victory at Pacific over modernism, the world became embroiled in the Second World War and there was a commensurate need for the YM to engage with the world in a new way and to revisit its humanitarian emphasis. Although small at first, these small steps eventually undermined the YM's insular nature and further assisted in bringing it out of a fundamentalist culture.

### **The Renewal of World Engagement and Humanitarianism**

It is not easy to pinpoint an exact cause for the demise of fundamentalism within OYM as a corporate culture. Certainly on the national scene fundamentalism was waning in popularity by the 1940s, and it has been suggested above that, as a reactionary force, fundamentalism had little left to react against, but these reasons do not entirely explain the changes within OYM. In this section, I review those causes, which were more external – world events – which in many ways drew the YM meeting out of its insular protectionism, and, in turn, had a reciprocal effect on changing the worldview of the YM.

After the 1940 sessions of OYM, in which it was decided that there would be no official connection between AFSC and OYM, some Monthly Meetings reformed their own Service Committees to work in collaboration with AFSC. This action was consistent with the wording of the 1940 minute. Most notable of the Service Committees are those of Portland and Newberg Quarterly Meetings. Newberg Friends Church (with the help of Pennington) took the lead to bring together three Quarterly Meetings (Newberg, Portland and Salem) and to create local Service Committees with named representatives. Their influence, plus the rising threat of war, contributed to the AFSC issue coming before the Yearly Meeting again in 1941.

Portland Quarterly Meeting put forth a 'plan for meeting the conscientious objector problem.' The plan was carefully worded and outlined the following four recommendations:

That the Yearly Meeting set up a new committee, to be known as the Oregon Yearly Meeting Service Committee, composed of representatives from each of the Quarterly Meetings.

That the committee be empowered to carry on its own program for financing the proper care of the Oregon Yearly Meeting conscientious objectors

That, for the purpose of participation in the placing of our [the YM's] conscientious objectors, the committee affiliate itself with the Civilian Public Service Section of the American Friends Service Committee, and appoint a representative.

That the committee cooperate in every needful and helpful way with the other peace churches in the establishment and operation of a camp or camps for conscientious objectors in the Northwest.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> *OYM Minutes-1941*, m. 12, p. 5.

It is not clear what debate occurred and whether or not the attendees realised that, technically, this carefully crafted proposal was, in effect, partly undoing the decisions of 1938 and 1940. Under the guise of an autonomous Northwest Friends Service Committee (NFSC) the Yearly Meeting would have representatives and limited participation at the corporate level with AFSC again. Perhaps by now the attendees saw the needs of COs as too great to stop such a proposal. Even though Pearl Harbor was still six months away, since the last Yearly Meeting sessions France had surrendered and Roosevelt had instituted The Selective Service and Training Act. Clarence Pickett's successful negotiation with the White House for AFSC to take oversight of all COs, regardless of their religious affiliation, made the AFSC the primary option (other than prison) for those who did not want to join the military.<sup>92</sup> In the end, Portland QM's proposal was approved.<sup>93</sup> The rationale appears to be pragmatic rather than signaling any intentional theological shift within the Yearly Meeting at this point, but it was a small opening that had the ultimate effect of bringing OYM out of some of its insular tendencies and back to the discussion table with far more service-minded groups and individuals.

By the next year, the U.S. had officially joined the war and the newly-formed Northwest Friends Service Committee was busy at work. Several men in Oregon went to AFSC work camps in lieu of service,<sup>94</sup> but their experience was different from that of the COs during the Great War. AFSC was granted oversight over all the Civilian Public

---

<sup>92</sup> Clarence E. Pickett, *For More than Bread* (Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1953), 314-318.

<sup>93</sup> *OYM Minutes-1941*, m. 12, p. 5.

<sup>94</sup> See GFUA. Section FA-4 files labeled 'Letters from CPS, Service Men' and 'Statements on Conscientious Objections to War'. See also, *OYM Minutes-1941*, m. 49, p. 21.

Service (CPS) men during the war, but no foreign relief work was allowed by these men. Instead of going to the battle zone and helping out war-torn villages or providing medical support to the injured, these COs were all sent to work camps in the U.S. The cost and administration of the camps was borne by the three peace churches (Friends via AFSC, Mennonites and Brethren) even though 40% of the COs in camp came from a different denomination or had no religious affiliation.<sup>95</sup> Some COs in the camps did meaningful work as attendants in mental health hospitals, fighting forest fires, building public works, soil conservation, etc. Many others struggled to find purpose in their long stays in camps, as they performed unimaginative work, such as manicuring the trees in national forests.<sup>96</sup> The duration of time for COs in camp technically became the length of the war plus six months.<sup>97</sup> All told, about twelve thousand American men registered for CO status and performed some form of alternative service in camps throughout the U.S.<sup>98</sup> Publically, these CO men in camps had little support and they were often considered un-American by others. Most people saw Roosevelt's Selective Service and Training Act as already allowing for an honourable option for conscientious objectors to enlist in the military as non-combatants. The tension many Quaker Conscientious Objectors held for doing any type of military service, even non-combative, was a fine nuance lost on the public.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Jeffrey Kovac, *Refusing War, Affirming Peace: The History of Civilian Public Service Camp #21 at Cascade Locks* (OR: Oregon State University Press, 2009), 15, 27.

<sup>96</sup> Pickett, *More than Bread*, 325. About five hundred CPS men across the U.S. became medical 'guinea pigs' and had various new drugs administered to them, were intentionally inoculated with diseases and purposefully subjected to semi-starvation. See Pickett, *More than Bread*, 328-329.

<sup>97</sup> Kovac, *Refusing War*, 15, 143-145. COs were to be discharged from service at the same rate as the enlisted.

<sup>98</sup> Kovac, *Refusing War*, 15.

OYM did, however, find ways to support its own COs even though their pacifism was not politically popular and their activities were perceived as sometimes mundane. In 1942, the YM covered the full cost for nine of its young men who elected to go to camp with the statement that, ‘We shall feel the burden of supporting them, as a father feels the burden of his own family.’<sup>100</sup> In 1943, that number rose to fifteen<sup>101</sup> and then to nineteen, in 1944<sup>102</sup> and, by the close of the war, in 1945, to twenty-nine.<sup>103</sup>

The pragmatics involved in this venture did cause two changes to be necessary which ultimately impacted the YM’s insularity. The first is the way the YM allowed for an entangling of alliances with ideas and organisations – most notably AFSC – they had previously shunned. In the first annual report of the newly-formed Northwest Friends Service Committee, the committee’s superintendent made a specific point of clarifying that, while the YM was supporting its own members who went to the work camps, the YM was not financially supporting the administration of the camps (mostly run by AFSC and supported by Friends, Brethren and Mennonites).<sup>104</sup> The reason appears to have been entirely related to the YM’s past organic separation from AFSC. The next year, NFSC’s report indicated that some members of OYM were also withholding their individual

---

<sup>99</sup> Those who enlisted as non-combatants and went into the military ended up doing the overseas relief work, instead, as they drove ambulances, handed out food, rebuilt bombed out structures etc. They were also the ones who received payment, while the cost of men in CO camps had to be entirely borne by themselves, their families, and, more often than not, their churches. See Pickett, *More than Bread*, 318-332.

<sup>100</sup> *OYM Minutes-1942*, m. 84, p. 47.

<sup>101</sup> *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 48, p. 26.

<sup>102</sup> *OYM Minutes-1944*, m. 42, p. 18.

<sup>103</sup> *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 50, p. 23.

<sup>104</sup> *OYM Minutes-1942*, m. 84, p. 47.

financial support for the CO camps, 'on grounds that they would thus be supporting camps in which communism, atheism and other unchristian movements are present.'<sup>105</sup>

This same year, however, there was an official shunning of such isolationist ideas and in its place a far more world-engaging framework was being promoted by YM leaders towards the camps:

We have wished for a more nearly unanimous support from our membership, and believe that we would receive it if there were complete and perfect understanding on the part of all... It is true that these elements are in the camps to which our boys are being sent, and in some cases to an alarming degree... We feel that no one need hesitate to support them on account of their antichristian associations. We have a responsibility for them regardless of their environment. Many of them are doing a definite service as they bear a consistent Christian testimony in such environments.<sup>106</sup>

Such statements represent a bit more generous allowance of engagement than that documented several years earlier during the acrimonious debates regarding AFSC and the involvement of OYM in any activities related to it. Over the remaining span of the war, the YM sent far more money and material support to AFSC than any other service agency they supported.

The second change is the re-emergence of significant war relief work not exclusively tied to evangelism now being supported at YM level. In addition to those who worked in the camps, the YM also started to campaign against the Japanese internment situation in the U.S.:

---

<sup>105</sup> *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 48, p. 26. Patricia Appelbaum's work, *Kingdom to Commune*, provides important context to this. After 1940, she argues, the pacific community in America became more focused on its peace ideology and commitment to pacifism, and less focused on its Christian heritage. The CPS camps then were important conduits during WWII where pacific ideas were transmitted within an ever-broadening eclectic ideological community. See Patricia Appelbaum, *Kingdom to Commune, Protestant Pacifist Culture between World War I and the Vietnam War* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 34-38.

<sup>106</sup> *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 48, p. 26.



We are glad that the Friends of Oregon Yearly Meeting are providing for the maintenance of our own members in the Civilian Public Service Camps, but we feel keenly that we are not by any means measuring up to our responsibility in the matter of help and encouragement to our own members who wish to serve more adequately, and in aid of our Japanese fellow citizens who are suffering such hardships and are in need of Christian sympathy and help. We wish to place our concern before Oregon Yearly Meeting, with the hope that that body will recommend its Northwest Friends Service Committee to find a way of accomplishing the service suggested for our own members, for the Japanese people, and for other needy peoples in other parts of the world.<sup>107</sup>

This measure was approved<sup>108</sup> and marked a significant shift in the level of humanitarian concern shown in the YM in comparison to what was shown in the 1930s. Noticeably absent from the measure is any reference or suggestion of a salvation first policy or evangelism. In 1945, after the cessation of hostilities, the YM sent a resolution to the White House reflecting this ideological shift:

It is our desire that all possible relief be given to the homeless and starving peoples of war-devastated areas in Europe. We feel a keen sense of responsibility for them in as much as part of the destruction came about through military activities of our nation. We feel also our obligation as inhabitants of a rich and favored country to alleviate as far as possible the horrible effects of war. We believe that our nation is well enough supplied with the necessities of life to spare great quantities of desperately needed materials to relieve these stricken peoples. We believe such action would not only partially fulfill our Christian duties toward the unfortunate but would do much to start our torn world back toward peace by displacing some of the hatred engendered by our bombings.<sup>109</sup>

Although the National Association of Evangelicals (a broad interdenominational association of evangelicals) was starting its own world relief projects, the YM split their resources between NAE and AFSC, ‘We would especially call your attention to the

---

<sup>107</sup> *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 10, p. 4.

<sup>108</sup> *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 74, p. 50.

<sup>109</sup> *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 49, p. 22.

program of the National Association of Evangelicals which will furnish meals for the starving peoples of Europe at 3 cents per meal. The A.F.S.C. is also urging money donations.’<sup>110</sup> That year, the latter of the two organisations received a near equal amount of material goods donated from the YM, and far more monetary donations compared to NAE (\$2,365.15 compared to \$6.50).<sup>111</sup> The Peace Report of 1946 poignantly reflects this corporate shift and shows the embrace of a far more progressive attitude regarding the relationship between social service and the Great Commission:

The second great World War has ended – but the world is not at peace. In many war-torn countries starvation and disease, death and despair, are tragic realities... Of course the picture is not all dark. Considerable effort is being made by the government and independent groups to feed and clothe foreign populations. For this we can be grateful and can resolve to give to the utmost. While thus trying to save lives we may also be helping to promote Christian fellowship and understanding among the people of the world... Problems of the present era are indeed challenging to the Christian pacifist – and his counsel is greatly needed. Relief and reconstruction must be carried on with vigor. Peaceful settlement of international problems must be sought. National and international abolition of armaments and military conscription should be urged. Civilian control of atomic energy should be achieved. There should be amnesty for C.O. prisoners, improvement in race relations, less friction between labor and management; and greater emphasis on Christian principles in all affairs of nation, state, community and home. *This is not a time for preaching alone, but a time to implement our preaching with deeds of kindness, mercy and compassion – for the relief and suffering of humanity everywhere.*<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> OYM Minutes-1946, m. 82, p. 52.

<sup>111</sup> OYM Minutes-1946, m. 82, p. 50.

<sup>112</sup> OYM Minutes-1946, m. 81, p. 49-50. Emphasis added.

By 1946, with the war having ended and the needs of the COs no longer being present, instead of discontinuing the Northwest Friends Service Committee, it was restructured to focus primarily on local and world relief efforts.<sup>113</sup>

Despite the noticeable shift within the YM regarding their relief work, it is inaccurate to say that suddenly, by 1947, there was a widespread embrace of humanitarianism. It was the same year that Gulley resigned from Pacific College, so fundamentalism still had large factions of support throughout the YM. The actions towards the COs and world relief work then, can better be seen as part of a sporadic (and growing) trend towards accepting (sometimes simply tolerating) social renewal ideals, such as pacifism and humanitarian work. The era between 1941 and 1947 becomes another transitional period within the YM, with respect to its identity, as it moved from a culture of fundamentalism towards neo-evangelicalism. During this same timeframe other such steps can be found reflecting this trend.

In the mid 1940s, the mission in Bolivia was at a crossroads. In 1944, Helen Cammack suddenly died of typhoid fever.<sup>114</sup> By 1945, Carroll and Doris Tamplin were mostly working for the National Holiness Missionary Society in a different area of Bolivia instead of through OYM.<sup>115</sup> The YM had originally envisaged an independent Bolivian Friends church, but, outside of Bible teaching and evangelism, it had done little to actually improve the lives of the indigenous people it was trying to save in order that

---

<sup>113</sup> The decision was made in 1945 and came into effect in 1946. See *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 32, p. 11-12. See also, *OYM Minutes-1946*, m. 82, p. 50.

<sup>114</sup> *OYM Minutes-1944*, m. 49, p. 22.

<sup>115</sup> *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 56, p. 29.

they could operate on their own. By the mid-1940s, it was time to rethink the way the YM conducted missionary work. Evangelism had taken hold in Bolivia on a small scale, but there were no real widespread results of holiness spirituality (short of the missionaries teaching revivalist sanctification doctrine). In 1944, this discrepancy became far more obvious to the Mission Board of OYM and, after a lengthy visit to Bolivia by Joseph Reece (YM General Superintendent) and Walter P. Lee, a restructuring of the mission organisation and purpose occurred.<sup>116</sup> By 1947, the mission was given permission to operate under a newly reorganised Field Mission Council, made up of local departmental secretaries, instead of the YM Board of Missions.<sup>117</sup> This move gave far greater freedom to the local missionaries and indigenous leaders to operate as a unified national church body with more independent decision making and collaboration. That same year the local church in Bolivia formed the 'Evangelical Society of Bolivian Friends', a council mainly populated by Bolivian nationals, who took responsibility for the evangelistic work.<sup>118</sup> In 1948, the National Society of Bolivian Friends (jointly led by missionaries and nationals) was formed, representing the foundation of a Bolivian Friends Church.<sup>119</sup>

In addition to changing the bureaucratic structure to optimise local control by Bolivian nationals (primarily comprised of Aymara Indians, who had very few rights in their own country), OYM realised that, if the local Friends churches in Bolivia were ever going to reach full self-sufficiency, a means of ongoing vocation was needed to provide

---

<sup>116</sup> See *OYM Minutes-1944*, m. 49, p. 28. See also, *OYM Minutes-1947*, m. 97, p. 50.

<sup>117</sup> *OYM Minutes-1947*, m. 97, p. 50.

<sup>118</sup> *OYM Minutes-1947*, m. 97, p. 52.

<sup>119</sup> *OYM Minutes-1949*, m. 104, p. 49.

basic sustenance and livelihoods. Starting in 1946, the YM solicited funds for the purchase of a large-scale farm, which would house a new Bible School and establish a method towards self-sustaining support for the local ministry.<sup>120</sup>

In 1947, the YM bought a 300 acre farm at Copajira, just outside La Paz, which included a three-acre compound, a chapel and 33 families, totalling 146 persons, who were included, as essentially slave-property, with the land. Along with constructing a new Bible School,<sup>121</sup> the new missionaries at the farm began work to improve crop yields and developed ways to mechanise and increase the yield of the local harvest.<sup>122</sup> The YM also immediately began work on freeing the slaves that came with the land and gave each family, which opted for it, sufficient area to provide for themselves.<sup>123</sup> The process of freeing the families was not entirely unbound from the YM's salvation-first policy used in the last decade,<sup>124</sup> but the overall process of seeing the necessity of altering unethical social structures, such as slavery and oppression, as part of broader efforts in social

---

<sup>120</sup> During the 1946 YM sessions, \$9,000 was raised. Eventually, local YM pastor Walter P. Lee conducted a tour of all OYM churches and by 1947 a total of \$35,000 had been raised. *OYM Minutes-1947*, m. 97, p. 48, 51.

<sup>121</sup> *OYM Minutes-1947*, m. 97, p. 54, 55-56.

<sup>122</sup> *OYM Minutes-1947*, m. 97, p. 54-55.

<sup>123</sup> The freeing of the peons was a greater obstacle than simply just giving each family land of their own. Many (if not most) of the peon families initially opposed such moves as years of cultural customs worked against the missionary's efforts. The missionary report of 1949 reports that, 'The peon flareup and settlement was the major farm crisis of the year. God protected and brought peace ultimately. We praise the Lord for the great change of attitudes.... Twenty-one of the thirty-two peon families eligible for freedom have accepted the freedom plan and are working to complete it. It is possible that in six months the first peon will be freed and given title to his property under the plan.' By 1951, only eight families were still considered peons, with six of those eight refusing the opportunity. See *OYM Minutes-1949*, m. 104, p. 57. See also, *OYM Minutes-1951*, m. 104, p. 55.

<sup>124</sup> Although no clear policy documentation remains regarding how the missionaries established guidelines for the 'freedom plan', there are some general hints that the process involved some level of 'interest in the gospel'. See *OYM Minutes-1948*, m. 109, p. 52. See also, *OYM Minutes-1951*, m. 104, p. 55.

progress was another small step towards a renewal of humanitarian effort on the part of the YM. In 1952, the Bolivia Friends Church was officially formed (*Iglesia Nacional Evangelica Los Amigos*).<sup>125</sup>

This shift represents another small step towards demonstrating a redevelopment of social services as an expression of the YM's orthopraxy. OYM still held on tightly to the basics of an evangelical theology and the idea of sanctification was still central to their beliefs, but overall recognition by the YM that mission was as much about services as it was about evangelism was a part of the process of change. The rigid fundamentalist exclusivity of the 1930s that led to mission work primarily focused on soul-harvesting was largely in abeyance, replaced by a moderate evangelical worldview, which still held the standard evangelical convictions, but allowed for a more generous social ethic. Even Edward Mott, in his writings in the 1940s, started to show a bit more of a generous approach towards social service than he had in the past:

Evangelism in its connection with social service expresses potently the love of God for His creature man. It is thus that social service paves the way for, and makes possible, a desire to know the Christ as Savior and Lord.<sup>126</sup>

Although Mott never wavered from the idea that, if social service was separated from evangelism, it was of no value,<sup>127</sup> this is the first time we find Mott acknowledging that social service could be used as a means to 'pave the way' for evangelism.

---

<sup>125</sup> *OYM Minutes-1952*, m. 118, p.50-51.

<sup>126</sup> Edward Mott, 'Evangelism and Social Service', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 24 no. 7 (July 1945): 15. During the 1940s Mott's monthly front page editorials in *Northwest Friend* regularly continued to emphasise the importance of social service within an evangelical framework and the danger of co-mingling with unorthodox alliances.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*

In addition to the changing ethos regarding humanitarian work and missions, by the late 1940s, sumptuary laws also played a noticeably decreasing role in the temperance programme of the YM. In 1940, the Temperance Department of OYM changed its name to the Department of Public Morals and its focus was extended to include ‘the use of tobacco, opium and its derivatives, marihuana, gambling, and dancing.’<sup>128</sup> Its reports of 1941 – 1946 reflected little change in the department’s practice. The annual reports of the department for these respective years show that OYM was still focused on ending the liquor trade and that it still sought social regulation through changing governmental laws as a primary means of legislating public morality. The reports are less full, though, and suggest a waning interest in the topic as a whole. In 1946, the committee’s Superintendent wrote, ‘An analysis of reports received from Quarterly Meeting Superintendents shows that while some meetings are active in furthering the cause of Public Morals, others are indifferent.’<sup>129</sup> In 1947, the issue of temperance was further relegated mostly due to a change in how the YM reports were given. In 1947, the Department of Public Morals stopped giving a separate report to the YM sessions. In its place was a larger umbrella report from the new Board of Public Relations. This broader report was not limited to the topic of temperance or public morals; it also included stewardship, peace, literature and education. It is interesting how quickly after this structural change occurred that temperance and public morals ceased to form major discussion points. The 1947 Public Relations report was dominated by the subject of peace and there is not a single item regarding issues that would have traditionally fallen

---

<sup>128</sup> *OYM Minutes-1940*, m. 41, p. 13.

<sup>129</sup> *OYM Minutes-1946*, m. 59, p. 30-31.

under the rubric of the old Department of Public Morals. From that point on, there was dwindling attention given to the topic of temperance within the YM. When the topic does come up, it is apparent from the reports, that the issues were more limited in scope. In fact, the entire report of the Public Relations Board is often brief, has minimal narrative, and sometimes was just printed in the minutes rather than read.<sup>130</sup> The space and time given to what would normally comprise the reading of a full report was instead filled with exhortations or anecdotal stories from individuals whose convictions remained along those lines. None of this is to say that attempts at temperance and legislated morality were intentionally discontinued. Liquor and other illicit drugs were still considered by many to be evil intoxicants leading to an array of social ills (as well as new evils, such as divorce, sexual impurity and the television) and there were still campaigns against the liquor trade and still many letters were sent to the White House, but the amount of space and time given to the previous emphasis on legislating morality is replaced by other means of achieving social reform. In 1951, there was a one line aspirational statement that simply read, 'Help elect and stand behind public officials who have good moral standards.'<sup>131</sup> In 1952, the exact same line appears as the only real guidance towards legislating public morality.<sup>132</sup> By 1954, there are no recommendations concerning legislated morality, though many social problems of the day are mentioned in the

---

<sup>130</sup> In particular, the reports of 1948 and 1949 were just printed. In 1950, the president of the Public Relations Board brought a 'short report'. See *OYM Minutes-1948*, m. 39, p. 13-14. *OYM Minutes-1949*, m. 44, p. 18-19. *OYM Minutes-1950*, m. 48, p. 21.

<sup>131</sup> *OYM Minutes-1951*, m. 51, p. 18.

<sup>132</sup> *OYM Minutes-1952*, m. 57, p. 25.



report.<sup>133</sup> That same year it was reported that 70% of the churches in OYM did not actively support a temperance programme.<sup>134</sup> By the time of the 1970 Discipline (the first revision since 1958), the entire section on temperance and the liquor trade had been deleted with the exception of a single Query[g].<sup>135</sup>

The significance of these findings is not so much in regard to documenting the YM's changing convictions on the use of alcohol. All evidence suggests that the convictions were probably unchanged for many Quakers in OYM over this time period.<sup>136</sup> What is of significance is the shift in the underlying methodology used by the YM regarding attempts at influencing individual and societal morality by the mid-century point. If the temperance programmes between the two great wars can be labeled as attempts at legislated morality then those years of morality-shaping after 1947 are best characterised as attempts to push people, including members of the Friends church, to live out their social responsibilities in Christ. Although the members of the Public Morality Department within the Board of Public Relations duly chastised accordingly

---

<sup>133</sup> *OYM Minutes-1954*, m. 56, p. 28.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>135</sup> 'Query 5 – 'Do you abstain from the manufacture, sale, or use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage? Are you careful to avoid all places and amusements inconsistent with a Christian character, and do you observe moderation in all things? Do you abstain from the growth, manufacture, sale, and use of tobacco as containing a habit-forming drug?' *OYM Discipline – 1970*, p. 71-72.

<sup>136</sup> With only minor modification, the same statement regarding temperance is in all five renditions of the Discipline from 1902 – 1958: 'All members are earnestly warned against the use of all alcoholic beverages and of other habit-forming drugs; they are warned also to abstain from the use of or traffic in tobacco. The effects of all of these tend toward physical, mental, and moral injury. As the liquor traffic is the great cause of poverty and crime and serious obstacle to the spread of the gospel, members of the church should never engage in it in any way; they should be active, earnest, and emphatic in their opposition to this great evil. There should be a constant effort to outlaw it in any and all of its forms.' From *The Discipline of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church – 1958* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1958), 35-36. Hereafter, *Discipline of OYM* followed by respective year and page number.

each year, it is clear that, after this point in time, individual conscience and social responsibility played a far greater role in deciding issues of personal morality than YM edicts or a singular focus on sumptuary laws did.

In changing temperance from a matter of Discipline to a matter within the Queries, the YM shifted from a negative model of legislation to a positive model of encouraging ‘every member to examine himself to see whether he acts in a way consistent with the principles of the Christian religion.’<sup>137</sup> Although changes in Discipline lagged behind what happened in the YM in actual practice, the process can really be seen, in a larger overview, to be symbolically culminating in 1947, with the end of the Department of Public Morals. If attempts at establishing public morality can, in a sense, be cast as similar to social outreach programmes along the lines of humanitarian relief work and missions, then this decline in relying on legislated morality in favour of a more Christian responsible-living framework represents another example of change. In no longer emphasising behavioural codes, the YM can be seen as slowly moving out of a fundamentalist mindset.

Much like the conclusions drawn from the changing philosophy towards relief work and missions, no sudden hard shift towards widespread neo-evangelicalism is indicated at the corporate level just because of the demise of legislated morality programmes like temperance. Any one of these three shifts on its own would not constitute sufficient evidence to justify the claims in this section. Rather, the accumulated effect of these minor changes is enough evidence only to suggest that fundamentalism was largely in decline at the corporate level after 1947. The mentality replacing it can be

---

<sup>137</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1970*, 71.

seen partly in the aforementioned renewal of world engagement and in humanitarianism, but, even more so, in the broad ecumenism and increased tolerance towards evangelical modernists in the YM, which is discussed below. In the next section, I review the major event that represents an internal shift in OYM towards the neo-evangelical typology.

### **Gathering Evangelical Friends Together**

In the 1940s, two competing organisations sprang up in evangelical Protestant America. Both new entities were partly in response to the perceived growing liberalism of the Federal Council of Churches, but each of the new agencies handled this concern differently. First, in 1942, the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) was formed by a group of progressive evangelicals trying to distance themselves simultaneously from past fundamentalism and from growing theological liberalism.<sup>138</sup> The NAE took a more inclusivist route and did not restrict membership to those individuals who were attached to denominations holding membership in the FCC. The NAE sought to maintain a supernatural orthodoxy, but they also, ‘desired to bring the gospel they preached into creative contact with American society.’<sup>139</sup> The second new agency, the American Council of Christian Churches, formed in 1941, was a fundamentalist entity which did not allow membership from those denominations who had not separated from the FCC. The American Council even made membership in the NAE grounds for exclusion.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Adrio König, ‘Evangelical Theology’, in *Initiation into Theology*, ed. Simon Maimela and Adrio König (Pretoria, JL van Schaik Publisher, 1998): 91. See also, Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 228.

<sup>139</sup> König, ‘Evangelical Theology’, 91.

<sup>140</sup> Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (Paris: Mouton and Co. 1963), 26.

These agencies, then, each represent one of the two competing views offered to evangelical denominations during the 1940s, while they both shared a similar evangelical theological base. The choice of which agency each denomination chose to associate with is indicative of the worldview embraced by that denomination.

By 1944, OYM was quick to align itself with the NAE. Although not a charter member, by 1944, the YM started to have representatives attending the annual NAE gatherings,<sup>141</sup> and, by the end of that same year, the YM had completed steps to affiliate itself with the NAE officially.<sup>142</sup> In 1945, OYM revised its Discipline and included the NAE Statement of Faith as the minimum standard for affiliate membership in OYM.<sup>143</sup> The annual YM sessions show that, in the following years, regular space and time is given to NAE reports and funds are regularly sent to support NAE causes.

In addition to joining the broad NAE movement of the 1940s, OYM also sought to establish a similar association of like-minded members within the Society of Friends who shared evangelical essentials, but may or may not always agree on proper methods of fulfilling the Great Commission or on the exact nature of Biblical inspiration. In order to understand this shift within OYM, we must first, briefly, go back to 1927.

In 1927, Edward Mott, building on the momentum of the success of the previous year in separating OYM from FYM, organised a conference for separatist Orthodox Quakers in Cheyenne, Wyoming. Mott specifically wanted to address three issues: 1) the

---

<sup>141</sup> Frederick B. Baker, 'Group Attends National Association of Evangelicals', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 23 no. 5 (May 1944): 2.

<sup>142</sup> 'National Association of Evangelicals', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 23 no. 11 (December 1944): 12, 15.

<sup>143</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1945*, 110.

promulgation of missionaries, 2) the problem of a safe and adequate education for Friends' youth – particularly focused on having Quaker colleges adopt an aggressive stand for revivalist holiness as a second definite work of grace, and 3) the establishment of a Quaker periodical, which would offer a faithful expression of the doctrines and standards, as held by the evangelical Friends in America.<sup>144</sup> While the conference had an ambitious set of goals, the proceedings had minimal impact on the fundamentalist isolationist culture within evangelical Friends as a whole. Only eleven people made the journey to Cheyenne.<sup>145</sup>

Instead, we see a pattern of separation similar to Oregon's separation from FYM occur in three other Gurneyite YMs, as they adopted similar isolationist tendencies. Starting in 1924, a two year fundamentalist exodus started from Indiana Yearly Meeting and Western Yearly Meeting because some Friends perceived FYM (and its leaders) to be unsound on issues of Orthodoxy. This led to the formation of Central Yearly Meeting.<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> Calvin Choate, 'The Cheyenne Conference of 1927', *Concern* vol. 4 no. 4 (October 1963): 9-12. See also, Milo C. Ross, 'Recollections of conversations between Edward Mott and Milo Ross concerning the first evangelical conference held in Cheyenne, Wyoming, 1927', *Concern* vol. 4 no. 4 (October 1963): 15-17. See also, Edward Mott, 'The Cheyenne Conference', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 3 (April 1947): 2, 10, 16 and Edward Mott, 'The Objectives of the Conference', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 4 (May 1947): 1, 15, 16.

<sup>145</sup> In the 1930s, the Great Depression forced Mott to postpone future conferences. Another attempt was made in 1942 to hold a conference in Colorado Springs, but it fell through due to difficulties of travel during the Second World War. In April of 1946 a group met in Cleveland, OH and put together detailed plans for such a conference to be held in 1947. See Arthur O. Roberts, *The Association of Evangelical Friends: A Story of Quaker Renewal in the twentieth century* (Newberg OR: The Barclay Press, 1975) 1. See also, 'A Conference of Evangelicals Friends', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 9 (October 1946): 15.

<sup>146</sup> Thomas D. Hamm, "Friends United Meeting and its Identity: An Interpretative History", *Quaker Life* (January/February 2009): 4. Central Yearly Meeting is in need of further academic study. Dandelion refers to it as a holiness YM, but he means this in the sense that it appears to be most related to the late nineteenth-century Holiness Movement among evangelicals. This author has included them as a possible fundamentalist YM, however, because they demonstrated similar behaviour to this author's

In California Yearly Meeting, in 1931, a large fundamentalist conservative group of Friends in Huntington Park Monthly Meeting submitted a proposal to the Yearly Meeting (their third such proposal in six years) requesting withdrawal from FYM.

We feel prayerfully led to once more write you regarding the matter of which we communicated with you 5<sup>th</sup> month 12<sup>th</sup> 1925 and 5<sup>th</sup> month 8<sup>th</sup> 1929, wherein we request you to take the proper steps to withdraw from all affiliation with the Five Year's Meeting.<sup>147</sup>

This request was followed by a litany of charges against FYM and its leadership.

Although the request came via Whittier Quarterly Meeting, it was sent to the Yearly Meeting 'without recommendation'. A special committee was assigned to consider the charges and the request was denied:

The Committee appointed by your direction to consider the charges preferred by Huntington Park Monthly Meeting against the Five Years Meeting, feels persuaded that nothing useful can be gained by investigating this subject save only as it bears definite relationship to the present appeal of Huntington Park Monthly Meeting.<sup>148</sup>

Although the YM did not separate from FYM at this time, the Ministry and Oversight Committee passed a lengthy resolution to be sent to FYM citing many of the same tenets previously mentioned.<sup>149</sup> Under the leadership of staunch fundamentalist Quakers, like

---

definition of fundamentalism (i.e. forming their own Bible College to combat the inroads of modernism at Earlham College, world-rejecting isolation and ecumenically separating from FYM). Their extensive mission work (also in Bolivia) also needs further academic study to help determine the motivations of the YM's social ethic. To this day, Central Yearly Meeting has never joined a larger umbrella organisation and operates independently. However, many of Central YM's individual members did seek involvement with the Association of Evangelical Friends (discussed in more detail below). For Dandelion's claims, see Pink Dandelion, *An Introduction to Quakerism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 165-166.

<sup>147</sup> *California Yearly Meeting Minutes-1931* (Whittier, CA: California Yearly Meeting of Friends Church, 1931), minute 9, page 7-8. The proposal was also supported by resolutions from Bell, Montebello, Earlham and San Diego Monthly Meetings. See Choate, 'The Cheyenne Conference', 9-12.

<sup>148</sup> *California Yearly Meeting Minutes-1931*, m. 27, p. 14.

<sup>149</sup> *California Yearly Meeting Minutes-1931*, m. 55, p 26-27.

William Kirby,<sup>150</sup> several hundred Friends left California Yearly Meeting (and Friends altogether) over their disillusionment with the YM's failure to act with greater resolve.<sup>151</sup>

In Kansas Yearly Meeting, in 1936, both Beaver Quarterly Meeting and Haviland Quarterly Meeting sent in requests that their Yearly Meeting sever ties with FYM. The issues cited were the same as those given by Kansas in the early 1920s.<sup>152</sup> The proposal was postponed for one year and, in 1937, five more Quarterly Meetings sent in similar requests. The proposal was then approved and Kansas YM officially separated from FYM.<sup>153</sup>

Thus, by the 1940s, there were four independent staunchly evangelical Gurneyite Yearly Meetings in America: Ohio (which never joined FYM in the first place because it was perceived to be insufficiently evangelical), Central, Oregon and Kansas. That these four independent Yearly Meetings never sought ecumenical collaboration or any sort of broad alliance with each other prior to the 1940s is indicative of the insular practices prevalent in the evangelical wing of the Society up to that point. Even though these independent YMs all shared common worldviews, such independence and isolationism (even amongst themselves) represents fundamentalist norms. Mott admitted that this sectional spirit got in the way of larger collaboration in the Friends Church.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> Fred Gavitt as told to the author, 'Impressions of The Cheyenne Conference', *Concern*, vol. 4 no 4 (October 1963): 12-15.

<sup>151</sup> Hamm, 'Friends United Meeting', 14. California YM would eventually separate from FYM, but not until 1993.

<sup>152</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1936* (Wichita, KS: Kansas Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1919), minute 6, page 6-7.

<sup>153</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1937*, m. 6 & 46, p 6-7 & 31.

Towards the middle of the twentieth-century, however, these four independent meetings, along with factions of evangelical groupings and individuals within other YMs, sought a greater identity and collaboration with each other around the evangelical mantra. In June 1947, a conference of evangelical Friends was held in Colorado Springs. Over 150 Quakers gathered, with nine Yearly Meetings represented. In addition to the four independent YMs, attendees also came from California YM, Indiana YM, Iowa YM, Nebraska YM and Western YM.<sup>155</sup> The conference marked a significant turning point in evangelical Quakerism, as many of the attendees and presenters called for a renewal of evangelical thought, based on a positive outlook, as well as sought to create a sense of unity among like-minded Friends to replace past divisiveness and isolation.<sup>156</sup> Edward Mott, aged 81, offered two papers at the conference and served as a kind of ‘beloved elder statesman’.<sup>157</sup> His talk during the opening session focused on the evangelical roots of the Religious Society of Friends and the transforming power of evangelical faith.<sup>158</sup> Mott lived for another eight years after the 1947 conference, passing on in 1955.<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> For a more detailed account of Edward Mott’s perception of the 1927 Cheyenne Conference and the attitudes of the Independent YMs, see Milo Ross’s account entitled ‘Recollections of conversations between Edward Mott and Milo Ross concerning the first evangelical conference held in Cheyene, Wyo., 1927’. Written in 1963 and located in Arthur Roberts papers – Box 2, folder 2.1.1, GFUA.

<sup>155</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 12-14.

<sup>156</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 2-3, 12-14.

<sup>157</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 13.

<sup>158</sup> Edward Mott, *Sixty Years of Gospel Ministry* (OR: Printed, 1948), 133-152.

<sup>159</sup> Although Mott lived until the mid 1950’s and was still respected within the evangelical community as an ‘elder statesman’, he does not appear to have had much involvement or influence in the life of OYM after the mid-1940’s. In 1945, Edward Mott’s twenty year tenure as YM Clerk came to an end. No reason is stated in the minutes as to why this change occurred and Mott received a standing vote of thanks (motion offered by Carl Miller, who had offered the same motion for Levi Pennington twenty years earlier). It is not stated whether the leadership shift was at Mott’s request or not, but he did express a desire to the YM that he might still be of service to OYM in some capacity. Likewise, in 1947, Mott discontinued



While many of the other conference presentations were also about establishing, or reasserting, the Quaker evangelical position, we also find the first formal indictment, by evangelical Quakers as a body, against the social ethic of their fundamentalist forebears. Herald Mickelson (Friends Church pastor in Portland, Oregon) gave a paper entitled ‘Are We Good Samaritans?’ Quoting heavily from Carl F. H. Henry’s *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, Mickelson said:

We have various types of people in the world today. There is the ‘do-nothing’ type who are not trying to do anything to make the world a better place to live. There are the ‘social gospel’ groups who are only interested in efforts from a humanitarian purpose. Then there are the ‘evangelical groups’ who should face the challenges before them but who have mainly evaded the claims of social service. Surely no true evangelical Friend can help but be touched by the difficulties and sorrows that are facing mankind today. We need today an evangelistic social passion like the early Friends who spared not their own comforts... It is our responsibility to put evangelistic spirit into our social service programs. The gospel is good news.<sup>160</sup>

Mickelson’s paper was well-received<sup>161</sup> and marked a turning point towards encouraging evangelical Friends to live out their evangelical theology with a broad and generous social ethic. Certainly, evangelism and salvation were still central characteristics of their

---

writing the main editorial in the *Northwest Friend*. Again, no reason is stated for his diminishing leadership role within the YM, though he was an octogenarian who had had significant health issues in his life. I suspect that Mott’s age and health played a dual role in first moving him out of the role of dominating the YM’s corporate life, while, also, granting him the sort of respect due a champion of the faith in his final years. Mott does not comment anywhere on the changing identity of the YM from fundamentalism towards neo-evangelism, though it would be somewhat premature to grant Mott such hindsight, as he died early in the process of change. His last book, *Sixty Years of Gospel Ministry*, written in 1948, is more concerned with historical analysis than identifying future trends.

<sup>160</sup> Herald Mickelson, ‘Are We Good Samaritans?’ Conference paper presented at the 1947 gathering of evangelical Friends, June 25-29, 1947, Colorado Springs. Reprinted in *Evangelical Conference Report*, p 36-40. Located in Arthur Roberts’ papers, GFUA. Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

<sup>161</sup> The conference paper was reprinted in full in the *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 10 (January 1948): 6-9.

activism,<sup>162</sup> but engagement in real world issues was also starting to be addressed again on a corporate level.

Out of this conference a loose conglomerate of like-minded evangelical Quakers eventually formed The Association of Evangelical Friends (AEF), which marked the first official ongoing collaboration across evangelical YMs in America. Arthur Roberts, who was in attendance at the conference, and later wrote a brief history of the AEF, says, ‘I recall feeling that it was in the nature of a super yearly meeting, a kind of rally of “those of like precious faith.”’<sup>163</sup> The concluding utterance of the conference showed a new unity around the historic vision of evangelical Quakerism:

We, as Evangelical Friends, assembled in conference at Colorado Springs, Colorado, June 25-29, 1947, do re-affirm our faith in the body of evangelical truths – the historic faith of Friends as set forth by George Fox in his letter to the Governor of Barbadoes, and as stated in the Richmond Declaration of Faith, issued in 1887.<sup>164</sup>

By 1956, an official constitution for the AEF was developed with Gerald Dillon (pastor of Friends Church in Portland, Oregon) named as the first president.<sup>165</sup> By 1959, an official organ (*Concern*) was being published (edited by OYM Quaker Arthur Roberts and published by the OYM publishing house, The Barclay Press).<sup>166</sup> More than just a Quaker association with an evangelical polity, the formation of the AEF reflected an intentional move away from the sectarian divisions among Friends in the 1920s and

---

<sup>162</sup> Even Mickelson would advocate in his paper that, ‘The world’s greatest problem today as it always has been since the fall of man is that of deliverance of man from sin.’ See Mickelson, ‘Are We Good Samaritans?’ 36.

<sup>163</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 14.

<sup>164</sup> Statement printed in Mott, *Sixty Years*, 153.

<sup>165</sup> *Report of Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*, held in Denver Colorado, July 11-15, p 44-48. Archive located in Arthur Roberts Papers, GFUA. Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

<sup>166</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 3.

1930s. The leaders of the AEF sought to reshape the evangelical apologetic within the Society to one that was far more world-engaging. Paralleling developments in the National Association of Evangelicals and their efforts to bring Protestant Christianity out of the clutches of fundamentalist separatists, AEF fashioned itself as a progressive orthodox Quaker organisation. AEF was still evangelistic in scope, but marked a definite trend away from evangelical Quakerism as a minority protest group within the larger Religious Society of Friends in America, into a more unified and recognised movement. The 1956 AEF constitution captures this shift:

The purpose of this organization shall be to promote the fellowship of the Gospel among all Friends. This we aim to do by achieving through organization the following objectives:

1. To provide fellowship and inspiration among those of like precious faith.
2. To make articulate the united voice of evangelical Friends in all current issues pertaining to doctrine and life, encouraging all who bear the name of Friends to a positive declaration of the Gospel of Christ.
3. To provide a possible means of association, interchange of concerns and cooperative promotion of the evangelical Friends service in the areas such as mission, evangelism, education, publication, youth work, relief, and peace.
4. To promote among all Friends the sense of Christian responsibility for active participation in the speedy evangelization of the world...<sup>167</sup>

For twenty-three years from 1947, the Association of Evangelical Friends provided the leadership and bureaucratic structure necessary to restate the evangelical position among Friends and to become a rallying point for the evangelical movement. One of the biggest shifts was expressed in the changing social ethic of the Friends

---

<sup>167</sup> Constitution of Association of Evangelical Friends, adopted July 13, 1956. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. Archive located in Arthur Roberts Papers, GFUA. Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

Church. At the 1956 conference, AEF president Gerald Dillon spoke in accord with Mickelson's comments from nine years earlier:

There are some programs of relief and social action with which we are in sharp opposition. But, we need more than a negative program and stand. We need a positive approach and program of relief and social action from an evangelistic point of view, an approach that honors our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.<sup>168</sup>

Three years later, AEF conference (held in Newberg, Oregon) was entirely focused on the theme of 'Relief and Social Action Among Evangelical Friends'.<sup>169</sup> Thus, the Association became an important – though relatively brief – conduit by which the Friends Church moved away from fundamentalism.

By 1970, due to a rising perception that the Association's mission to bring renewal to the evangelical emphasis within the Society had been largely accomplished, and due to a perceived greater ecumenical collaboration across of spectrum of Friends, the Association was disbanded, with the *Concern* having been discontinued a few years earlier.<sup>170</sup> Roberts sees the ongoing history of the Association as 'the ascendancy of a center party among Quakers and a shift away from the strong polarities of the 1920s and 1930s'.<sup>171</sup>

It may seem easy to challenge the use of the AEF as evidence supporting the claim that a fundamentalist culture was diminishing across OYM and in several other

---

<sup>168</sup> Gerald W. Dillon, 'What of the Future?' Speech given at the 1956 AEF conference. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. Archive located in Arthur Roberts Papers, GFUA. Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>170</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 45-48. In 1963, the Evangelical Friends Alliance (EFA) was formed as a separate organisation and now serves as an umbrella structure for evangelically minded Quakers. In 1967 the EFA resumed publication of the *Evangelical Friend* as its official organ. See Appendix for a broader discussion of the EFA.

<sup>171</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 1.

independent YMs during the 1940s. It is true that those involved in the Association's life were not any more tolerant of unsound views or liberal modernism than earlier generations of evangelical Friends. Like fundamentalists, neo-evangelicals were still opposed to any theology that moved away from a perceived evangelical base. Likewise, the Bible was still held in high regard as the source of all truth and evangelism would dominate much of the Association's focus.<sup>172</sup> It was an association of like-minded evangelicals, after-all, and orthodox positions were generally assumed.

What is important to emphasise, though, as it relates to this study, is the inclusion of, and openness towards, evangelical modernists; anathema to fundamentalists. Membership in AEF was not exclusive to just individuals within those YMs that had separated from FYM.<sup>173</sup> Rather, a large number of participants came from YMs still tied to FYM. While the Association was formed within an evangelical framework, it was a framework that allowed for a variety of orthopraxy. Differing viewpoints on issues such as Wesleyan Holiness and biblical literalism were openly tolerated and discussed,<sup>174</sup> while leading neo-evangelical Quakers pushed for more dialogue and collaboration with

---

<sup>172</sup> The 1954 AEF conference, held in Oskaloosa, Iowa from June 30-July 4, appears to have been intentionally entirely geared around evangelism, with nine of the fourteen papers specifically focused on the topic. See *Report of the Third Conference of Evangelical Friends in America*. Archive located in Arthur Roberts' papers, GFUA. Box #2, Folder 2.1.1.

<sup>173</sup> The charter list of membership includes 495 names representing the following YMs: Oregon, Indiana, California, Iowa, Central, Ohio, Kansas, Rocky Mountain, Nebraska, Wilmington, Canada, and New York. See Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 22.

<sup>174</sup> When objections were made to the parts of the AEF constitution that included the word 'infallible' in reference to biblical interpretation, and to the word 'instant' in regards to sanctification, both words were clarified by the AEF president (Gerald Dillon – who was also Pastor at First Friends Church in Portland, Oregon) as having a 'broad interpretation' and that membership was not contingent on a narrow interpretation. Likewise, Arthur Roberts argues that the AEF developed a far more inclusive view of Christian holiness than that of the early twentieth century Wesleyan formulation – something he largely attributes to camp meetings and the Bible School movement. See Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 20-22.

those Friends who merely differed on matters of Scripture as opposed to those who denied Christ as Saviour.<sup>175</sup> Thus, by the 1959 AEF conference, Everett Cattell articulated the culmination of a radical shift within the evangelical wing of the Society. Recognising that past divisions within the Society were a tragedy, he suggested the following five point solution (paraphrased):

- 1) that liberals recognize evangelicals as a legitimate and important part of the church and the Quaker movement,
- 2) that evangelicals recognize that liberals<sup>176</sup> who have not denied Christ and who claim Him as Savior are to be accepted as Christians and to be loved and held in regard as Christian brethren.
- 3) that there be greater willingness to continue to dialogue on a consultative basis, while working separately in different fields of actions,
- 4) that evangelicals take the time for wider consultation,
- 5) that liberals refrain from actions that would compromise the convictions of evangelical Friends, while evangelical Friends let love rule and be tender with liberal Friends concerning matters of conscience, in private and in corporate actions.<sup>177</sup>

Thus, while evangelical modernists found acceptance within AEF, the theological liberal modernists still did not. Roberts' paper at the 1956 conference ('Significant Doctrinal Trends Affecting Friends') was entirely devoted to the liberal and secular trend of

---

<sup>175</sup> Everett L. Cattell, 'Passion for Unity: A Critical Survey of Contemporary Quakerdom'. Speech given at the 1959 gathering of the Association of Evangelical Friends in Newberg, Oregon. Reprinted in *Concern*, vol. I, no. 3 (Fall 1959): 16.

<sup>176</sup> Cattell is fairly clear in his paper that he thought of 'liberals' as falling into two groups, 'At one extreme end stands the humanist and the syncretist. At the other extreme end stands the man who believes everything held by the evangelical except his high view of inspiration.' In some ways, this author's classification of 'evangelical modernist' and 'theologically liberal modernist,' provides a somewhat better differentiation between the two groups. Cattell used the word 'liberal' interchangeably to describe both groups. His Point 2 above, then, is his attempt to divide the 'liberal' classification into similar sub-groupings. See Cattell, '*Passion of Unity*', 4.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*

modernism away from orthodoxy.<sup>178</sup> Thus, a marked feature of the mid-century neo-evangelical Quakers was their discontinuation of the double-separation tendency. This change, coupled with a call for being ‘tender with one another’ compared to the sometimes truculent nature of the militant exclusivity of erstwhile fundamentalism, shows an important shift occurring within the Friends Church. These changes all parallel attitudinal changes also occurring in such organisations as NAE.

The heavy influence of OYM on the creation and ongoing operations of AEF suggests that, once again, it lead the way forward in this shift, making it an important case study in understanding evangelical Quakerism during the twentieth-century.

### **A Settled Division**

The final issues with AFSC at the mid-century point were a little more nuanced. In 1947, the Religious Society of Friends won the Nobel Peace Prize. It was the third time that century they had been nominated for this prestigious award.<sup>179</sup> The award was split between American Friends Service Committee in the States and the Friends Service Council in Britain. Henry Cadbury was selected to travel to Norway and receive the prize on behalf of AFSC.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>178</sup> Arthur Roberts, ‘Significant Doctrinal Trends Affecting Friends’, paper given at the 1956 AEF conference, Denver, Colorado, June 11-15. Reprinted in the *Report of the Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. Archive located in Arthur Roberts Paper, GFUA. Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

<sup>179</sup> The first coming for their relief work after the First World War and the second coming in the 1930s for their assistance to refugees from Hitlerism. Irwin Abrams, *The Nobel Peace Prize and the Laureates: An Illustrated Biographical History, 1901-2001*. (Nantucket Massachusetts, Science History Publications, 2001), 159

<sup>180</sup> Margaret Hope Bacon, *Let this Life Speak: The Legacy of Henry Joel Cadbury* (PN: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 147.

There was no official action taken by Oregon at the Yearly Meeting level to honour this Nobel Prize, although the actual award was on display for a period of time at the Oregon AFSC branch.<sup>181</sup> In a second period of renewed American patriotism after World War II and the rising Cold War, AFSC was perceived as moving towards militant neo-liberalism and anti-American activities. It helped matters little when AFSC gave their portion of the Nobel Prize money to efforts to improve Soviet/U.S. relations.<sup>182</sup>

After the war, a new breed of worker was drawn to AFSC by its social testimony, but not compelled by any sort of inward Christological transformation. Whereas, during its first thirty years, AFSC was loosely viewed as still operating within the perceived revelation of what it meant to its members to be Quaker, by mid-century, many moderate and conservative evangelical Friends questioned what was still 'Quakerly' about the organisation. In the decade to come less than 15% of the people working for AFSC were Friends.<sup>183</sup> Many who worked for AFSC did not see their actions as extensions of a core religious belief, but were drawn to the agency for its pacific and humanitarian impulse, and they held no religious belief whatsoever. Most of AFSC's donations now came from non-Friends sources.<sup>184</sup>

Exactly a year after the Nobel Prize was awarded to AFSC, the *Northwest Friend* ran an editorial calling into question the Christian nature of the organisation and reminding people that its 'relief work is not done in the name of Christ' and that 'it has no testimony on the saving grace of our Lord.' The article concluded:

---

<sup>181</sup> No author noted, 'Nobel Award to be Shown', *Newberg Graphic* vol. LIX (April 8, 1948).

<sup>182</sup> Abrams, *Nobel Peace Prize*, 161.

<sup>183</sup> Thomas Hamm, *The Quakers in America* (NY: Columbia University Press, 2003), 175.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*



Oregon Yearly Meeting still has on its books a testimony against this policy of the American Friends Service Committee. It is not likely that it will change its attitude until there is radical change within the Committee itself, and it ceases to be controlled by a liberal element that has no sympathy with our evangelical standards.<sup>185</sup>

Levi Pennington, who had retired from Pacific College seven years previously, quickly sent a letter to AFSC General Secretary, Clarence Pickett, challenging him to clarify the truthfulness of the editorial in the *Northwest Friend*. Despite the many letters shared by these two men over the years, showing mutual understanding and support, this particular letter is quite direct and short: ‘Would it be impertinent to ask, is this true? Does this committee [AFSC] do its work in the name of Christ, or does it not?’<sup>186</sup> Given Pennington’s longstanding pro-AFSC stance and his historically open relationship with Pickett, his questioning seems out of place. It is likely that the post-war shifts within AFSC personnel exacerbated Pennington’s concern. Pickett responded to the allegations within two weeks saying, ‘My answer is that it [AFSC] does work in the name of Christ. If it were not for His spirit in the hearts of men and women who have put in a great many years of service with the Committee, the work would never have been done.’ Pickett did clarify that ‘some workers are far less effective than others in this field of evangelism’, but stressed that, ‘Almost every worker who comes back states as his primary concern the deep spiritual need of the country which he has served.’<sup>187</sup>

Sensing perhaps another opportunity to revisit the discussions of 1938 and 1940, Pennington forwarded the letter to Joseph Reece, the new Superintendent of Oregon

---

<sup>185</sup> Ray Carter, ‘What about the AFSC?’ *Northwest Friend* vol. 7 no. 2 (December 1948): 2.

<sup>186</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter to Clarence E. Pickett, dated December 15, 1948. GFUA. Section FA-4, file labeled ‘American Friends Service Committee’.

<sup>187</sup> Clarence Pickett, personal letter to Levi Pennington, dated December 29, 1948. GFUA. Section FA-4, file labeled ‘American Friends Service Committee’.

Yearly Meeting.<sup>188</sup> Reece had earlier spoken in favour of the function and benefit of AFSC during the 1939 called meeting of the Permanent Board. He also was one of the three authors of the 'minority report' sent out about Emmett Gulley's rehiring at Pacific College. Pennington's letter to Reece was awkwardly written, framing the issue in reverse, asking Reece to imagine it was he who was in the role of AFSC. Whatever Pennington hoped to gain through this odd writing style, never materialised probably due more to the messenger than the message. Although he never wavered in his own evangelical theological convictions, he had been the *de facto* leader of a losing party during the tenuous debates in the 1920s and 1930s. In a time of positive neo-evangelical renewal, Pennington's reminder of past conflicts probably received little attention. Despite a renewal of neo-evangelicalism, which was in so many ways in line with Pennington's ideology, after his retirement Pennington was able to shape the Yearly Meeting's ideology less and less and this was a situation which often led to feelings of emptiness for him.<sup>189</sup>

In the end, nothing more was done by the Yearly Meeting at that time to follow up on Pennington's concerns. Pennington continued to be involved in international and peace initiatives for the rest of his life. As he aged, many of the old polarities passed and he received some recognition for his life-long service to the college, the YM and the Newberg community.<sup>190</sup> The publication of his auto-biographical ruminations in 1967,<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>188</sup> Levi Pennington, personal letter to Joseph Reece, dated January 5, 1949. GFUA. Section FA-4, file labeled 'American Friends Service Committee'.

<sup>189</sup> Donald McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker: Levi T. Pennington* (OR: Barclay Press, 1980), 157.

<sup>190</sup> McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker*, 117-155.

<sup>191</sup> Pennington, *Rambling Recollections*.

however, re-opened old scars and he received an official rebuke of sorts from the YM leadership at the time.<sup>192</sup> Pennington lived until 1975, passing-on just a few months shy of 100 years of age.<sup>193</sup>

Clarence Pickett retired from AFSC in 1950, taking on the title of Honorary Secretary – a position which did not appear to equate to any less responsibility or time commitment.<sup>194</sup> Pickett was replaced by 33 year old Lewis Hoskins, who had served as director of personnel with AFSC since 1949 and had spent three years serving with AFSC in China.<sup>195</sup> Prior to that, Hoskins had been an active member of Oregon Yearly Meeting and had served as Dean of the Pacific College History Department during the Gulley administration,<sup>196</sup> but he seemed to share none of the fundamentalist perspective of the YM. Rather, Hoskins had spent most of his adult life, up to this point, ‘answering the call to carry relief to stricken people in various parts of the world.’<sup>197</sup> Hoskins viewed the historical Quaker testimonies concerning social service as stemming more from a psychological impulse than from a theological source.<sup>198</sup> In some ways, Hoskins and Cadbury shared a similar ethical, rather than Christological, basis for humanitarian work.

---

<sup>192</sup> A corrective addendum, written by the YM leaders of the time, was inserted into the official copy of the book held at George Fox College library.

<sup>193</sup> McNichols, *Portrait of a Quaker*, 171.

<sup>194</sup> Lawrence McK. Miller, *Witness for Humanity: A Biography of Clarence E. Pickett* (PN: Pendle Hill, 1999), 275, Chapters 16, 17, 18.

<sup>195</sup> Miller, *Witness for Humanity*, 276.

<sup>196</sup> George H. Moore, ‘With Our College’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 24 no. 9 (October 1945): 14-15.

<sup>197</sup> Moore, ‘With Our College’, 14.

<sup>198</sup> Lewis Hoskins, personal letter to Roy Clampitt, dated April 7, 1950. AFSC archives, General Administration Communications and Organizations - 1950, file labeled ‘evangelical Friends’.

In 1954, the Oregon Yearly Meeting Executive Committee<sup>199</sup> sought both to reaffirm its Peace Testimony while simultaneously ensuring it was not connected with what was now being viewed as the increasingly left-wing activities of AFSC:

The question was presented to the Executive Committee at its mid-winter meeting as to what the Yearly Meeting's attitude should be relating to the use by our local meetings of American Friends Service Committee personnel and speakers sponsored by the said committee. There was a feeling of deep concern by the members of the Executive Committee.

After their discussion, the following statement was drafted:

The reasons for which our Yearly Meeting severed official relations with the American Friends Service Committee according to the 1938 Minutes, page 43, Minute 105, are the same today. Neither the status nor the attitudes of both the Service Committee and of Oregon Yearly Meeting have changed since that time.<sup>200</sup>

The following resolution was passed:

That all local meetings be advised to refrain from using any American Friends Service Committee personnel or A.F.S.C. sponsored or approved leadership, other than members of Oregon Yearly Meeting, in any services, or meetings, and that members of Oregon Yearly Meeting refrain from presenting in any way the work of the American Friends Service Committee. And we further advise that no local Meeting house be made available to the American Friends Service Committee. And that members of Oregon Yearly Meeting be discouraged from participating in any activity of the American Friends Service Committee.<sup>201</sup>

The resolution also encouraged all local meetings to 'strengthen their testimony and ministry on Peace and Social Service from the evangelical and Scriptural point of view' and included a request for additional funding for peace and social justice activities.<sup>202</sup> The

---

<sup>199</sup> This was the new name of the Permanent Board.

<sup>200</sup> 1954 Mid-Winter Executive Committee Minutes regarding the American Friends Service Committee. GFUA. Box labeled 'Dean and Fred Gregory's Collection' file labeled 'A.F.S.C. Correspondence up to Sept. 1. 1956'.

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.*

resolution was presented and approved by the Yearly Meeting during its next annual session.<sup>203</sup>

New Yearly Meeting Superintendent, Dean Gregory, sent Hoskins a copy of the above resolution, with this added special clarification:

It is with the most profound and heartfelt regret that the Executive Committee has felt, after these observations to be true, that we find no other alternative than to make such a statement and clarification. Our hearts are left to suffer because of the distance observed between the conscientious practice of early Friends and present day service expressions.<sup>204</sup>

Hoskins took almost a year to respond fully, saying, 'I acknowledged your letter of August 27, 1954 earlier, but it deserves a more considered reply.' Hoskins' two page response can best be summed up with the following quote:

It seems to me that the crux of the discontent indicated in the actions of 1938 and 1954 is the feeling that the AFSC is not sufficiently evangelical, that our good works are not obviously enough done in the name of Christ... We feel we are evangelical in the broad and deep sense of the word. Our formulation may appear more indirect or diffuse than you would like. I am convinced that our own experience justifies this approach for us by the standard of effectiveness: that of souls awakened. We find that some people can best be reached this way. We aim to witness by service in the spirit and character of Christ, so far as we are able to infuse our work with His way.<sup>205</sup>

Nothing more was done about the relationship of OYM to AFSC officially and the 1938, 1940 and 1954 decisions still exist to this day as the formal Oregon Yearly Meeting

---

<sup>202</sup> *OYM Minutes*-1954, m. 14, p. 6-7.

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>204</sup> Personal letter from Dean Gregory to Lewis Hoskins dated August 27, 1954. GFUA. Box labeled 'Dean and Fred Gregory's Collection' file labeled 'A.F.S.C. Correspondence up to Sept. 1. 1956'.

<sup>205</sup> Personal letter from Lewis Hoskins to Dean Gregory dated June 30, 1955. GFUA. Box labeled 'Dean and Fred Gregory's Collection' file labeled 'A.F.S.C. Correspondence up to Sept. 1. 1956'.

policy regarding AFSC.<sup>206</sup> Although there had been an increase in collaboration between OYM and AFSC during WWII, the perceived radical shifts in the AFSC ideology and personnel after the war caused OYM to abandon the relationship.

In addition to OYM, other YMs began to express concern over the changing underlying movement in AFSC towards perceived left-wing activities. In addition to California YM also severing its ties to AFSC, similar feelings were expressed in Iowa, Indiana and North Carolina Yearly Meetings.<sup>207</sup> After the mid-century point, OYM, along with other YMs, put their energies into other avenues and pursued expressions of their own neo-evangelical convictions regarding service to others primarily through the National Association of Evangelicals and Evangelical Friends Alliance.<sup>208</sup> Likewise, AEF continued to keep social concern on the front burner in the evangelical mindset. The choice of conference sessions given and the topics discussed strongly suggest that a steady humanitarian-based impulse continued among evangelical Friends during these years, despite their rejection of AFSC.<sup>209</sup> For Oregon Friends, battling the perceived

---

<sup>206</sup> Although Gregory did clarify that, 'recommendations adopted by the Yearly Meeting are not edicts but advice.' Personal letter from Dean Gregory to Lewis Hoskins dated August 27, 1954. GFUA. Box labeled 'Dean and Fred Gregory's Collection' file labeled 'A.F.S.C. Correspondence up to Sept. 1. 1956'.

<sup>207</sup> Guenter Lewy, *Peace and Revolution: The Moral Crisis of American Pacifism* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 42.

<sup>208</sup> See Appendix for a fuller discussion on EFA.

<sup>209</sup> During the 1950 AEF conference, Harold Kuhn offered a paper suggesting that Friends 'explore the possibility of some such programs, which will aim at laying the foundation for the rehabilitation of some of Expellees in Germany itself.' The paper generated significant discussion sparking attendees to ask both, 'How can we put evangelical content in social work?' and, 'Is it possible to work within the framework of the American Friends Service Committee? Lewis Hoskins, who was in attendance, invited Evangelical Friends to work with AFSC. Over the years, while social work remained a higher priority for evangelical Friends, working with AFSC appears to be a minority expression. The 1959 AEF conference was entirely dedicated to 'Relief and Social Action'. During the 1962 AEF conference emphasis was put on the alternative service of the CO as, 'filling a need' contributing to 'national health and safety', and also, 'giving a cup of cold water in Christ's name.' Likewise, an entire workshop at the conference was

growing ultra-liberalism and secularism within the AFSC leadership no longer held their attention.

### **Institutes of Evangelical Academia**

At Pacific College they seemed to be heading for a new era under this neo-evangelical paradigm, too. After Emmett Gulley resigned from Pacific College, George Moore failed to raise the promised funds necessary to increase faculty salary or to secure the promised number of Ph.D. professors. He was eventually officially chastised by the Board for overstepping his bounds:

The majority opinion of the Ex. Com. was that he had taken upon himself too many of the activities more properly belonging to the Board's Faculty Committee as well as some matters of personnel which should have been handled by the President. He was directed to concentrate on financial matters except as the Faculty Com. or Ex. Com. might approve or request his assistance on other matters.<sup>210</sup>

Moore resigned that summer from his role at Pacific College and went on to get his own Ph. D.<sup>211</sup> By the middle of the summer, with no president in place, Gervas Carey (the new

---

given to 'Social Concern', with the decision that, 'the local church group must begin now to do a much better job in its own community of ministering fully to the needs of all persons.' See Harold Kuhn, 'Ministering to the Need in Europe', paper given the 1950 AEF gathering in Wichita, Kansas, June 21-25 and reprinted in *The Story of the Second American Conference of Evangelical Friends*. Archive material located in Arthur Roberts's Papers, GFUA. Box #2, Folder 2.1.1. See also, Gerald W. Dillon, 'What of the Future?' speech given at the 1956 AEF conference. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. Archive located in Arthur Roberts Papers, Box #2, folder 2.1.1. See also, Paul Langdon, 'Opportunities for C.O.'s', *Concern* (January 1963):25, See also, Wayne Conant, 'Social Concerns Workshop', *Concern*, (January 1963): 24.

<sup>210</sup> Pacific College Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, November 29, 1946. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes: May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

<sup>211</sup> Moore would later return to the college as Dean of the Faculty, passing on in 1985. See Kenneth Williams' memorial written on George Moore, dated August 1, 1985. GFUA. Section FR1, folder labeled, 'George Moore'.

Clerk of OYM<sup>212</sup>) was given the title of Acting President.<sup>213</sup> The aged Carey served for two years until his resignation in 1950.<sup>214</sup> During his tenure the institution changed its name to George Fox College,<sup>215</sup> mostly due to the efforts of Arthur Roberts, who became faculty at the college and was a well-respected rising star of neo-evangelical Quakerism.<sup>216</sup>

In 1954, after almost two years of leadership by an Administrative Committee instead of a President, Cascade College alumnus, Milo Ross, was offered the Presidency – a position he held for the next fourteen years. Beebe, who had simply called the years

---

<sup>212</sup> *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 18, p. 7-8.

<sup>213</sup> Pacific College Board Meeting Minutes for June 13, 1947. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes: May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

In August 1948, the Board and Carey corresponded with Walter Williams Jr. and got him to agree, initially, on a three year appointment as President, with the understanding that, 'at the end of that time, it would be mutually decided as to the continued service.' His tenure was scheduled to start a year later, on July 1, 1949. The entire plan, however, was contingent upon the University of Florida (where Williams was a serving faculty member) granting a three-year leave of absence, which it refused to do. See Pacific College Board of Managers Meeting Minutes, August 13, 1948. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes: May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'. See also Pacific College Board of Managers Meeting Minutes, September 12, 1948. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes: May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'. See also Pacific College Board of Managers Meeting Minutes, October 16, 1948. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes: May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

<sup>214</sup> George Fox College Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, February 10, 1950. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes: May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

<sup>215</sup> The change was mostly pragmatic as a myriad of other institutions and universities, particularly along the Western United States, had a similar name to Pacific College. While several possible names were considered - including Hoover College, Friends Pacific College, Friendswood College, Chehalem College, Newberg Friends College and Northwest Friends College – most credit the effort of Arthur Roberts for convincing the Board and the Yearly Meeting to change the name to George Fox College.

<sup>216</sup> By 1952, Roberts was so well respected within OYM that George Fox College sent a Board representative to meet him, while he was still in his doctoral training, to offer him a job as faculty at the school, 'We recommend that we take steps to secure Arthur O. Roberts as full time instructor or as part time instructor and member of the Administrative Committee. It was the feeling of the group that there was a place for Arthur Roberts at George Fox College.' See George Fox College Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, November 5, 1952. GFUA. Section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes: May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.



between Pennington and Ross the 'Interim Period'<sup>217</sup> at Pacific College, praises glowingly the new era beginning under President Ross and the closely related hiring of Arthur Roberts to the faculty:

The hiring of Ross and Roberts symbolizes the dual emphasis of the College in recent years: the increasing constituent support, along with a concentrated effort to strengthen the College academically. Both men were well-known and highly respected in Oregon Yearly Meeting and throughout Quakerdom. Both remained at George Fox many years, and were to see the school attain progress which had been unparalleled throughout its history. The imagination of the Yearly Meeting was to be stirred as it had not been for decades. The dominant theme was faith – faith in a work President Ross, the faculty, the board, and the yearly meeting constituents firmly believed to be the will of God.<sup>218</sup>

As a result of this renewed connection between George Fox College and OYM, there was no longer a need for an alternative institution offering biblical instruction such as North Pacific Evangelistic Institute (by then operating as Cascade College) once offered. Instead, during the remainder of the twentieth century, evangelical Quaker parents showed a greater willingness to send their youth to George Fox than had been evident in earlier eras. By the 1958-59 academic year, George Fox College had the highest percentage, by a large margin, of Friends students (in relation to its entire student population) of all the traditional Quaker liberal arts colleges in the U.S.<sup>219</sup> Partly related to this trend, by the 1960s, Cascade College was struggling for enrolment and, in 1969,

---

<sup>217</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 136.

<sup>218</sup> Beebe, *Garden of the Lord*, 146.

<sup>219</sup> Earlham College 28.7%, Friends University 12.9%, George Fox College (previously, Pacific College) 66.6%, Guilford College 18.5%, Haverford College 10.7%, Malone College (formerly, Cleveland Bible College) 20%, Swarthmore College 10%, Whittier College 5%, William Penn College 21.4%, Wilmington College 7.3%. See Wilmer A. Cooper, 'Shall Friends Train Their Own Leaders?' *American Friend*, vol. XLVII no. 23 (November 16, 1959): 361.

the institution officially discontinued operations.<sup>220</sup> Today, Oregon Yearly Meeting continues to name the majority of the board members to the George Fox University<sup>221</sup> trust.

The trend at George Fox University in the latter half of the century was similar to that unfolding in other evangelical Quaker colleges around the nation as Friends' schools tried to bring closure to the fundamentalist/modernist conflicts of the past. After Gulley's final resignation from Pacific College, the institution's organ, *Crescent*, ran the following opinion on the whole matter:

It is to be noted that such a movement is somewhat general among American Quakers, and has brought about recent changes in administrative policies and personnel in Friends University, William Penn

---

<sup>220</sup> In June of 1960 Cascade College became so similar to George Fox College in terms of its academic outlook that the two entities briefly discussed merging. The Board of George Fox College was fairly adamant, however, that the merged site be located at the Newberg Campus and Friends make up thirty seats on a proposed new forty-five seat board. Cascade College rebuffed the idea with a Board member writing back, 'I would not favor further negotiations, unless there is some evidence that these points are more flexible than the statements from George Fox College would seem to indicate.' In fairness to the Board of George Fox, it is unlikely the Yearly Meeting (which had legally protected claims regarding the number of trustees) would have agreed to any other terms. In 1968, Cascade College had its accreditation as a four-year liberal arts college revoked by the *Northwest Association of Secondary and High Schools*. In 1969, the college suddenly closed its doors. It was officially classified as a 'merger' with Seattle Pacific College – a Free Methodist college three hours north.

See letter written by Charles A. Beals, Secretary of George Fox College Board of Trustees to Mr. Ronald E. DeFresne, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Cascade College, dated June 14, 1960. Oregon Historical Society Archives. Box labeled, 'MSS 1417' file labeled 'Merger George Fox'. See also, General statement written by V.A. Ballantyne, Evangelical United Brethren Minister, undated. Oregon Historical Society Archives. Box labeled, 'MSS 1417' file labeled 'Merger George Fox'. See also, insert stapled into Cascade College Bulletin, Catalog issue 1968-1969, March-April 1968, 5. See also, Cascade to Terminate Eventful Era, Cascade College Bulletin vol. 39 no 6. Portland, Oregon. May- June 1969. p 1.

<sup>221</sup> In 1944, the OYM Board of Evangelism considered starting its own post-graduate seminary, but found it unfeasible at the time. By 1945, the YM became aware of an interdenominational plan to form the Western School of Evangelical Religion as the only holiness seminary west of the Kansas City, Missouri. In 1946, the school opened and gave OYM the rights to ten percent representation on the governing board, the trustees and the corporation. Additionally, the YM took responsibility to cover one-half of the salary of one of the institute's first faculty (Gerald Dillon, who was serving simultaneously as pastor of Hillsboro Friends Church). In 1996, the seminary officially merged with George Fox College, and thus it became George Fox University. See, 'Better Training for our Ministers and Missionaries', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 4 (May 1947): 6-7; Dean Gregory, 'Western School of Evangelical Religion', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 6 (December 1947): 6; 'Presenting WSER', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 27 no. 10 (December 1948): 5.

College, Earlham College, and Wilmington College, resulting in more decided religious emphasis and closer connection with church constituency. The general sentiment is that for a Quaker college to justify its existence, its educational program must contribute actively to the church.<sup>222</sup>

Much as Hamm credited many of the Quaker institutions and colleges of the nineteenth-century with providing the doorway for modernism to access the larger Religious Society of Friends,<sup>223</sup> Arthur Roberts credits many of the Quaker liberal arts colleges with providing the energy and force behind the neo-evangelical identity of the newly formed Association of Evangelical Friends, from the 1950s onwards.<sup>224</sup> Suggesting a resurgence, within the Society, of people who valued holistic pedagogical approaches within Christological frameworks, as well as a decline in the exclusivity and isolation of fundamentalist leaning Quaker Bible Schools, Roberts concludes:

This was an era of rapprochement between church and college, a time of moving away from the more limited curriculum of a Bible institute into the more extended curriculum of the Christian college, seeking to restore the holistic position that existed at the time of the uniting conferences, 1887 and 1902.<sup>225</sup>

While Roberts is correct in his conclusions, we see in his thinking some of the same tendencies found in Ralph Beebe's – the neo-evangelical interest in mollifying negative implications of past incidents by using a positive spin. Roberts mentions little of some of the questionable means by which the Quaker liberal arts colleges were brought back into

---

<sup>222</sup> 'Gulley Resigns', *Crescent*, vol. 30 no. 4 (November 18, 1946): 1

<sup>223</sup> Thomas Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907* (IN: Indiana University Press, 1988), 147-153, 166 – 167.

<sup>224</sup> Roberts specifically refers to, 'Byron Osborne and Everett Cattell of Malone; Scot T. Clark of Friends Bible and George Fox; Canby Jones of Wilmington; Charles Ball of Friends University and William Penn; Sheldon Jackson of Friends Bible College; Lowell Roberts, Verlin Hinshaw, and Stanley Brown of Friends University; Milo Ross, Myron Goldsmith, and Arthur Roberts of George Fox.' See Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 5.

<sup>225</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 6.

the fold of their respective YMs. The fact that YM Superintendent Joseph Reece intentionally created division at Pacific College (and in the Yearly Meeting) by co-writing the ‘minority report’ after the College Board re-hired Gulley in 1945,<sup>226</sup> is recast by Roberts in terms of Joseph Reece leading ‘efforts to increase Yearly Meeting support to Pacific College.’<sup>227</sup> Putting such a positive spin on things was not an anomaly within the larger Protestant neo-evangelical movement, as it moved away from its fundamentalist heritage. Particularly in places such as Oregon, where the fundamentalists essentially won control of the YM, the role past fundamentalists provided in harboring away the sacred and supernatural elements of Christianity becomes highlighted as almost heroic regardless of the means by which it was done. George Marsden suggests that this was a fairly common pattern among neo-evangelicals:

Histories are typically written by the victors, who inevitably emphasize those parts of the past that were the roots of later and lasting developments. Other roots, whose branches later withered or were cut off, are easily forgotten.<sup>228</sup>

What neo-evangelical leaders in Oregon saw of the past was a common connection, through the essentiality of evangelical orthodoxy, which fundamentalism had tried to protect. Thus theory was given precedent over practice, and theology was perceived to be of greater importance than experience.

---

<sup>226</sup> Typed letter signed by Paul Cammack, Joseph G. Reece and Allen Dunbar dated August 1, 1945. GFUA. Section SU2. Box labeled, “Joseph Reece’ Collection’.

<sup>227</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 5.

<sup>228</sup> George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1987), 3.

Aside from changes supporting an evangelical renewal at many of the traditional Quaker liberal arts colleges, one of the more significant academic developments in the second half of the century, during this era of new evangelicalism among Friends, was the near complete disappearance of the Quaker Bible School. As a new neo-evangelical identity began to show itself more and more through college personnel in the second half of the twentieth-century, some Friends saw an ever-diminishing need to protest against the perceived modernist impulses coming from their respective colleges by establishing alternative institutions. Those insular institutions, which already existed around the nation, Cleveland Bible Institute, The Training School for Christian Workers and Kansas Central Bible Training School, were forced into a similar decision as the one faced by Portland Bible Institute – either transform into the model of world-engaging liberal arts education in opposition to which they were once formed, or risk closure. All of them chose the former. The very first Quaker Bible School, Cleveland Bible Institute, became a college in 1937.<sup>229</sup> Then, in 1957, the campus moved to Canton, Ohio, and was reshaped in the mold of a Christian liberal arts college, hoping to become a leader in higher education, under the new name Malone College (now Malone University).<sup>230</sup> In 1939, the Huntington Park Training School for Christian Workers became Pacific Bible College. In 1947, the college sought to become more of a liberal arts institution (and

---

<sup>229</sup> Like Portland Bible Institute, part of the motivation for this change was so that students wishing to do further academic study, but who still wanted some biblical training, could more easily transfer their credits to a liberal arts college. See Bryon L. Osborne, *The Malone Story: The Dream of Two Quaker Young People* (Printed by United Printing Inc., 1970), 206-207.

<sup>230</sup> Osborne, *The Malone Story*, 267. In an official press release put out by the college, it specifically advertised that the new campus was adding, ‘a new liberal arts curriculum and a new staff. Added to the previous two divisions of religion and music are the beginnings of four new divisions – science, social science, literature, and education.’

needed more space) and moved to a new location and changed its name to Azusa College. After two more mergers with other liberal arts colleges in the second half of the twentieth-century, the institution now operates today as Azusa Pacific University. In Kansas, the Kansas Central Bible Training School became Friends Bible College in 1930.<sup>231</sup> Over the next fifty years the college became increasingly similar to liberal arts schools; seeking accreditation and offering a new array of courses and subjects outside of biblical staples.<sup>232</sup> In 1990, the institution perceived that its name limited its academic breadth, and intentionally dropped the 'Bible College' nomenclature in favour of Barclay College.<sup>233</sup> The fates of Barclay, Azusa Pacific and Malone have proved much better than that of Cascade College, as they all successfully navigated the entrepreneurial nature of academia in the latter half of the twentieth-century. Even more indicative of the change is the complete embrace of world-engaging pedagogical approaches by these institutions, as compared to the isolation and exclusivity of their fundamentalist founders. Whereas, once Quaker Bible Schools, like NPEI, saw themselves as safe-harbours for escaping the evils of modernism, the same schools exist today and are far more engaged with the world and actively seek to reconcile faith with modern thought. This change becomes evident in the way the schools advertise themselves to the public today – with glossy websites and catchy slogans, such as Barclay's 'Life, Service, Leadership';<sup>234</sup> Azusa Pacific's four

---

<sup>231</sup> Sheldon G. Jackson, *Barclay College: Lighthouse on the Prairies* (KS: Barclay University, 1992), 47.

<sup>232</sup> Jackson, *Barclay College*, 101-128.

<sup>233</sup> Jackson, *Barclay College*, 135.

<sup>234</sup> See [www.barclaycollege.com](http://www.barclaycollege.com), accessed May 28, 2011.

cornerstones of ‘Christ, Scholarship, Community and Service’<sup>235</sup> and Malone’s mission statement of providing ‘students with an education based on biblical faith in order to develop men and women in intellectual maturity, wisdom and Christian faith who are committed to serving the church, community and world.’<sup>236</sup> It appears then that for Friends, the Bible School movement was almost entirely tied to a reactionary effort by fundamentalists against the perceived heterodoxy of modernism and that the vicissitudinal shifts within the academic aspects of Quakerism, from the 1940s onward, suggests they embraced much of what neo-evangelicalism offered. Today, these schools, along with the original Quaker liberal arts colleges, all seem to understand the importance of fostering an educated mind and a devout heart.<sup>237</sup>

## **Chapter Analysis**

The central claim of this chapter is that, during the 1940s, OYM transitions out of a predominant culture of fundamentalism towards the same neo-evangelical identity gaining acceptance throughout much of Protestant America. In support of this claim, this author’s typology of neo-evangelicalism described in Chapter One provides an effective structure within which to analyse the aforementioned events.<sup>238</sup> Below, each element of the typology, as it relates to this chapter, is considered in turn:

---

<sup>235</sup> See [www.apu.edu/about/cornerstones/](http://www.apu.edu/about/cornerstones/), accessed May 28, 2011.

<sup>236</sup> See [www.malone.edu/about/mission-statement.php](http://www.malone.edu/about/mission-statement.php), accessed May 28, 2011.

<sup>237</sup> The one Quaker Bible School formed by fundamentalist Friends, which continues to function today somewhat in the same tradition as when it was founded, is Union Bible College (founded as Union Bible Seminary in 1911) within Central Yearly Meeting. Today UBC sees its primary role not as a liberal arts college, but as a ministerial training school, offering scriptural-based, inter-denominational, revivalist holiness theology. They also offer a K-12 academy. See [www.ubca.org](http://www.ubca.org), accessed May 28, 2011.

1. Engagement without accommodation. One of the continuous traits present within the corporate identity of OYM during these highlighted years is the YM's ongoing commitment to a Peace Testimony. Although staunch pacifism was no longer considered the absolute standard, as had been a growing trend in every American YM since the American Civil War,<sup>239</sup> during the first half of the twentieth-century, OYM continued an unbroken pattern of support for an orthodox based peace programme. A good many of the aforementioned YM leaders, on both sides of the fundamentalist equation, were known pacifists, including Edward Mott, Levi Pennington, Gervas Carey, Chester Hadley, A. Clark Smith, Loyde Osborne, Emmett Gulley, Earl Barker, Arthur Roberts and many others. While the activities of AFSC were rejected in the 1930s as increasingly humanistic and not evangelistic enough, the elevation of peace was still a central doctrine of the Oregon Friends Church. In many ways, then, it was this ongoing tendency within OYM to embrace its Quaker heritage as a peace church, coupled with the impact of WWII, which encouraged the YM to come out of its insularity and pushed OYM to reengage with society during the 1940s. Starting in 1941 with the proposal of Portland QM to develop a Northwest Friends Service Committee,<sup>240</sup> the YM began to develop infrastructures that inherently involved collaboration with previously shunned organisations. Most telling, with regard to this change, is the demonstrated willingness to work with AFSC during the war in support of Oregon Quakers who elected to serve as

---

<sup>238</sup> Engagement without accommodation, decreased emphasis on biblical literalism, gospel answers for social issues of the day, intellectual consistency between faith and science and ecumenical collaboration across religious traditions. See *Neo-evangelical* in the 'Terminology and Historical Context' section of Chapter One.

<sup>239</sup> Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 50-51.

<sup>240</sup> *OYM Minutes-1941*, m. 12, p. 5.



COs.<sup>241</sup> After the cessation of hostilities, the YM continued the operations of its Service Committee focusing more on humanitarian relief work and domestic needs.<sup>242</sup> Thus, we see in OYM a new type of engagement not previously present during the years of fundamentalist insularity. By the 1946 Peace Report, the YM was thinking about such issues as its role as a Christian community in response to ‘atomic energy’, ‘race relations’ and ‘labour issues’.<sup>243</sup> Despite the marked shift towards greater engagement, however, the YM continued to stress the orthodox basis for its behaviour. Pacifism was supported not because it was perceived of as a good ethical foundation, but because, ‘Christ has come into our hearts and has taken away all occasion for war, and has convinced us that every human being is precious in His sight.’<sup>244</sup> Arthur Roberts’ two-part editorial in the *Northwest Friend* on the essential connection between the Quaker Peace Testimony and holiness theology captures nicely the YM’s mid-century thinking on this matter:

I am convinced that our ethics of holiness include living at peace at every level, and being peacemakers... Our pacifist stand has normatively included a basis in experiential holiness.<sup>245</sup>

We find then, in Roberts’ writing, a charge ‘to be in the world and not be part of it’<sup>246</sup> and not to ‘retreat from the implications of spiritual life’.<sup>247</sup> Thus, one significant change in

---

<sup>241</sup> *OYM Minutes-1942*, m. 84, p. 47; *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 48, p. 26; *OYM Minutes-1944*, m. 42, p. 18; *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 50, p. 23.

<sup>242</sup> *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 10, p. 4; *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 49, p. 22; *OYM Minutes-1945*, m. 32, p. 11-12; *OYM Minutes-1946*, m. 82, p. 50.

<sup>243</sup> *OYM Minutes-1946*, m. 81, p. 49-50.

<sup>244</sup> Earl B. Barker, ‘N.W. Peace’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 21 no. 11 (December 1942): 6.

<sup>245</sup> Arthur Roberts, ‘Follow Peace and Holiness’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 33 no. 10 (January 1955): 7.

<sup>246</sup> Arthur Roberts, ‘Follow Peace and Holiness [continued]’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 33 no. 11 (February 1955): 11.

OYM during the 1940s and 1950s was a greater demonstrated openness to engaging with the world, with a simultaneous emphasis upon grounding that behaviour in evangelical theology.

2. Decreased emphasis on biblical literalism. There are a few general pieces of evidence to support this claim, most noteworthy are the inclusive platform of AEF, with respect to competing views on Wesleyan Holiness and Biblical literalism,<sup>248</sup> and Cattell's call that evangelicals distinguish between liberals who simply differ with their evangelical brethren on matters of Scripture as opposed to those who deny Christ as Saviour.<sup>249</sup> In many ways, however, the decrease in the emphasis on biblical literalism is difficult to tease-out beyond the general because the YM Statement of Faith regarding biblical authority remained unchanged over the period in this study.<sup>250</sup> Likewise, leaders within OYM still espoused an elevated opinion of Scripture as the source of truth. The *Northwest Friend* was full of articles in the 1940s and 1950s about the centrality of Scripture and the importance of the Bible as a guide for Christian living. What really differed then between fundamentalists and neo-evangelicals within OYM was the reduction in attacks on higher criticism from the 1940s onward. In the 1920s, acceptance

---

<sup>247</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>248</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 20-22.

<sup>249</sup> Cattell, 'Passion for Unity', reprinted in *Concern*, vol. I no. 3 (Fall 1959): 18.

<sup>250</sup> The following exact statement appears in the 1934, 1945 and 1958 renditions of the *Discipline of OYM*, which was in turn an exact copy of the 1924 and 1902 *Uniform Discipline of FYM*:

The Holy Scriptures were given by inspiration of God and the divinely authorized record of the doctrines which Christians are bound to accept, and of the moral principles which are to regulate their lives and actions. In them as interpreted and unfolded by the Holy Spirit, is an ever fresh and unfailing source of spiritual truth for the proper guidance of life and practice.

See *Discipline of OYM* for all the aforementioned years (1902, 1924, 1934, 1945 and 1958).

of higher criticism was the primary charge leveled against the leaders of FYM,<sup>251</sup> and rampant anti-modernism campaigns targeting higher criticism are evident in the pages of the *Friendly Endeavor*.<sup>252</sup> However, there is a general disappearance of similar militant discourse in the *Northwest Friend*. By the time the full Revised Standard Version of the Bible was published in 1952 (Henry Cadbury served as one of nine scholars for the New Testament portion of that translation),<sup>253</sup> the *Northwest Friend* ran an article that specified:

The translators were mostly men of very definite modernistic and liberalistic views. Some of them are the type of men who deny the very truths that real Christians hold as basic to vital Christianity. These truths include the virgin birth, inspiration of Scriptures, miracles and others.<sup>254</sup>

Despite this charge, the author provided a tempered list of pros and cons with the new version, based on textual comparisons with other modern translations and the original texts, and he ultimately concluded that:

The attitude of Friends toward the R.S.V. Bible is not one that can be determined by any one person for the whole group, but each individual must make his own decision as seems to him best in view of the total evidence available to him.<sup>255</sup>

From there, the author recommended a safe course of action was to be a ‘little hesitant in condemning without investigation.’<sup>256</sup> Thus, we find in the neo-evangelical OYM, a bit

---

<sup>251</sup> *OYM Minutes-1920*, m. 35, p. 16.

<sup>252</sup> See the ‘Chapter Analysis’ section of Chapter Two.

<sup>253</sup> Bacon, *Let this Life Speak*, 88, 143.

<sup>254</sup> Gerald E. Cronk, ‘The New RSV Bible’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 32 no. 1 (February 1953): 3.

<sup>255</sup> Gerald E. Cronk, ‘The New RSV Bible [continued]’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 32 no. 2 (March 1953): 5.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*

more of a generous position being offered with respect to the way to view scriptural criticism compared to the 1920s.

3. Gospel answers for the social issues of the day. One of the most marked changes within OYM during the 1940s was their reengagement with social action outside of evangelism. This neo-evangelical corrective can be seen in the YM's attempts to meet the humanitarian needs of those victims of WWII, including both the relief work needed in war-torn Europe and the local needs of Japanese citizens unjustly interned at camps. Similarly, we see a greater willingness to give responsibility over the mission work in their own country to the Bolivian nationals, to empower the Aymara Indians who had very few rights in their own country and to free the slave-families on the farm at Copajira; all suggestive of a renewal of humanitarian efforts within the YM not exclusively tied to conversion based evangelism. The AEF, in which OYM played a significant leadership role, also provided an important conduit through which social action was stressed within the evangelical Quaker community and it was regularly discussed at the organisation's conferences. As a whole, the YM embraced a viewpoint regarding social action which was, in many ways, similar to the viewpoint given expression by the YM pre-1919. In 1948, the *Northwest Friend* ran an article by Ross McIntyre, Superintendent of World Service, which captured nicely the altered stance of the YM, by the 1940s, on social action:

Many in the world still have physical as well as spiritual needs. Yet unnumbered thousands have nothing, or very little, to eat... the need increases for Christians to get busy at the thing that seems to be needed.<sup>257</sup>

---

<sup>257</sup> Ross McIntyre, 'From the Superintendent of World Service', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 27 no. 9 (November 1948): 14.

There is no evidence, however, that neo-evangelicals in OYM changed their minds about the process between sanctification and social service carried over from the Holiness Movement. Gerald Dillon, pastor and teacher in the YM, made it clear that, ‘when the solution to [social] problems is sought independently of the atonement of Christ, and without the necessity of individual regeneration, that is a “social gospel” and not the gospel of Jesus Christ.’<sup>258</sup> Rather, the important and noticeable change is that the YM did not abandon most social and political causes due to fears of association with unsoundness, as was more prevalent in the 1930s. Ray Carter published a moderate editorial in the *Northwest Friend*, in 1954, saying:

We, who hold the evangelic message of the church – the message of salvation through Christ – need to remember that much of the teachings of Jesus put social responsibility upon His followers. Our Lord commended such simple humanitarian acts as giving a cup of cold water in His name. He commended the visiting of those in prison... But, he never divorced creed from conduct, nor service for our fellow man from heavenly aspirations.<sup>259</sup>

Carter then went on to detail some pragmatic ways in which the YM could meet both the physical and spiritual needs of people as part and parcel of Christian service.

4. Intellectual consistency between faith and science. Although conflict ensued at Pacific College in the 1940s as a residuum of fundamentalism held sway on the YM’s corporate identity, one of the most marked features of this conflict is that Pacific College did not become an insular Bible School. Instead, the ongoing liberal arts emphasis at the college showed that enough people within OYM supported more modern pedagogical approaches and were successful in keeping the school focused on a broad curriculum

---

<sup>258</sup> Gerald Dillon, ‘The Gospel of Christ’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 11 (February 1948): 6.

<sup>259</sup> Ray Carter, ‘The Christian and Social Service’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 32 no. 12 (February 1954): 2, 4.

outside of just biblical staples. In 1944, Milo Ross, future president of George Fox College, wrote an editorial in the *Northwest Friend* arguing that, ‘An ignorant congregation is an unstable congregation.’<sup>260</sup> In 1947, Pacific College hired a new head for their Psychology Department (Dr. Wallace L. Emerson) who espoused the idea that Christians needed to stop shunning the field of psychology lest it be exploited by non-Christians.<sup>261</sup> In 1955, the administration of George Fox College restated its organisational purposes to include the following goals (the importance of scholarship and the evangelical doctrine are self-evident):

1. To prepare its graduates for pursuing those vocations for which they have studied.
2. To equip the higher ranking students with suitable tools and background for entering graduate or professional school.
3. To develop Christian character.
4. To direct extra-class activities in such a manner that they will reinforce the classroom.
5. To administer a college community in which its students experience development of scholarship and learn how to apply their learning to life.
6. To provide a center of leadership for Quakerism in which the evangelical concepts of its founder relating to Christian holiness are elaborated for contemporary needs.<sup>262</sup>

The growing attendance at the institution by local Quakers during the 1950s<sup>263</sup> suggests that this approach, of emphasising both scholarship and faith, was well received in the

---

<sup>260</sup> Milo C. Ross, ‘How a Church Grows: Educational Facilities’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 23 no. 3 (March 1944): 4.

<sup>261</sup> Donna Heacock, ‘Coming to Pacific College’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 2 (March 1947): 6.

<sup>262</sup> Milo C. Ross, ‘Policies of Our College’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 34 no. 3 (May 1955): 5.

<sup>263</sup> Cooper, ‘Shall Friends Train Their Own Leaders?’ 361.

YM. The college did continue to focus heavily on its evangelical heritage and still, into the twenty-first century, proudly advertises itself as a:

Nationally recognized Christian university, providing students with personal attention, global opportunities to learn and serve, and a supportive community that encourages academic rigor and spiritual growth.<sup>264</sup>

What is most marked about the events at Pacific College, then, is that, in the height of fundamentalist hegemony within the YM, the college did not alter its focus away from providing modern teachings and modern subject matter and become a sort of quasi-replacement for the loss of Portland Bible Institute. The neo-evangelical mood towards academia was sufficiently established by the late 1940s within OYM to keep the school as an important bridge between faith and science. This new mood, however, did not in any way alter the basic presumption in OYM that all education should be grounded in Christian principles and the YM continued to protest against the perceived growing secularisation within public education. In 1949, Walter Lee cautioned the YM, in a *Northwest Friend* article, that, ‘there is a shocking lack of Godly discipline in many Christian homes, which is a clear reflection of the theories which have been taught to or practiced on the parents when they were in school.’<sup>265</sup> His solution to this concern was the proposed development of ‘a Christian system of education which runs from the kindergarten through college.’<sup>266</sup> Sounding very familiar, in 1951, Kenneth Williams, in an article in the *Northwest Friend*,

---

<sup>264</sup> <http://www.georgefox.edu/about/index.html>, accessed March 27, 2012.

<sup>265</sup> Walter P. Lee, ‘Caution... Pagan Education in America’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 28 no. 3 (April 1949): 28.

<sup>266</sup> Lee, ‘Caution...’ 28.

bemoaned, ‘we have lost the conflict of secularization in education.’<sup>267</sup> While Williams blamed this loss on ‘non-Christian philosophy’<sup>268</sup> invading public schools in America, he also saw a unique opportunity for the YM to provide Christian instruction which provided ‘social, moral and spiritual standards’.<sup>269</sup>

As God has been erased from education in our public schools, so we believe Christian schools are exerting a tremendous influence in bringing Him back from the educational tomb into which secular education has endeavored to seal him.<sup>270</sup>

Thus, while the YM embraced the philosophy that ‘the training of the mind is of the utmost importance’<sup>271</sup> and ‘that one of the great tasks of the church then, is in education’,<sup>272</sup> there was also a clear emphasis upon a system that taught all modern subject matter ‘from a God-centered viewpoint’.<sup>273</sup>

5. Ecumenical collaboration across religious traditions. That OYM elected to associate itself with NAE, and not the ACC, suggests that it, too, was adopting a more inclusive ecumenical evangelicalism. The formation of an Association of Evangelical Friends that mimicked the membership openness of NAE provides further evidence that previously separatist YMs were looking to broaden their collaboration across religious traditions. AEF was not exclusive in its membership and its participants did not have to

---

<sup>267</sup> Kenneth Williams, ‘God and Education’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 30 no. 7 (September 1951): 11.

<sup>268</sup> Williams, ‘God and Education’, 2.

<sup>269</sup> Williams, ‘God and Education’, 11.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>271</sup> Ross, ‘How a Church Grows’. 4.

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>273</sup> Williams, ‘God and Education’, 2.



belong to separatist YMs, although essential orthodoxy was assumed.<sup>274</sup> Overall, there is a clear lack of absolute ecumenical separatism as a matter of faith in these various neo-evangelical explorations such as was more indicative of fundamentalism. That OYM played such a significant role in forming and maintaining AEF, shows the change in its corporate identity away from the sectarianism of the past, which had previously led to insularity and separatism. Edward Mott represented the last of the voices with any credence still strongly championing a strict ecumenical separation in his regular *Northwest Friend* articles during the 1940s,<sup>275</sup> but his last editorial was published there in September 1948.<sup>276</sup> During the 1950s, the YM seems far more interested in defining itself in terms of its relationship to the broader evangelical holiness community across all of American Protestantism and shows less of a tendency to simply define itself through the lens of an insular protest group within Quakerism.

The year 1947, then, becomes a good demarcation point for the culmination of the shift from fundamentalism to neo-evangelicalism within OYM. So many significant events happened that year (Gulley resigned from Pacific College, AFSC won the Nobel Peace Prize, the Association of Evangelical Friends had their first conference, Oregon Yearly Meeting bought the farm at Copajira, the Department of Public Morals was

---

<sup>274</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 3.

<sup>275</sup> See, in particular, Edward Mott, 'Can a Church Organization be both Orthodox and Heterodox?' *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 4 (April 1946): 2, 14-15; Edward Mott, 'The Problem of Unity', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 8 (September 1946): 2, 15-16; Edward Mott, 'The Basic Principles of Unity', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 10 (November 1946): 2, 14-15; Edward Mott, 'Two Yearly Meetings United', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 12 (January 1947): 2, 14-16.

<sup>276</sup> There is no clear reason documented for Mott suddenly discontinuing his articles in the *Northwest Friend*. September 1948 was the last month the organ was printed by an outside agency rather than the YM's own printing press and there were some minor format changes that occurred with the next month's issue, but no records indicate why Mott stopped writing the opening editorial article and whether or not it was his choice or that of others.

discontinued) that it becomes nominally symbolic of the end of one era and the beginning of another. Always tempered with the understanding that such shifts are far more complex and overlapping than simply a date on the calendar, from 1947 onward, we can best describe the stance of the Religious Society of Friends in Oregon Yearly Meeting as neo-evangelical Quakerism.

## **Chapter Summary**

The 1940s saw something that both fundamentalists and emerging neo-evangelicals could claim as success. Fundamentalist-leaning Quakers successfully eradicated modernist/liberal connections with both Five-Years Meeting and American Friends Service Committee and could now claim victory over Pacific College as well. In their last success, however, came their end. With no fight left to be had on such a large scale, the extreme belligerent defence and isolationism were largely on the wane after 1947. Instead, Quakers in Oregon found a new ecumenical community to which they could belong and became leaders in spearheading the Association of Evangelical Friends, an identity they rallied around for the rest of the century. Thus, the decrease in insular tendencies during the 1940s becomes a major indicator suggesting the end of the reign of fundamentalism in the corporate identity of the YM.

The mere decline of fundamentalism as the pervasive corporate ideology does not automatically lead to its replacement by neo-evangelicalism. There were, however, other important indicators which match the neo-evangelical typology. An increase in social service, mission work not exclusively focused on conversion, a desire to engage the world in creative ways, the decrease of codified religious rules, tolerance towards

evangelical modernists and respect for modern pedagogical approaches, all combine to show that the neo-evangelical spirit was sufficiently entrenched in the YM's corporate religious identity by mid-century. The Yearly Meeting continued to struggle with the balance between its perceived commitment to evangelism and its ethical obligation towards the world for the rest of the twentieth-century. This mid-century shift, however, allows us to place these Oregon Evangelical Quakers in the same neo-evangelical camp as much of American Protestantism at the time.

## CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

### Introduction

In 2002, an unofficial ‘ad hoc committee for revival’ in Northwest Yearly Meeting (previously OYM), sent out a White Paper entitled ‘Suggestions for the Spiritual Life of Northwest Yearly Meeting’.<sup>1</sup> Underlying their suggestions was the primary ‘concern that evangelism, holy living, and revival be a major emphasis of the Yearly Meeting.’<sup>2</sup> The recommendations of the committee largely echoed the fundamentalist mantra of the 1920s and 1930s, as they called for the YM leaders to ‘train pastors in evangelism’, that the annual Pastors Conference become ‘labs where pastors are inspired and trained to minister for evangelism’, that ‘Yearly Meeting sessions be geared to evangelism’ and that the YM officially change its name to include the word ‘evangelical’.<sup>3</sup> Also showing the same separatist mindset typical of fundamentalism, the committee recommended cutting ties with questionable organisations, particularly suggesting that any ‘unholy’ association with AFSC be discouraged, that any connection with Friends United Meeting (previously FYM) distracted from revival and that the YM withdraw membership from the Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC).<sup>4</sup> The proposal included no recommendations for engaging with the world other than traditional evangelism and had no social or humanitarian emphasis.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Ad-Hoc Committee for Revival, *A White Paper: Suggestions for the Spiritual Life of Northwest Yearly Meeting* (October 2002). In author’s possession.

<sup>2</sup> Ad-Hoc Committee for Revival, *A White Paper*, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Ad-Hoc Committee for Revival, *A White Paper*, 3, 9, 10.

<sup>4</sup> Ad-Hoc Committee for Revival, *A White Paper*, 6-10.

The YM as a whole generally did not pursue the committee's recommendations, but the White Paper and the ensuing discussions of it were evidence that such debates have historically been a constant presence within the evangelical tradition of Quakerism as a whole, as it continues to struggle to define an orthopraxy that fulfils both the Great Commission and the Great Commandment in a modern world. Although OYM appears to have been a significant conduit for the formation of the fourth strain of American Quakerism, much of what unfolded in Oregon paralleled equivalent developments throughout other conservative evangelical YMs in America. Evangelical Christianity is sometimes seen to be at odds with the religious pluralism and atheism increasingly common in other parts of the Society and in society. The ways these various tensions have been, and continue to be, navigated not only determines the ability evangelicals have to spread their glad tidings, but the means they adopt towards achieving their ends become the epitome of their good news.

The primary goal of this historical case study has been to bring a deeper understanding of the theological transitions within Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends during the highlighted years (1919-1947) and to discover the process by which a mid-century neo-evangelical paradigm became corporately normative. More broadly speaking, what unfolded in OYM during these years had implications for the larger American Quaker milieu. In this chapter, I review the main findings of each of the previous chapters, discuss similarities in OYM during the highlighted era as compared to broader Protestantism over the same period, state my original contribution to scholarship and address the implications of this research for current and future scholarship.

## **Findings of Chapter Summaries**

This thesis argued that, prior to 1919, OYM was characterised by an ecumenical spirit influenced equally by the late nineteenth-century Holiness and Social Gospel Movements. By 1919, however, there was increasing evidence of a budding fundamentalist culture within the corporate identity of the Yearly Meeting marked by separatism, exclusivity and a decrease in social concern outside of evangelism. This fundamentalist identity strengthened and was rather solidified by 1926, by which time it could be classified as dominant in shaping the corporate identity and decision making process of the YM. Fundamentalism pervaded the identity of the YM until the 1940s when it was replaced with a more socially aware, world-engaging expression of evangelicalism – much in line with the neo-evangelical developments unfolding in Protestant America. By 1947, this new spirit of increased ecumenism, tolerance and world-engagement came to characterise the corporate identity of OYM. As noted in this case study, the transitions from one corporate identity to another over these three decades were frequently characterised by internal conflicts and a lack of consensus, yet were definitive enough at the corporate level to justify the aforementioned claims.

In Chapter One the definitions of the six primary terms used throughout this study (evangelicalism, holiness, social gospel, fundamentalism and neo-evangelicalism) were established. The remainder of Chapter One included sections dedicated to a brief history of the Religious Society of Friends and to pre-1919 OYM history. This was followed by sections discussing the relationship of this work to prior scholarship and to clarifying the research methods used.

In Chapter Two, it was shown how OYM started the shift towards a culture of fundamentalism in 1919. The data to support the claim made in this chapter centred on two key changes within the Yearly Meeting. The first change was the formation of a Bible School in reaction to the perceived modernist teachings at Pacific College, and the second, the decision to separate from FYM, in 1926, because it was deemed insufficiently orthodox. Interspersed throughout the same years were smaller scale events (the arrival of fundamentalist Friend, Edward Mott and his rise to Clerk of the Yearly Meeting, being one such example), which constitute corroborative evidence indicating the broader shift toward fundamentalism. The impact of such changes is that, in electing to become one of only two independent evangelical Gurneyite YMs in America, OYM intentionally removed itself from co-mingling in the larger Quaker community. Similarly, in attempting to wrest the intellectual foundation of the Friends more towards biblical exclusivity, and in rejecting much of modern thought and science of the time, the YM isolated itself from broader society as a whole. The lengthy anti-modernism campaigns that ensued (particularly evident in the pages of the YM's organ) suggest that much of the early debate was centered on this issue. By 1926 then, using the fundamentalist typology defined by McDermott, the YM could officially be classified as having met the standard for a broad fundamentalist corporate identity, albeit with some notable exceptions and differing opinions on the matter.

In chapter three, it was shown that, in the 1930s, there was a further strengthening of the fundamentalist culture of isolationism, initially started in the 1920s, and also a reduction in world engagement and humanitarianism. The evidence supporting the claims in this chapter centred on the separation of Oregon Yearly Meeting from American

Friends Service Committee (AFSC). The decision (and its supporting rationale) becomes evidence for Oregon's ongoing insular tendencies, but even more, the rationale behind the decision becomes evidence of the slow decline in a community and social emphasis for fulfilling the Great Commission. Instead, the YM moved towards an almost exclusive focus on conversion-based evangelism. These changes appear to have been exacerbated by the perception that social gospel types ventured away from Christocentric foundations and towards pluralistic liberal theologies, which were perceived to downplay the importance of sanctification in the Christian narrative. The decision to disassociate from these perceived theologically liberal organizations could have been mitigated if the YM had developed their own social programmes to give sufficient humanitarian expression to their evangelical theology. However, a review of the various programmes (mission work, temperance, etc.) show that the YM instead emphasised salvation and evangelism as their primary strategies for world engagement. By the end of the 1930s, the YM can still be cast as markedly fundamentalist, continuing to be dominated by the identity which had gained power in the 1920s. While this manner of exclusivity and isolation was not embraced with unanimity throughout the YM, it remained the dominant corporate expression.

Chapter Four explored the last stand of the strong fundamentalist group within the YM, as it successfully wrested control of Pacific College, attempting to rid the institution of modernist impulses. As fundamentalism was primarily an anti-modernism crusade, which did not differentiate between evangelical modernists and theologically liberal modernists, the events at PC can best be understood as an attempt to eliminate any last vestige of modernism from the YM by a still dominant force within the YM leadership.



Success by the fundamentalists in this crusade, however, also seems to mark the end of their pervasive presence in the identity of the YM, as fundamentalism was slowly replaced by a neo-evangelicalism. The evidence for this claim is based primarily on two attitudinal changes. The first was the desire by Friends in Oregon to seek out ecumenical allegiance with other Friends: in order to do this they spearheaded the efforts to form the Association of Evangelical Friends. Although liberal modernism remained a philosophy rejected by evangelical Quakers, OYM came to see itself as being defined less by its opposition to, and protest against, that approach, and rather, more by its basic evangelical theology and association within the larger Protestant evangelical community. The second was the slow increase in social obligation within their evangelical expression. This change is primarily seen through a renewal of mission work not so exclusively based on soul-harvesting and through an increase in relief work that went beyond mere evangelism. Based on this author's typology of neo-evangelicalism used to analyse the events of the chapter, by the middle of the twentieth-century, a new and fourth strain of the Society was officially formed – American neo-evangelical Quakerism, with Oregon Yearly Meeting as its headquarters. This new expression of evangelical theology was, in some ways, rather similar to the ideology that had permeated the YM prior to the Great War – eternally optimistic and world-engaging, though still embracing evangelism as one methodological tool and still holding conservative social constructs.

### **Similarities and Differences to Broader Protestantism**

One of the overall suggestions of this work is that what happened in Oregon among the Religious Society of Friends during the highlighted years echoes a similar

pattern displayed in the broader Protestant denominational disputes in America in the same timeframe. In this section, those similarities are reviewed and some noticeable differences indicated.

One of the first similarities between what happened in OYM and what unfolded in larger Protestant America has to do with the chronological inception of fundamentalism into denominational corporate identity. Other studies of broad American Protestantism also claim that in the era just after the First World War fundamentalism became far more truculent and widespread – particularly as a reactionary force against liberal modernism and American cultural mores.<sup>5</sup> While militant defenders of perceived orthodoxy had increased in strength within evangelical America during the twentieth-century, it was really with the end of the war that eradicating modernists from the church became a primary goal. Among the Northern Baptist denomination, starting in 1920, we find the first official action towards separation by fundamentalist forces, when 160 conservative church-members held a ‘Pre-convention Conference on Fundamentals of Our Faith’<sup>6</sup> just prior to the denomination’s annual convention.<sup>7</sup> The goal of the ‘pre-convention’ was to counter the increasing role of liberalism in their denomination.<sup>8</sup> The group made itself a permanent body by electing a committee to investigate charges of unsoundness within denominationally controlled colleges and reported back the next year to another ‘pre-

---

<sup>5</sup> George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1980), 141. See also, Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 181.

<sup>6</sup> Stewart Cole, *History of Fundamentalism* (CT: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1931), 67.

<sup>7</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 66-67. Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy* (CT: Archon Books, 1963), 104. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 159.

<sup>8</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 104. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 159.

convention'.<sup>9</sup> Soon after, the group came to call itself officially the National Federation of Fundamentalists of the Northern Baptists.<sup>10</sup> In 1921, a second, more conservative organisation within the Northern Baptists was formed (Baptist Bible Union), which shunned cooperation with any Baptist agency disloyal to inherited beliefs and supported only doctrinally sound schools, missionaries and publications.<sup>11</sup> For the Presbyterian denomination, in 1918, The New Era Movement was formed within the Presbyterian Church, designed to identify Presbyterian opportunities for expansion following the world's armistice.<sup>12</sup> By 1919, the New Era Movement group was quickly charged by fundamentalists with being tolerant of missionaries who broke with evangelism and held unorthodox beliefs.<sup>13</sup> These fundamentalists called for an investigation to determine whether the church should continue to fund its missions.<sup>14</sup> By 1922, when Harry Emerson Fosdick (a Baptist minister working at a Presbyterian church) preached his galvanising sermon ('Shall the Fundamentalist Win?'), the denomination polarised even further.<sup>15</sup> Within the Methodist denomination, a group Furniss argues was less impacted than Baptist and Presbyterians by the fundamentalist-modernist controversies,<sup>16</sup> the early

---

<sup>9</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 67. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 104.

<sup>10</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 104.

<sup>11</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 70-71. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 105-106.

<sup>12</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 101.

<sup>13</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 131.

<sup>14</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 101.

<sup>15</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 102, Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 131-133. Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1997), 40.

<sup>16</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 148-150.

1920s still marks the inception of some internal denominational disputes. Starting at the 1916 quadrennial conference, conservative churchmen attacked what were perceived as increasingly ethical rather than orthodox views being tolerated within the denomination's recommended Courses of Study.<sup>17</sup> Unhappy with their success in influencing the quadrennial that year, at the 1920 conference the group went on full attack against these 'unorthodox' publications and conservatives attended the meeting in full strength regularly publishing minority reports.<sup>18</sup> Some modifications to the Conference's Courses of Study were made as a result.<sup>19</sup> Still not fully satisfied with their success, by 1925, a fundamentalist group formed the Methodist League for Faith and Life, which also started to publish its own periodical (*Essentialist*).<sup>20</sup> Both the group and the periodical existed for several more years as an outlet for Methodist anti-modernist agitation.<sup>21</sup> Among the Disciples of Christ denomination, disputes also ensued. Just prior to their 1918 convention<sup>22</sup> a self appointed uncompromising party called the Christian Bible College League issued a call to 'recover the College of the Bible from the control of destructive critics.'<sup>23</sup> By the 1919 Disciples' convention, 'indecorum' ensued and accused liberals

---

<sup>17</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 165-166. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 150.

<sup>18</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 166-167. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 150-151.

<sup>19</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 151.

<sup>20</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 169-171. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 153.

<sup>21</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 155.

<sup>22</sup> In the end, this convention was cancelled due to the influenza epidemic. Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 135.

<sup>23</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 135. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 172.

had to answer inquisitive doctrinal questions publicly to the League.<sup>24</sup> By 1921, this fundamentalist group formed the New Testament Tract Society, which published articles ‘violently critical of church members and agencies that appeared to have succumbed to modernism’.<sup>25</sup> In the Mennonite tradition, those early post war years altered the context of the modernist/fundamentalist arguments from what James C. Juhnke calls ‘restrained refutation’ and ‘polite dialogue’, to intra-denominational exchanges that were far more ‘bitter and fearful’.<sup>26</sup>

Thus, we see a militant and separatist pattern of fundamentalism developing in several Protestant denominations after World War One and on into the 1920s. On the national scene, the single most influential fundamentalist organisation, the World’s Christian Fundamentalist Association held its first conference in May, 1919, and its membership increased throughout the early 1920s.<sup>27</sup>

The events within Oregon Yearly Meeting correlate with this timeline and process, as we see both an increase in separatist rhetoric and a far more rigid defence of orthodoxy just following the Armistice. This era is the first time the YM officially held discussions on separating from FYM as well as when they formed an alternative Bible School in reaction to their own Pacific College. While discord with perceived modernist organisations was evident prior to 1919 (revivalist Quakers and social gospel Friends had been arguing over appropriate redemptive methodologies for much of the twentieth-

---

<sup>24</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 136.

<sup>25</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 173.

<sup>26</sup> James C. Juhnke, *Vision, Doctrine, War: Mennonite Identity and Organization in America, 1890-1930* (PN: Herald Press, 1989), 261-262.

<sup>27</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 158.

century already), that year marks a significant shift towards the complete severing of organisational ties and attempts to drive the scourge of modernism from the church.

Thus, the chronological inception of fundamentalism into evangelical Quakerism can be placed squarely alongside its entry into many other Protestant denominations in the early twentieth-century.

The second similarity between what happened in OYM and what happened within the larger American Protestant community is also related to chronology – it is the demise of fundamentalism as a force in shaping corporate identity. While the beginning of fundamentalism can be more clearly demarcated, its demise is not so easy to pinpoint.<sup>28</sup>

In a broad sense, on the national scene, the acceptance of fundamentalism within Protestantism can generally be seen as wavering from the 1930s onward, though.

Throughout the 1930s, membership in the World's Christian Fundamentalist Association was in decline.<sup>29</sup> The formation of the National Association of Evangelicals, in 1942, has often been associated with the symbolic beginning of neo-evangelicalism in Protestant America.<sup>30</sup> Within various denominations we find a similar pattern of diminishing

---

<sup>28</sup> The circumstances surrounding the demise of fundamentalism are hotly debated, with most scholars recognising that, while the 1920s represent a critical moment in the conflict, fundamentalism has had pockets of strength throughout the twentieth-century and it comes to the fore again, cyclically, in Protestant America. Taking a rather broad approach to defining fundamentalism, Joel Carpenter argues that 'This survey should dispel any doubts about the vitality of fundamentalism in the wake of its public defeats in the 1920s. The movement was thriving; it was developing a complex and widespread institutional network to sustain its activities. Indeed, perhaps the best way to think about the fundamentalist movement and its location in the American social, cultural, and religious landscapes is to remember these interconnections: the ties between people and institutions, the collective interests and concerns being expressed, the mutual involvement in religious projects. These different kinds of fundamentalist activity – education, "conferencing," publishing, radio broadcasting, and evangelization – each connected individuals and congregations to endeavors of larger scope.' Carpenter, *Revive us Again*, 31. Thus, while the fundamentalist controversy can effectively be tied to those post war years, as an ideology within the sub-grouping of evangelicalism, the end can not be clearly pinpointed.

<sup>29</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 193.

conflict between fundamentalist and liberal forces starting anywhere from the late 1920s up to the 1940s – sometimes due to reconciliation between separatist and non-separatist forces, and sometimes simply due to schism eliminating the opportunity for conflict. Among the Northern Baptists, the most contentious and separatist denominational organisation (Baptist Bible Union) left, in 1932, to form its own denomination (General Association of Regular Baptists),<sup>31</sup> while those moderate conservative forces, which remained, chose to work for change from within.<sup>32</sup> In 1947, another separation occurred among Northern Baptists, when another new denomination (Conservative Baptist Association of America) was formed in response to the Convention banning a new conservative mission enterprise.<sup>33</sup> That same year, William B. Riley (founder of the World's Christian Fundamentalist Association) resigned his membership of the Northern Baptists.<sup>34</sup> Among the Presbyterians, leading fundamentalist, James Machen and others resigned their membership, in 1936, to form the Orthodox Presbyterian Church,<sup>35</sup> and then, in 1937, another schism led to the formation of the Bible Presbyterian Church.<sup>36</sup> Marsden argues that, afterwards, 'anti-modernism ceased to be a force at the national

---

<sup>30</sup> Marsden accurately suggests that it is historians who have traced the inception of neo-evangelicalism back to the inception of the NAE, rather than any sort of internal referencing used by the movement at that time. It was not uncommon in these early mid-century years for all evangelicals to refer to themselves as 'fundamentalist'. See George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1987), 16.

<sup>31</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 193.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 141. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 192.

<sup>36</sup> Carpenter, *Revive us Again*, 7.

level'<sup>37</sup> for Presbyterians. In the 1930s, among Methodists, who were 'never greatly excited by fundamentalism',<sup>38</sup> those forces most keen on pushing the fundamentalist agenda quietly tempered their cause and 'abandoned their crusade'.<sup>39</sup> However, in 1939, when the Methodist Episcopal Church (North and South) and the Protestant Methodist Church united, a small dissenting group left, due to perceived theological liberalisation seen as ongoing within Methodism, to form the Bible Protestant Church.<sup>40</sup> Within the Disciples of Christ, Furniss argues, that it took almost thirty years before the denomination settled into a more peaceful accord on issues of modernism.<sup>41</sup>

In OYM we see a similar chronology in which its fundamentalist corporate paradigm shifted into neo-evangelicalism, though perhaps with a slightly longer life-span. Although the YM was moving in the same direction as other Protestants during the 1940s, it is not really until 1947 that we reach a significant milestone marking the end of one era and the beginning of another. The first conference of what was to become the Association of Evangelical Friends, then, shares important symbolism with the National Association of Evangelicals. This is the date and event that Thomas Hamm has dubbed the beginning of the 'fourth strain' of American Quakerism.<sup>42</sup> That fundamentalism held

---

<sup>37</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 192.

<sup>38</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 155.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (Paris: Mouton and Co. 1963), 22.

<sup>41</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 176.

<sup>42</sup> Like many scholars, Hamm links the AEF to the eventual Evangelical Friends Alliance, as if they were one continuum, but it is more accurate to see these two organisations as separate movements within evangelical Quakerism, each with different goals and impulses (see Appendix for a more detailed discussion of this issue). See Thomas Hamm, *The Quakers in America* (NY: Columbia University Press, 2003), 60.



on longer in OYM than in some other Protestant groups (1947 compared to 1942) is partly explained by the fact that, in OYM, we find a locale where the fundamentalist viewpoint achieved dominance in the corporate identity of the YM. The neo-evangelical correction, then, was not necessarily as strong a corrective force to fundamentalism, but more an internal modification. It is no surprise then that, even as recently as this current century, fundamentalism still has pockets of support throughout the YM.<sup>43</sup> However, in general, the overall time period in which fundamentalism was a major force in the YM's corporate identity (1919-1947) closely parallels its influence in broader Protestant America.

The third similarity between OYM and the larger Protestant ecclesiastical community is that, at its core, the overriding impetus in the rise of fundamentalism to corporate hegemony in the 1920s was its anti-modernism crusade. Marsden argues that:

Militant opposition to modernism was what most clearly set off fundamentalism from a number of closely related traditions... Fundamentalism was a loose, diverse, and changing federation of co-belligerents united by their fierce opposition to modernist attempts to bring Christianity into line with modern thought.<sup>44</sup>

What sparked the initial acrimonious post-WWI debates in every denomination mentioned above (Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Disciples of Christ and Mennonites) was the conflict over conservative church members attempting to preserve supernatural orthodoxy and biblical authority against the perceived heterodoxy of modernism. The Northern Baptist 1920 'preconvention' was held to counter the

---

<sup>43</sup> See *Introduction* section of this Chapter.

<sup>44</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 4.

increasing role of liberalism in their denomination.<sup>45</sup> The Presbyterian New Era group was charged by fundamentalists with being tolerant of missionaries who broke with evangelism and who held unsound beliefs.<sup>46</sup> At the Methodist 1916 quadrennial conference, conservative leaders attacked what were perceived to be increasingly ethical, rather than orthodox, views being tolerated within the denomination.<sup>47</sup> Among the Disciples of Christ denomination, a self appointed uncompromising party issued a call to ‘recover the College of the Bible from the control of destructive critics.’<sup>48</sup> In 1923, the Mennonite Conference’s Board of Education closed Goshen College for an entire school year and the ministerial status of several ministers was removed in an attempt to ‘remove Modernist influences’.<sup>49</sup> On the national scene, the World’s Christian Fundamentalist Association was formed to battle ‘The Great Apostasy’.<sup>50</sup> None of this is to say that the fundamentalist movement was specifically anti-intellectual. While the obscurant caricature of fundamentalism is deeply seated,<sup>51</sup> few fundamentalists discredited the need for an educated mind in itself.<sup>52</sup> The 1929 bulletin of the North Pacific Evangelistic Institute specifies that, ‘While strong emphasis is placed upon the spiritual life, the

---

<sup>45</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 104.

<sup>46</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 131.

<sup>47</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 165-166. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 150.

<sup>48</sup> Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, 135. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 172.

<sup>49</sup> Juhnke, *Vision, Doctrine, War*, 265.

<sup>50</sup> Declaration of the first conference organisers as quoted in Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 158.

<sup>51</sup> Furniss went so far as to say ‘Ignorance, then, was a feature of the movement; it became a badge the orthodox often wore proudly.’ Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 39.

<sup>52</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 212-221.

acquisition of knowledge and the culture of the mind are constantly emphasized.<sup>53</sup> Rather, fundamentalism was anti-modernist and, more specifically, it was anti-higher criticism because higher criticism undercut a supernatural orthodoxy. In the same way that Marsden claims social outreach became a casualty of fundamentalists attacking the social gospel,<sup>54</sup> this author claims that intellectual development, at times, became a victim of anti-modernist pursuits, which frequently targeted educators and their institutions of higher learning. The events within Oregon Yearly Meeting parallel this.

Much like in broader Protestantism, modernism was, at least initially, the primary target for OYM fundamentalists. Some of the initial rhetoric published in the YM's organ (*Friendly Endeavor*), particularly that attacking biblical criticism, set the tone for the ensuing debate.<sup>55</sup> The attacks on Five-Years Meeting and the *American Friend* were essentially about orthodoxy and fears that FYM was permeated with modernism, most notably that Walter Woodward's editorials were. The attacks on Pacific College and, in particular, on Levi Pennington, were largely about the perception that he allowed higher criticism into the school's curriculum and that the school was far too focused on teaching modern pedagogical approaches rather than biblical staples. By the time of the *coup* at Pacific College during the Gulley regime,<sup>56</sup> the fundamentalist forces had garnered sufficient gains that the mere accusation of modernism was eventually sufficient to oust the President. As a whole then, anti-modernism becomes the common thread tying

---

<sup>53</sup> N.P.E.I. Catalogue, 1929, p. 10. As referred to in Lyle Good, *The Founding and Early Years of North Pacific Evangelistic Institute* (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Oregon, 1969), 23.

<sup>54</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 91-92.

<sup>55</sup> Untitled notice, *Friendly Endeavor* vol. II no. 9 (March 1920): 4.

<sup>56</sup> See the section in Chapter Four entitled 'Scourging Modernism from Pacific College.'

together the raft of American fundamentalist forces and explains its attributes of separatism and exclusivity exhibited both within the YM and in Protestant America.

Although theological liberalism and secular modernism would remain rejected philosophies to evangelicals, one of the more striking shifts within the Protestant neo-evangelical mid-century movement was its tolerance towards evangelical modernists (the end of the double-separation era); a marked shift away from its rigid anti-modernist past where any form would be considered apostate. Thus, acceptance by OYM (and all neo-evangelical Quakers), during the second half of the century, of those evangelical modernists who merely differed on grounds of Scriptural interpretation, becomes yet another pattern that mimics the wider trends.

The fourth similarity between OYM and the larger Protestant community is in regard to the decline in social action as the fundamentalist culture percolated through the corporate structures of the church. As mentioned in chapter one, a major shift in the view of fundamentalists, with respect to the Great Commission, was the almost complete elimination of socially responsible programmes as compulsory expressions of sanctification. Instead of such programmes, we find an almost single-minded emphasis on evangelism. As Marsden points out, the conflicts between the two methodologies mostly had to do with what conservatives perceived as the liberal endorsement of a social gospelism, which did not emphasise such outreach as the complementary outgrowth of regeneration and undercut the relevance of the message of eternal salvation through Christ's atoning work.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 91-92.

In OYM we find a similar pattern, and the evidence presented suggests a significant decline in social action starting in the 1920s continuing through until the 1940s. Whereas it could be demonstrated that, from its inception (1893) up to about the First World War, the YM was keenly interested in finding expressions for some of the historic Quaker testimonies as part of its evangelical thinking (most notably through their temperance, peace, missions and education efforts),<sup>58</sup> after the war these same programmes either withered, or the underlying motives for engaging in them had ulterior evangelistic designs. The residuum of testimony related to a high social ethic, which remained after 1919, was mostly related to the early collaborative efforts OYM gave to AFSC and its rebuilding and relief programmes.<sup>59</sup> However, even this one programme was generally in disfavour by the 1930s and then all that remained of social engagement was either evangelistic programmes aimed at soul-harvesting or some limited humanitarian programmes (schools and a medical clinic in the Bolivian mission) tied to a salvation first policy.<sup>60</sup> The temperance programme became far more focused on legislated morality than social betterment,<sup>61</sup> the peace programmes became far more focused on evangelism than on establishing social order<sup>62</sup> and education was more about teaching biblical staples than valuing members educated in the intellectual constructs of

---

<sup>58</sup> See the section in Chapter One entitled 'History of Oregon Yearly Meeting'.

<sup>59</sup> See the section in Chapter Three entitled 'Inception of the American Friends Service Committee'.

<sup>60</sup> See the section in Chapter Three entitled 'A Change in Christian Ethics'.

<sup>61</sup> See the section in Chapter Three entitled 'A Change in Christian Ethics'.

<sup>62</sup> See the section in Chapter Three entitled 'Oregon Yearly Meeting Disbands its Service Committee'.

modern society.<sup>63</sup> The shift away from demonstrating social action would not be so significant and readily noticed had not the YM already, during the previous period, been exhibiting behaviours far more consistent with the implied outreach of sanctification doctrine.<sup>64</sup> However, like much of Protestant America of the day, ‘the “Great Reversal” took place from about 1900 to about 1930, when all progressive social concern, whether political or private, became suspect among revivalist evangelicals and was relegated to a very minor role.’<sup>65</sup> Some fundamentalists took this ideology to extremes. Baptist evangelist Judson E. Conant’s 1937 work (*The Growing Menace of the Social Gospel*) blamed the natural disasters of the 1930s, which exacerbated the lingering Great Depression, on social gospelism:

When God is compelled to speak to our nation in floods, in droughts and in devastating dust-storms, in order to arrest and rebuke those who try, by their ‘planned economy,’ to take the care of the people out of His hands, it is high time the professing Church came back to her first love, that He might once more speak through her the word that would arrest the nation in her trend toward moral chaos and national decadence.<sup>66</sup>

Compare the similarities of Conant’s solution to social problems, to words penned in 1935, by Oregon Yearly Meeting Clerk, Edward Mott:

Another most momentous problem confronting us at the present time is the world-wide economic distress which rests upon us as a great weight. Here again, the Gospel means of alleviation is the only way of deliverance.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> See the section in Chapter Two entitled ‘The Quaker Bible School Movement’.

<sup>64</sup> See the section in Chapter One entitled ‘History of Oregon Yearly Meeting’.

<sup>65</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 86.

<sup>66</sup> J. E. Conant, *The Growing Menace of the ‘Social Gospel’*, (IL: The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1937), 70.

<sup>67</sup> Edward Mott, *The Friends Church in the Light of its Recent History* (OR: Loomis Printing Company, 1935), 64.

Both these quotations demonstrate a high emphasis on regeneration first and humanitarianism second. Thus, in OYM we find a matching trend suggesting, once again, that the shifts within the YM paralleled those in Protestant America. That we see an increase in socially responsible behaviour during and after the 1940s suggests that much of the decline was linked to the corporate fundamentalist identity of the YM.

The fifth similarity between OYM and the larger Protestant community is in relation to the overall lack of world-engagement among fundamentalists. Using phraseology recognisable as Friends' idea of the 'hedge',<sup>68</sup> Joel A. Carpenter reflects on the larger fundamentalist impulse to disengage from the world:

The most immediate sign and seal of fundamentalists' calling to come away from the world and from worldly Christianity was not their church membership but their commitment to live a 'separated life.' During the 1930s and 1940s, fundamentalists were developing patterns of devotion and habits of thought that marked them, in both the biblical and ordinary sense of the word, as a peculiar people.'<sup>69</sup>

Carpenter specifies that:

The separated life for fundamentalists meant a variety of things, but most visible, of course, was their desire, in the midst of the Jazz Age, to uphold the behavioral standards of nineteenth-century evangelicalism. In addition to abiding by principles of strict sexual chastity and modesty in dress, fundamentalists were to abstain from alcoholic drink, profane or coarse language, social dancing (and dance music), and the theatre – including movies. Using tobacco, playing cards, gambling, and working on Sundays (or, even playing, too strenuously) were also forbidden. Extremes in fashion and heavy use of cosmetics were considered worldly; the idea was to look clean-cut and 'wholesome.'<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> See the section in Chapter One entitled 'The Religious Society of Friends, A Brief History'.

<sup>69</sup> Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 57.

<sup>70</sup> Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 58.

Thus, Clark Smith's primary frustration about his time serving in AFSC ('learning to smoke cigarettes, play cards, and drink his first beer')<sup>71</sup> makes more sense in light of his fundamentalist view on societal mores. Marsden argues that in some ways, the fundamentalist ideology provided an effective mental boundary to the changing social norms of the twentieth-century.<sup>72</sup> The strict behaviour code at NPEI/PBI<sup>73</sup> and Milo Ross's concern over male AFSC workers attire while employed on reconstruction projects<sup>74</sup> all provide additional evidence of similarity between OYM and the larger fundamentalist codification. Fundamentalists, in general, tried to set themselves apart from the liberal society, particularly during the 'roaring twenties' in America.

Beyond just a strict behavioural code, though, OYM fundamentalists regularly rejected people and associations that would bring them into contact with the world, building, in a sense, their own modern 'hedge'. OYM's biggest protest with Walter Woodward and the *America Friend* was that too many articles were being published that dealt with social and political issues of the day.<sup>75</sup> That OYM wanted such articles to cease suggests that they were far less interested in having their faith come into creative contact with the present day issues of society than had been true of prior generations of

---

<sup>71</sup> *Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board – Called Meeting*, October 5, 1939. George Fox University Archives, section FB-3, file labeled 'Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board'. Newberg, Oregon.

<sup>72</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 227.

<sup>73</sup> See the section in Chapter Two entitled 'The Quaker Bible School Movement'.

<sup>74</sup> Milo Ross, personal Letter to Clarence Pickett, dated December 17 1937. American Friends Service Committee Archives (AFSC hereafter). General File 1937 'complaints'. Archives located at the AFSC headquarters in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Geographical referencing left-off hereafter.

<sup>75</sup> *Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Official Minutes – 1920* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1920), minute 35, page 16-18. Hereafter, '*OYM Minutes*' followed by respective year, minute and page number.



Friends. Oregon Friends formed North Pacific Evangelistic Institute (NPEI) as a tool to protect young minds from the broad liberal intellectual influences of the day.<sup>76</sup> The ministers and denominational leaders who formed NPEI viewed the goal of education primarily as preparing young people to save the lost from a lost world. OYM rejected the relief work of AFSC because it dealt with issues in the present realm, rather than emphasising sanctification as a priority.<sup>77</sup> Thus, similar to the trends in the broad Protestant American milieu, disengagement from the world becomes a discernible characteristic among Oregon Quakers as well in the 1920s and 1930s.

The sixth similarity between OYM and the larger Protestant community concerns ecumenical separation. Related, to some extent, to the aforementioned world-rejecting tendency among fundamentalists, this trait is more about the practice of double-separation within the church (i.e. separating from both theologically liberal modernists in the churches and from evangelical non-separatists). By the 1930s, fundamentalists could no longer be classified as primarily anti-modernists who battled within their denomination, but rather were separatists who left the perceived apostate church to form a distinct religious community.<sup>78</sup> In 1929, James Machen formed Westminster Theological Seminary in opposition to Princeton, which was being re-aligned by the Presbyterian General Assembly along modernist lines and with a modernist board and faculty.<sup>79</sup> In the 1930s, there were splinter groups of fundamentalist members in both the

---

<sup>76</sup> Lurana Terrell, North Pacific Evangelistic Institute Bulletin, May 1919 vol. 1, number 1 OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

<sup>77</sup> *OYM Minutes-1938*, m. 105, p. 43.

<sup>78</sup> Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 33.

<sup>79</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 141.

Baptist and Presbyterian denominations who decided they could no longer work from within the denomination.<sup>80</sup> Even in the early 1940s, as fundamentalism was on the wane as an influential force in mainline Protestantism, ultra-conservative evangelicals kept up the message that ecumenical separation was critical. Leading Presbyterian fundamentalist Carl McIntire wrote:

There are fundamentalists who desire to and actually do work and fellowship with modernists. To us such a course is wrong, and a violation of the commands of Scripture. We must testify to these brethren who continue to help the ungodly. They must answer to God for their conduct, for He alone is the Lord of the conscience. But we cannot in obedience to Scripture join them or work together with them in organization where our presence with them will lead people to think that their example and conduct in living with modernists should be followed. It should not be. They are misleading the sheep in regard to the most vital issue facing the church in our day, and are not being obedient to the plain commands of our Lord. Light and darkness cannot live together, even though these fundamentalists try to demonstrate that they can.<sup>81</sup>

Among Gurneyite Friends, along with OYM, Central YM<sup>82</sup> and Kansas YM<sup>83</sup> also broke away from FYM during the mid-twenties and thirties, despite the fact that its basic statement of faith was soundly orthodox. The insularity went deep and these various fundamentalist separatists did not make much effort to work even with each other. Despite the fact that several other independent YM's, prior to the 1940s, could also be classified as having fundamentalist tendencies (Ohio, Central and Kansas), these various

---

<sup>80</sup> General Association of Regular Baptists and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, respectively. See, Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 192-193. Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 141.

<sup>81</sup> Carl McIntire, *Twentieth Century Reformation* (NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1944), 186-187.

<sup>82</sup> Thomas D. Hamm, 'Friends United Meeting and its Identity: An Interpretative History', *Quaker Life* (January/February 2009): 4.

<sup>83</sup> *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes-1937*, m. 6 & 46, p. 6-7 & 31. George Fox University Special Collections Room.

groups never sought ecumenical alliance with each other. That is even more telling of how deep the insular ideology pervaded the various YMs' corporate identities. Edward Mott's failed 1927 conference for evangelical Friends in America (only eleven people attended)<sup>84</sup> provides further evidence that separatism, not just from modernists, but also from non-separatists evangelicals, was a primary characteristic of fundamentalism and something that OYM shared with the larger Protestant community. By the 1940s, this sectarian spirit in evangelical Protestantism as a whole was on the wane, however.

In 1942, the National Association of Evangelicals was formed partly in response to concerns shared by many evangelicals, who wanted to start a national body in contrast to the Federal (now National) Council of Churches.<sup>85</sup> Around the same time leading fundamentalist, Carl McIntire, formed the American Council of Christian Churches for similar reasons.<sup>86</sup> What separated the two agencies was really the issue of ecumenical separation. The NAE did not restrict membership from those individuals who were attached to denominations holding membership in the FCC, while the American Council did (including even denying membership to churches involved in the NAE).<sup>87</sup> The fate of the two organisations over the second half of the twentieth-century has shown that most evangelicals sided with the ideology of the former.

We see a similar pattern in OYM around mid-century, although they still responded cautiously to potentially contaminated institutions. The AEF was not exclusive

---

<sup>84</sup> See section in Chapter Four entitled 'Gathering Evangelical Friends Together'.

<sup>85</sup> Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, 48.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>87</sup> Gasper, *Fundamentalist Movement*, 26.

in its membership and its participants did not have to belong to separatist YMs, although essential orthodoxy was assumed.<sup>88</sup> Likewise, several smaller pieces of evidence show a guarded reaching-out to evangelical non-separatists and evangelical modernists. They allowed their COs to work with AFSC during WWII, but made sure funds were not sent directly to cover the administrative costs of that agency.<sup>89</sup> Lewis Hoskins was invited for a Question and Answer session at the 1950 conference of the Association of Evangelical Friends, but he was peppered with questions.<sup>90</sup> Everett Cattell called for tolerance for those who merely differed on matters of biblical hermeneutics, but rejected those who denied the Christology of Jesus.<sup>91</sup> There is a clear lack of absolute ecumenical separatism as a matter of faith in these various neo-evangelical explorations (such as was more indicative of fundamentalism), but, nevertheless, it was a guarded participation that condoned limited collaborating, if done within an evangelical paradigmatic structure of basic orthodoxy.

These six correlations between OYM and Protestant America are robust enough to suggest that a significant reason for the changes unfolding within OYM during these highlighted years is that the Yearly Meeting, essentially, had stronger identity ties to the evangelical religious community in America, than it did to any other religious community, including its own. Although Quakers have historically often thought of themselves as a ‘peculiar people’, intra-denominational unity was sacrificed by OYM

---

<sup>88</sup> Arthur Roberts, *The Association of Evangelical Friends: A Story of Quaker Renewal in the Twentieth Century* (OR: The Barclay Press, 1975), 3.

<sup>89</sup> See *OYM Minutes-1942*, m. 84, p. 47. See also, *OYM Minutes-1943*, m. 48, p. 26.

<sup>90</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 16.

<sup>91</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 26.

when maintaining it would have been perceived as a challenge to their larger connection with theologically similar evangelicals. Thus, as Protestant America shifted through holiness, revivalism, fundamentalism and neo-evangelicalism during these highlighted years, evangelical Quakerism shifted as well. While these similarities allow us, with caution, to place evangelical Quakers within the Protestant evangelical denominational fold, there are some differences between this case study and the larger evangelical community that should be noted.

The first difference is that there is not a clearly defined schism away from its fundamentalist heritage within OYM. The best evidence of this phenomenon is probably in the way neo-evangelical leaders of the 1940s responded to the fundamentalist leaders of the 1920s and 1930s. Edward Mott was treated like a ‘beloved elder statesman’<sup>92</sup> at the 1947 conference in Colorado, his books, published in the 1940s, received positive press from the YM and George Fox College President, Milo Ross, refers to Mott as, ‘the founding father of the evangelical movement as we know it today.’<sup>93</sup> These actions suggest he was still held in high regard by the new evangelical order. In this sense, the movement from fundamentalism toward neo-evangelicalism within OYM can be cast as more of a shift than a revolt. Roberts describes the 1947 conference as more ‘transitional’<sup>94</sup> than any sort of intentional distancing from fundamentalist leaders. Rather, he sees that conference as both a ‘vindication of the faith of all those ministers and leaders in frontier America who identified their labors with such as John Henry

---

<sup>92</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 13.

<sup>93</sup> Milo C. Ross, ‘Recollections of conversations between Edward Mott and Milo Ross concerning the first evangelical conference held in Cheyenne, Wyoming, 1927’, *Concern* (October 1963): 16.

<sup>94</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 2.

Douglas and others of the revivalist era and who resented being treated as if they were ersatz Quakers'<sup>95</sup> as well as 'a way toward unity rather than division'.<sup>96</sup> Thus, we see in Oregon a far more subtle and slow shift from fundamentalism to neo-evangelicalism than was typical of larger Protestant America.

The second difference is that OYM represents a single separatist group within a larger denomination. Although the unique Quaker corporate structure allowed for more local independence within each YM than is common among many other Protestant denominations with national headships, there was still a corporate body (FYM) identified by 1902 that held sway over evangelical Quaker polity in America and was the denominational head for those respective meetings. The aggregate theological shifting of this larger denominational headship was not the primary focus of this work, and if it had been, it is probable that different conclusions would have been revealed. Instead, I have elected to highlight a separatist body, which would take the lead in establishing a new wing of the Society. In some ways, a more appropriate comparative study might be within the separatist bodies of other denominations compared to the entire denomination (i.e. General Association of Regular Baptists or the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.). It would not be accurate to say, then, that this was a study of the impact of fundamentalism on all Gurneyite Friends in America. Rather, this is a study of how OYM's relationship to all Gurneyite Friends was influenced due to fundamentalism. However, even this caveat has its limitations. While OYM did represent a minority view of separatists in the 1920s and 1930s, it came full circle as a YM and played an important leadership role in

---

<sup>95</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 13.

<sup>96</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 3.

fundamentally reshaping the entire American Friends Church in the latter half of the twentieth-century.

The third notable difference is in relationship to geography. While the notion that fundamentalism was exclusively a rural phenomenon has been generally discredited,<sup>97</sup> it is to be noted that the State of Oregon, even as late the early twentieth-century, could still be classified as part of the frontier west. Although this study was not about the impact of socio-economic factors tied to geographical anomalies across America, people within OYM clearly were not experiencing the same world as those with better connections to emerging technologies. In the late nineteenth-century, America became an urban industrialised nation: 'Between 1860 and 1920 the nation's population more than tripled, but the number of its businesses increased eightfold, and its net national product became thirty times larger.'<sup>98</sup> However, in the period immediately following the Great War, transportation or communication to and from the State of Oregon was by no means

---

<sup>97</sup> Early after the intense fundamentalists/modernists conflicts of the 1920s, historians begin to analyse the movement, with a broad consensus suggesting that some of the conflict stemmed from a rural/urban divide in America. H. Richard Niebuhr (1937) claimed, 'In the social sources from which it [fundamentalism] drew its strength fundamentalism was closely related to the conflict between rural and urban cultures in American... It achieved little strength in the urban and industrial sections of the country but was active in many rural states.' See H. Richard Niebuhr, 'Fundamentalism', *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, eds. E. R. A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson (New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1937), 527. For further support of this view see also, Francis X. Curran, *Major Trends in American Church History* (New York, NY: America Press, 1946), 149 and George E. Mowry, *The Urban Nation, 1920-1960* (New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 1965), 28-31.

Ernest Sandeen (1970) was one of the early and influential voices to provide a critique against the prevailing notion that American fundamentalism was the result of such classifications, suggesting that rather, the base of support for both fundamentalists and modernists were 'indistinguishable' from one another. See Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (MI: Baker Book House, 1970), xi-xvi, 132-270. Sandeen's view has been supported by Marsden, 'The common social hypothesis, premised on the conflict between rural and urban, cannot stand.' See Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 202.

<sup>98</sup> Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992), 304. Noll doesn't clarify with this reference how much of the growth was due to geographical increases in the U.S., including the addition of the following territories: Midway Islands 1867, Alaska 1867, Hawaii 1898, Puerto Rico 1898 and American Samoa 1899.

simple (even for those days). Although Seattle was a major railroad hub in the North with the completion of the Northern Pacific Railroad, at this time, those Monthly Meetings in the Puget Sound area were still attached to Indiana Yearly Meeting. To the South, California long enjoyed the benefits of the Transcontinental Railway. However, in 1919, Oregon (and Portland, in particular) sat underserved in the middle. Travel to and from the Eastern United States, in particular, involved switching to multiple lines and working with different train companies.<sup>99</sup> This is not to say that those in Oregon were in any way without information or in some way intellectually ‘backward’, more that there were some clear geographical boundaries that hindered the speed and relevance of communication and relational immediacy to the outside. Hemmed in by the Pacific and the Rockies on the East and West and the Canadians and the Californians to the North and South, OYM had some physical boundaries separating it from the larger American conversation. Although left unanswered by this work, it would be of interest to study how such geographical anomalies influenced OYM’s intra-group cohesion and thus exacerbated insular tendencies.<sup>100</sup>

Thus, while OYM can still be cautiously shown to have many similarities with Protestant America during the same era, these three caveats are to be noted when arguing for generalising from OYM patterns to the larger evangelical world.

---

<sup>99</sup> Unlike today’s unified passenger rail service in America, during this era the rail service was still an open competitive market with different companies operating different portions of rail lines, or in some cases, competing rail companies building tracks side by side. During Hoover’s administration (1929-1932), there were over 100 different rail companies providing passenger services in the U.S. Passengers looking to make long distance connections into underserved areas often had to work with multiple rail lines.

<sup>100</sup> There are also some possible cross-denominational comparisons which could be made here as well, as the largest USA Presbyterian church in the world existed in Seattle during this same era, and it too, was staunchly conservative evangelical. See Harold Lindsell, *Park Street Prophet: A Life of Harold John Ockenga* (IL: Van Kampen Press, 1951), 61.



## Original Contribution

There has been no single large scale study focused exclusively on issues of evangelical Quakerism in America in the early twentieth-century. Nor has there been any large scale study that highlights the various shifts and changes within the socio-theological manifestations of that population. There have not even been in-depth local studies (such as this one) that focus on a particular twentieth-century evangelical Quaker sub-population or grouping. As a whole, it is a largely understudied population. This work starts to fill that void by focusing on an important centre of evangelical Quakerism, Oregon Yearly Meeting.<sup>101</sup> As shown in this work, during the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s OYM proves an excellent case study of evangelical Quakerism and its protean ethos.

Ironically, then, with the exception of Beebe's denominational narrative, no scholarly work has highlighted Oregon evangelical Quakers within the same timeframe. This work fills this gap and becomes the only large scale piece of research providing a specific account of the theological changes in neo-evangelical Quakerism, as seen through the history of Oregon Yearly Meeting during the three decades highlighted. Both by focusing on a unique region, largely unexamined by other scholars, and by highlighting an understudied population (evangelical Quakers as a whole), this work makes an original contribution to scholarship. Thus, the central finding of this work is

---

<sup>101</sup> Oregon YM is unique from other YM's in America in that it played such an influential leadership role in moving evangelical Friends as a whole into fundamentalism as well as into neo-evangelicalism. This makes it an important case-study worthy of an in-depth analysis such as is offered herein. While there were other YMs in America, which could have provided effective comparative analysis, this work was focused on how the neo-evangelical identity came to be a normative experience among American Friends by mid-century. That research question could not have been adequately addressed without a singular focus on the phenomenon within OYM. At some point, future research will need to supplement this work with similar case studies for other YMs (see Implications for Scholarship section below).

exactly how neo-evangelical religious identity became normative for the YM by mid-century, a process that is best understood in relation to the fundamentalist movement.

More than providing academia with a better understanding of evangelical Quakerism, though, this work also adds a scholarly contribution to the larger study of Protestant Christianity. While there is a reasonable collection of academic work on the issues of fundamentalism and modernism within the Protestant community, there has been no research dedicated to considering how these same controversies impacted the Religious Society of Friends. This research, however, has pinpointed significant similarities between the evangelical Quakers in Oregon and these other denominational groupings. This thesis, then, provides both an original historical understanding of the theological shifts within evangelical Quakerism as a whole during the first half of the twentieth-century, and it adds an original contribution to the broader study of Christianity in America during the highlighted years.

### **Implications for Scholarship**

There is little past scholarship on the subject matter modified by the research findings here. The aforementioned work by Beebe is challenged simply on the grounds that his neo-evangelical bias led to a minimisation of some more negative elements of the story. This inclination is not only a common pattern amongst denominational narratives written by denominational leaders, but it was a pattern evident in works by neo-evangelicals as a whole as they looked back to their fundamentalist roots.<sup>102</sup> The tendency has been either to caricature the movement as an aberrant reaction, led mostly

---

<sup>102</sup> Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, 3.

by biblical literalists and/or rural anti-intellectual forces against modernism, or (somewhat more positively) to cast it as part of a necessary means to re-energise the waning evangelical influence in society. And as such, minimise the movement's more questionable methodologies.

This work has brought both tendencies into check and has shown that, within OYM at least, the fundamentalist leaders were not 'culturally backward', but are better viewed as being champions of establishing evangelical theology as the exclusive paradigm for understanding modern society, i.e. defenders of the faith. Such single-minded evangelical protectionism by fundamentalist leaders, however, did lead to brazen examples of the-ends-justifying-the-means. Over the course of the twentieth-century, it is mostly through these leaders that the 'fourth strain' of American Quakerism was born and it is from leaders, such as Mott, that the Friends Church today can claim much of its heritage. His status, thus, parallels Rufus Jones' in terms of having a lasting and formative impact on a major twentieth-century development within the Friends. Mott's lifelong scorn for modernism, his spirit of separatism and his use of questionable corporate-decision-making methods certainly make him a flawed character, not generally embraced by scholars. However, still more studies are needed offering an alternative analysis alongside those many studies of Quakerism that have hailed the triumph of liberalism in the Society, most notably led by Jones, as the most marked feature of the early twentieth-century.<sup>103</sup> It is apparent that the most marked feature of early twentieth-century Quakerism is its shift through conservative evangelical Protestantism, a trend that had already been established as dominant toward the end of the nineteenth-century. Thus,

---

<sup>103</sup> See the section in Chapter One entitled 'The Relationship to Previous Scholarship'.

a proper understanding of evangelical Quakerism today is best acquired by seeing it rooted in the ‘aberration’ of fundamentalism. This work has started to provide that corrective.

One of the most notable implications of this work for future scholarship, then, is to determine the transferability of these findings to other Yearly Meetings within the Religious Society of Friends. Prior to 1947, three other evangelical American YMs, besides Oregon, were separate from the Five-Years Meeting structure (Ohio Yearly Meeting never joined, Central Yearly Meeting and Kansas Yearly Meeting). After 1947, two more YMs left FYM – Rocky Mountain Yearly Meeting (formerly, Nebraska Yearly Meeting) and Southwest Yearly Meeting (formerly, California YM). All five of these YMs seem, on the surface, to express common reasons for their respective decisions not to be a part of FYM: future scholarship needs to determine whether or not that is accurate. Questions in need of answers include: why, if the reasons were the same, were there such widespread differences in leaving dates from one YM to the next? Can fundamentalism, which is generally thought of as a 1920s and 1930s phenomenon, be attributed to other YMs’ change as much as it has been applied to OYM? And are there unique geographical differences in the expression of an evangelical theology in each YM? The creation of Alaska Yearly Meeting in 1970 (another understudied evangelical YM), then, also becomes important to future studies, as they were the first YM to join EFCI (formerly EFA) immediately upon formation. Understanding what it was that Alaska perceived in EFCI that matched their core beliefs sufficiently to join them, as opposed to any other possible affiliation or just being an independent YM, will further

improve our understanding of evangelical Quakers as a whole. On a broader scale, it would also be of academic interest to examine the bifurcation of FYM geographically. During the course of the twentieth-century, every Gurneyite YM west of the Mississippi, except Iowa YM, separated from Friends United Meeting (formerly Five-Years Meeting),<sup>104</sup> while no Gurneyite YM east of the Mississippi did.<sup>105</sup>

In addition to the question of the ones that separated, there is also the question of those that did not. Of the twelve Yearly Meetings attached to the FUM structure in 1907,<sup>106</sup> nine of them are still a part of that organisation more than a hundred years later. All nine of these YMs were considered evangelical Gurneyite Yearly Meetings at the end of the nineteenth-century – and some of them are still easily classified today as evangelical (in the manner defined by Bebbington). Punshon claims that the majority of Quakers today, who refer to themselves as ‘evangelical’, are not associated with the official bodies of Evangelical Friends.<sup>107</sup> It would be helpful to see both, in what ways, if any, their expression of evangelical Quakerism differs from that of the ones that left FYM, as well as to understand what factors contributed to them staying within the FYM

---

<sup>104</sup> In 1996, Iowa Yearly Meeting came close to separating from Friends United Meeting as well, but, in the end, it decided to allow each Monthly Meeting to elect for itself whether or not it would affiliate to FUM. Iowa YM also sent a letter to FUM stating that the YM dissociates itself with the National Council of Churches and World Council of Churches. See Hamm *Quakers in America*, 150; See *Iowa Yearly Meeting Minutes-1996* (Oskaloosa, IA: Iowa Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, 1996), page 11-19, 22-25.

<sup>105</sup> Ohio YM, now functioning as Evangelical Friends Church Eastern Region is the one Gurneyite YM east of the Mississippi today not organically attached to FUM. It never was a member of Five Years Meeting and remained an independent YM until it joined the Evangelical Friends Alliance in 1963. On the founding EFA members, see J. L. Wilcuts, ‘Evangelical Friends Alliance’, *Concern*, (October 1963): 5.

<sup>106</sup> New England, New York, Baltimore, North Carolina, Indiana, Western, Iowa, Kansas, Wilmington, Oregon, California and Canada Yearly Meetings.

<sup>107</sup> John Punshon, *Reason for Hope: The Faith and Future of the Friends Church* (IN: Friends United Press, 2001), xv.

structure. Likewise, it would be useful to see whether these two groups are now essentially so similar to each other that their current disunification is only at the corporate level rather than theologically or spiritually based.<sup>108</sup> This type of study might get to the deeper question, asked by some who study evangelical movements, as to whether or not exclusivity and isolation were necessary components in order to keep sacred what was perceived as essential to the evangelical mantra, or, whether there were other means which might have proved successful at preserving the same supernatural theology?

## **Chapter Summary**

This chapter has summarised the research findings and presents conclusions regarding the development and process by which a mid-twentieth-century neo-evangelical ethos became a normative identity for the Friends Church within Oregon Yearly Meeting. It also examined to what extent this process of change paralleled similar theological shifts within the larger Protestant milieu of evangelical America. It argued that the neo-evangelical identity among Evangelical Quakers, which came to maturity by the mid-twentieth-century, is best understood as both heir to the fundamentalist impulses of the 1920s and 1930s, and, simultaneously, a moderate corrective to the same impulses.

---

<sup>108</sup> In January 2012, the Superintendent of Northwest Yearly Meeting (formerly OYM) was hired as the General Secretary of Friends United Meeting (formerly FYM). See <http://fum.org/staff/>, accessed October 4, 2012.

## **APPENDIX**

### **FORMATION OF THE EVANGELICAL FRIENDS CHURCH INTERNATIONAL**

Today many conservative evangelical Friends look to the Evangelical Friends Church International (EFCI) as the umbrella entity binding together what were once independent evangelical Yearly Meetings (YM) in the Friends Church. This Appendix examines the formation and early history of the EFCI (originally called the Evangelical Friends Alliance) and its relationship to the Association of Evangelical Friends.

After years of sectarian divide and isolation among evangelical Friends in America, 1947 saw the formation of what was to become the Association of Evangelical Friends (AEF) – a broad movement within the Friends Church to promote the fellowship of the Gospel. The primary aim of this new organisation was to provide fellowship and inspiration among all evangelical Friends.<sup>1</sup>

The initial conference giving impetus to this new movement was held in Colorado Springs and comprised over 150 Quakers, with nine Yearly Meetings represented (in addition to the four independent YMs, Ohio, Oregon, Central and Kansas– attendees also came from California YM, Indiana YM, Iowa YM, Nebraska YM and Western YM).<sup>2</sup> Papers were given by leading evangelicals of the past and emerging leaders of the future

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Constitution of Association of Evangelical Friends*, Adopted July 13 1956. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. Archive located in Arthur Roberts Papers, George Fox University archives, Newberg, Oregon, Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

<sup>2</sup> Arthur Roberts, *The Association of Evangelical Friends: A Story of Quaker Renewal in the Twentieth Century* (OR: The Barclay Press, 1975), 12-14.

and included a broad spectrum of topics (prayer, evangelism, social service, missions, etc.).<sup>3</sup> By the end of the conference, evangelical Quakers were united in ‘a kind of rally of those of like precious faith.’<sup>4</sup> The concluding utterance at the conference shows a budding unity around the historic vision of evangelical Quakerism:

We, as Evangelical Friends, assembled in conference at Colorado Springs, Colorado, June 25-29, 1947, do re-affirm our faith in the body of evangelical truths – the historic faith of Friends as set forth by George Fox in his letter to the Governor of Barbadoes, and as stated in the Richmond Declaration of Faith, issued in 1887.<sup>5</sup>

Subsequently, the conference of evangelical Friends decided to continue meeting as a unified (non-binding) body every 2-4 years for similar rallies, open to all individuals who agreed with the basic evangelical theology of Friends.<sup>6</sup> By 1956, a constitution was developed,<sup>7</sup> and, shortly thereafter, an official organ was published regularly (*Concern*).<sup>8</sup>

The formation of AEF marks a significant turning point in the Friends Church as it started to move out of its fundamentalist heritage and sought to improve its recent history of limited engagement with the world and ecumenical separation from perceived apostate organisations. After almost half a century of division within the Gurneyite wing

---

<sup>3</sup> See conference programme printed in the *Evangelical Friends Conference Report – 1947*. Archive located in Arthur Roberts Papers, George Fox University archives, Newberg, Oregon, Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

<sup>4</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 14.

<sup>5</sup> Statement reprinted in Edward Mott, *Sixty Years of Gospel Ministry* (privately printed, 1946), 153.

<sup>6</sup> ‘Membership in the association is open to any individual who subscribes to the evangelical Friends statement of faith and believes in the purpose and objectives of this association.’ AEF Constitution, Article IV. *Constitution of Association of Evangelical Friends*, adopted July 13, 1956. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*.

<sup>7</sup> *Constitution of Association of Evangelical Friends*, adopted July 13, 1956. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*.

<sup>8</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 23.



of the Society, the formation of AEF was intended to bring collaboration and support to a group of evangelicals whose limited unity was primarily in their protest against the inroads made by modernism. Although, by mid-century, tolerance to some forms of modernism (i.e. those who differed on Scriptural interpretation as opposed to those who denied the divinity of Christ) was openly embraced in the Friends Church,<sup>9</sup> it is in this same impulse against modernism (now more honed in terms of secular and theologically liberal modernism) that we find the impulse for forming the Evangelical Friends Alliance (precursor to the EFI and EFCI) – which can only be properly understood in its relationship to, and differences from, the Association of Evangelical Friends.

The Evangelical Friends Alliance officially formed in 1963, but its inception goes back to the 1954 AEF conference in Oskaloosa, Iowa (the third such conference to date). The AEF Steering Committee<sup>10</sup> reported during the Business Meeting that it had received several requests for ‘a more definite or permanent form of organization’.<sup>11</sup> Up to this point, AEF conferences had been primarily rallying points to encourage those with evangelical convictions. It did not develop official statements that were binding upon the participating individuals or their respective Yearly Meetings (YM). It was a voluntary, non-representative gathering, meant to serve as, ‘a catalytic agent for the yearly meetings

---

<sup>9</sup> See Everett L. Cattell, ‘Passion for Unity: A Critical Survey of Contemporary Quakerdom’. Speech given at the 1959 gathering of the Association of Evangelical Friends in Newberg, Oregon. Reprinted in the *Concern*, vol. I, no. 3 (Fall 1959): 16.

<sup>10</sup> Sheldon Jackson, Gerald Dillon, Paul Baiotto, Ralph Coppock and Arthur Roberts. See *Report of the Third Conference of Evangelical Friends in America*, held in Oskaloosa, Iowa June 30-July 4, 1954. Archive located in Arthur Roberts’ papers, Box #2, Folder 2.1.1.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

and their groupings as already organized.’<sup>12</sup> No actual reason is stated in the conference minutes for the motive behind these requests, but they garnered sufficient support that a representative Continuation Committee<sup>13</sup> was formed to study the matter.

Within two years an official constitution was developed and approved at the 1956 AEF gathering in Denver, Colorado.<sup>14</sup> The form of government decided upon, however, was more of a ‘promotional council’ as opposed to a ‘rally’ or a ‘delegate authority’.<sup>15</sup> Gerald Dillon (AEF Chairman and pastor of First Friends Church in Portland, Oregon) specified:

One thing is increasingly clear at least in my own mind. It is that we do not want a supra-yearly meeting type of an organization necessitating representatives, boards and committees. It is our firm belief that the Lord’s work should be done at the individual level as long as possible and carried on by Spirit-filled believers with burning hearts. Organization on any higher level should be only in cases of necessity where the work demands a greater body of people to do a job more effectively. Considering the many miles that separate us, the very effective job that is already being done by the various Yearly Meetings, and the objectives of our association, I am sure I speak the mind of our conference when I say we do not want another “Five-Years Meeting” type of organization.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 2.

<sup>13</sup> Gerald Dillon (chairman), Ralph Coppock, Paul Todd, T. Clio Brown, Lowell Roberts, Walter Lee, Orlando Dick, Simeon Smith and Ray Morford. See *Report of the Third Conference of Evangelical Friends in America*.

<sup>14</sup> *Constitution of Association of Evangelical Friends*, adopted July 13, 1956. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*.

<sup>15</sup> In 1955, Arthur Roberts presented a paper to the committee which advocated just such an organisational structure. Although he was not on the Continuation Council, his advice seems to have been heeded. See Arthur Roberts, ‘Exploring the Nature and Possible Functions of an Organization of Evangelical Friends’, February 24 1955. Archive located in Arthur Roberts’ Papers, Box #2, Folder 2.2.6.

<sup>16</sup> Gerald W. Dillon, ‘What of the Future?’ Speech given at the 1956 AEF conference. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. Archive located in Arthur Roberts’ Papers, Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

Over the next ten years, while AEF continued to grow and provide inspirational conferences, some within the mid-century neo-evangelical movement among Friends sought a more definitive (and official) form of administration and government, particularly in regards to developing a single mission work all evangelical Friends could support. This was something the AEF Administration Board felt structurally limited to provide since it was designed to function mainly as a renewal and fellowship body.<sup>17</sup> Also, the AEF was not an official representative body and had no connection to the respective YMs of its members. It did not, and could not, speak for the voice of evangelical Friends.<sup>18</sup> This second issue may not have been so pressing but for some important developments during the second half of the twentieth-century in both Five-Years Meeting (FYM) and the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), which led to increasing alarm among evangelical Friends over what those respective organisations perceived to be tolerant attitudes towards theological liberalism and secular modernism. Despite some openness toward evangelical modernism during the second-half of the twentieth-century, liberal and secular ideas that undermined Orthodoxy were still staunchly rejected beliefs within the Friends Church.<sup>19</sup>

The first change within FYM, which caused concern for evangelical Friends, was in regards to FYM's relationship to the World Council of Churches and the National

---

<sup>17</sup> Gerald Dillon, 'Alliance---Association', *Concern* vol. 4 no 4 (October 1963): 2.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> See Everett L. Cattell, 'Passion for Unity: A Critical Survey of Contemporary Quakerdom.' Speech given at the 1959 gathering of the Association of Evangelical Friends in Newberg, Oregon. Reprinted in the *Concern*, vol. I no. 3 (Fall 1959): 16.

Council of Churches.<sup>20</sup> During the 1950 session of FYM, active membership in both organisations was started.<sup>21</sup> The impact of this new collaboration soon resulted in another round of organic division within FYM. In 1954, Nebraska Yearly Meeting<sup>22</sup> adopted a resolution with respect to FYM, citing almost all the same concerns of Oregon YM and Kansas YM several decades before, but with the addition of concern over FYM's membership in the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches. A proposal from Nebraska to FYM that all references to the FYM's involvement with the World Council and National Council specify their exception and made clear the Nebraska YM was not included, did not garner consensus at the 1955 session of FYM.<sup>23</sup> An official statement was adopted, however that read:

While the Committee is not in harmony with statements made by some persons connected with the National Council of Churches and with the World Council of Churches we feel that membership of the Five Years Meeting in these Councils results in values which should be preserved, and we recommend that, for the present, our membership be continued. While we feel this recommendation should be made, we also wish to re-

---

<sup>20</sup> The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States was formed at a meeting in 1950 comprised of delegates from the Federal Council of Churches, eight interdenominational agencies, twenty-five Protestant denominations and four Eastern Orthodox churches. The primary purpose of the National Council was an effort among the Christian churches in America to cooperate in Christian service, where none of them could do so separately. After the formation of the NCC, the Federal Council of Churches ceased its operations, giving way to the larger entity. Fundamentalists as a whole quickly charged the National Council with being unsound, communist and a move towards a one-world church. See Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (Paris: Mouton and Co., 1963), 55-75.

<sup>21</sup> Technically, FYM elected to join the World Council of Churches in 1940, but due to a decade of provisional planning somewhat slowed by the onset of world war, 1950 is nominally when active participation in that organisation began. That same year, FYM officially joined the National Council of Churches. See *Minutes of the Five Years Meeting-1940*, m. 48, p. 53-53 (Richmond, IN: Five Years Meeting). See *Minutes of the Five Years Meeting-1950*, m. 24, p. 35-36 (Richmond, IN: Five Years Meeting).

<sup>22</sup> The first American Yearly Meeting to have been formed directly through the Five-Years Meeting rather than being 'set-off' by another Yearly Meeting.

<sup>23</sup> *Minutes of the Five Years Meeting of Friends-1955*, 45-46.

affirm our respect and love for Nebraska Meeting of Friends, and our respect for their point of view.<sup>24</sup>

The following year Nebraska Yearly Meeting, which was in the process of changing its name to Rocky Mountain Yearly Meeting and moving its headquarters to Denver, elected instead to split into two Yearly Meetings, so as to intentionally create an organic division, allowing each Monthly Meeting to decide independently which Yearly Meeting to join.<sup>25</sup> By 1957, twenty-one Monthly Meetings in Nebraska voted to join the newly-formed Rocky Mountain Yearly Meeting, which affiliated itself to the Association of Evangelical Friends. The remaining six Monthly Meetings continued as NYM and as part of FYM.<sup>26</sup>

The second change within FYM was more nuanced. In the middle of the twentieth-century a unification movement started within some Gurneyite and Hicksite YMs. Partly due to declining membership and partly to the ending of past theological division over modernism, around the middle of the century, YMs in New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore united.<sup>27</sup> While some evangelical Friends looked at these unifications with indifference, others were gravely concerned over the impact these changes would have on FYM – an organisation that, despite its perceived flaws, was still a part of the Gurneyite Orthodox branch of the Society. By default, the unification brought Hicksite Friends into FYM:

---

<sup>24</sup> *Minutes of the Five Years Meeting of Friends-1955*, 133-134.

<sup>25</sup> *Nebraska Yearly Meeting Minutes-1956* (Central City, Nebraska: Nebraska Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1956), minute 83, page 36-37.

<sup>26</sup> *Nebraska Yearly Meeting Minutes-1957* (Central City, Nebraska: Nebraska Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1957), minute 16-22, page 9-12.

<sup>27</sup> Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 61.

Within the Five Years Meeting three member Yearly Meetings have united with their Hicksite counterpart, and thus by a tactical device brought Hicksites officially within the Five Years Meeting without getting the consent of the other members or of the body as a whole and thus without frank facing of the issues involved.<sup>28</sup>

For evangelicals (both those attached to the Independent YMs and those attached to YMs still part of the organic structure of FYM), the move created grave concerns regarding the inroads of secular modernism.

To the evangelical this is still a life and death matter and the evangelical cannot understand the callousness with which actions of the sort are forced upon him without consultation and without appreciation of his position.<sup>29</sup>

Thus, through the World Council of Churches and National Council of Churches, evangelicals perceived that FYM was showing alarming signs of tolerance towards theological liberalism, and, through allowing Hicksite membership, was allowing secular modernism into its fold. These changes caused an increased suspicion by evangelicals of that organisation's ability to speak for what was left of the Gurneyite wing of the Society in the second half of the twentieth-century.

In addition to shifts within FYM, AFSC was perceived as moving in an even more extreme leftist direction. Over the second half of the century, AFSC adopted what moderate and conservative Friends labeled 'militant' and 'extreme leftist' policies.<sup>30</sup> By the 1960s, AFSC was accused by many of embracing total non-exclusivity, and

---

<sup>28</sup> Everett L. Cattell, 'Passion for Unity: A Critical Survey of Contemporary Quakerdom.' Speech given at the 1959 gathering of the Association of Evangelical Friends in Newberg, Oregon. Reprinted in the *Concern*, vol. I, no. 3 (Fall 1959): 13.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> Thomas Hamm, *The Quakers in America*, Columbia Contemporary American Religion Series (New York, Columbia University Press, 2003), 176.

purposefully supporting violent protests in order to disrupt the American government.<sup>31</sup>

Henry Cadbury, who served as Chairman of the AFSC Board up until 1960 (and as Honorary Chairman thereafter), actively supported these changes as forward thinking.<sup>32</sup>

While AFSC continued to support the historic Quaker statement ‘that of God in everyone’ within its mission statement, it is clear there was no longer any sort of divine absolute underlying that belief, and leaders of the AFSC, like Lewis Hoskins, began to intentionally recast the historic statement as, ‘non-theological, more psychological.’<sup>33</sup>

Such trends were a constant point of frustration for evangelical Friends who, despite a broader awareness of their need for having a social ethic, held tightly to a polemic that the Quaker testimonies were not valid outside of that to which they gave testament – the gospel experience of transforming the individual. Increasingly, evangelicals called for the creation of an alternative service organisation to take the place of AFSC and FYM.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Guenter Lewy, *Peace and Revolution: The Moral Crisis of American Pacifism* (MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 27-55.

<sup>32</sup> Aside from indirectly encouraging and supporting many of the new movements within AFSC, he wrote portions of AFSC policy against nuclear testing as well as the AFSC’s official recommendation for a woman’s right to abortion. He provided assistance to those who refused to pay war taxes. He also approved the decision for an exercise in civil disobedience by approving AFSC’s controversial decision to send medical supplies to the National Liberation Front in North Vietnam and he supported the rise of black power and the request of reparations for slavery. See Margaret Hope Bacon, *Let this Life Speak: The Legacy of Henry Joel Cadbury* (PN: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 183, 187-190, 205-206.

<sup>33</sup> Lewis Hoskins, personal letter to Roy Clampitt, dated April 7, 1950. AFSC archives, General Administration Communications and Organizations-1950, file labeled ‘evangelical Friends’.

<sup>34</sup> In 1960, Arthur Roberts, editor of *Concern*, strongly indicted AFSC calling for its disbandment and a new model of social service: ‘I submit that the American Friends Service Committee does not and, because of lack of proper organic relationship, cannot with any continuity, speak and act for the corporate membership of the Society of Friends. I suggest, therefore, that serious consideration be given to disbanding the organization. Let social concern arise from yearly meetings which will stand responsible for their policies and actions. We might not win a Nobel Prize; but I believe the Holy Spirit would lead us into greater unity of the Gospel witness – which is our true strength – than now obtains in the unpolitic situation of official missions and unofficial service.’ See *Concern* vol. 2, no. 4 (October, 1960): 1.

In response to the growing concerns and the organizational needs perceived of as not being met by the AEF, in 1963, four independent Yearly Meetings (Kansas, Ohio, Rocky Mountain and Oregon – previously calling themselves KORO) formed the Evangelical Friends Alliance (EFA), an official entity representing the evangelical voice of these four independent evangelical YMs in America.<sup>35</sup> The new entity immediately set up four commissions: Foreign Mission, Friends Youth, Publications and Evangelism and Church Extension.<sup>36</sup> In many ways (some of which were unintended), the EFA became a ‘supra-Yearly Meeting’, the evangelical equivalent to Friends United Meeting (FUM – its name was changed from Five-Years Meeting in 1960). The AEF continued to exist as a separate body and continued in its purpose to be a fellowship body of individual Friends bringing renewal to the evangelical concern. The respective leaders felt like both organisations provided a unique and necessary function within the Friends Church and there was no inclination to disband one in favour of the other.<sup>37</sup>

In this historical analysis, we find three motivating impulses in the formation of EFA, as a distinct organisation from AEF. Firstly, there was a desire to have greater unity

---

<sup>35</sup> Oregon YM, Kansas YM, Ohio YM and Rocky Mountain YM. See J. L. Willcuts, ‘Evangelical Friends Alliance’, *Concern*, vol. 4 no. 4 (October 1963): 5.

<sup>36</sup> See Jack L. Willcuts, ‘Evangelical Friends Alliance’, *Concern* vol. 4 no. 4 (October 1963): 5-7.

<sup>37</sup> Gerald Dillon (who served as president of both organisations for a season) argued that, ‘the Association is not bogged down with a multiplication of committees, reports, and business sessions. The main business is to seek the mind of the Lord for the Friends Church today. At this point there is no yearly meeting, or other organization that would not profit immeasurably as its leading representatives gather with other concerned Friends for a time of prayerful seeking and challenge. In the providence of God, I trust the Association will continue to be a catalyst for all Friends to move toward a greater sense of unity in Christ, a deeper spiritual concern for the evangelization of the world, and a more perfect witness of the church of Jesus Christ.’ See Dillon, ‘Alliance---Association’, 4. Jack L. Willcuts said, ‘It should be pointed out that the Evangelical Friends Alliance is entirely different from the Association of Evangelical Friends, which meets each three years as a fellowship group only.’ See Willcuts, ‘Evangelical Friends Alliance’, 5.



around programme development, which only a legalised headship could provide – most notably, for mission work and evangelism. Within a few years of its inception, EFA officially adopted Mexico as its missionary site.<sup>38</sup> Today, the Evangelical Friends Mission (EFM) is the cooperative mission arm of Evangelical Friends Church International, providing outreach ministries in Africa, Central and South America, Asia, Europe and North America.<sup>39</sup>

The second was to ensure that evangelical Friends had a unified voice and one place to speak for issues of polity and doctrine. Towards this end, the new Alliance developed its own organ and resumed national publication of *The Evangelical Friend*.<sup>40</sup> The purpose of the periodical was to be a top quality magazine to include religious news, editorials, inspirational articles, doctrinal emphases, information and promotion among the Friends Church.<sup>41</sup> Many of the personnel in the Alliance and its official organ, basically, constitute a ‘who’s who’ of Oregon Friends. The Alliance’s first president was OYM pastor Gerald Dillon, the Alliance’s chairman of Christian Education was Howard Harmon – who also served as president of OYM Board of Christian education,<sup>42</sup> editor of *The Evangelical Friend* was OYM’s previous General Superintendent, Dean Gregory,<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> No author noted, ‘Borne of Four’, *Evangelical Friend* vol. I, no. 1 (September 1967): 10.

<sup>39</sup> Evangelical Friends Mission website – about us page, <http://friendsmission.com/about-efm/about-us>, accessed October 2, 2011.

<sup>40</sup> First issue was September 1967. See, *Evangelical Friend* vol. I, no. 1 (September 1967). Ohio YM was already using the name *Evangelical Friend* for its official YM organ.

<sup>41</sup> Willcuts, ‘Evangelical Friends Alliance’, 7.

<sup>42</sup> *Evangelical Friend*, vol. I no. 1 (September 1967): 15.

<sup>43</sup> *Evangelical Friend*, vol. I no. 1 (September 1967): 5.

the Executive Editor was the current OYM General Superintendent, Jack L. Willcuts,<sup>44</sup> the Managing Editor was Oregon Quaker Harold Ankeny<sup>45</sup> and the journal was published by Oregon's Barclay Press.<sup>46</sup> The Alliance's official headquarters were also in Newberg, Oregon.<sup>47</sup> Thus, once again, OYM led the way as an important epicentre of change.

The third motivational impulse was a reactionary push against the perceived inroads made by theological liberalism and secular modernism into FUM and the perceived radical leftist ideas of AFSC, both ideologies which were considered heterodoxical to evangelicals. While today, in the twenty-first century, FUM is perceived by evangelicals to have come back to a more Christological centre, for much of the remainder of the twentieth-century, it was charged with increasing liberalism.<sup>48</sup> In 1993, Southwest Yearly Meeting (formerly California YM) left FUM over its refusal to endorse the Richmond Declaration of Faith and joined EFA, leaving a huge dearth of strong evangelical pastoral constituents in the former.<sup>49</sup> In 1996, Iowa YM almost left FUM (also citing concern over FUM's affiliation with the World Council of Churches and National Council of Churches), but in the end left it to each of its Monthly Meetings to

---

<sup>44</sup> *Evangelical Friend*, vol. I no. 1 (September 1967): 1.

<sup>45</sup> *Evangelical Friend*, vol. I no. 1 (September 1967): 1.

<sup>46</sup> *Evangelical Friend*, vol. I no. 1 (September 1967): 1. In 1967, OYM elected to discontinue its own organ, the *Northwest Friend*, for it to be replaced by the *Evangelical Friend*. Many of the *Northwest Friend* staff simply transferred over to the same position they were in previously, but with the new publication. See Frederick B. Baker, 'Friends Journalism in the Northwest', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 47 no. 5 (July-August 1967): 4-6; see also, Jack Willcuts, 'Time for Change', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 47 no. 5 (July-August 1967): 3.

<sup>47</sup> *Evangelical Friend*, vol. I no. 1 (September 1967): 1.

<sup>48</sup> Thomas D. Hamm, 'Friends United Meeting and its Identity: An Interpretative History', *Quaker Life* (January/February 2009): 12-15

<sup>49</sup> Hamm, 'Friends United Meeting', 15

decide its own individual allegiance.<sup>50</sup> Today, the relationship between the EFCI churches and AFSC is primarily historically based. While both organisations identify common roots, neither shares allegiance with the other at the corporate level.

One of the unintended consequences of having two organisations (AEF and EFA) representing evangelical Quakers was a moderate power struggle between the leaders and the laity of the evangelical renewal movement among Friends. The Alliance was specifically intended to be the official, legally incorporated body that could speak for all member evangelical YMs. Unlike the AEF, individual members could not join the EFA, but rather the Alliance was limited to only YMs that consented to the Alliance's Statement of Faith.<sup>51</sup> Many evangelical Friends, who were still part of YMs attached to FUM, were excluded from the EFA. It, thus, became an exclusivist representative body of duly chosen individuals from only approved YMs, whereas AEF was open to all who came and shared in the statement of faith. Jack Willcuts claimed that, in this unintentional and largely unspoken competition between the two entities, the EFA came to represent the expression of the YM leaders (Superintendents and Clerks), while the AEF came to serve the lay leaders.<sup>52</sup> Although both AEF and EFA existed side by side for some years, primarily due to a sense that its purpose had been fulfilled and because of unspoken competition between the two entities, the Administrative Council of the AEF laid down

---

<sup>50</sup> See *Iowa Yearly Meeting Minutes-1996* (Oskaloosa, IA: Iowa Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, 1996), page 11-19, 22-25.

<sup>51</sup> This practice was later changed so that individual monthly meetings could also join regardless of the decision of their respective YM. See Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 36-37.

<sup>52</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 47.

the organisation in 1970,<sup>53</sup> leaving EFA to provide both ongoing structure and inspiration to the larger movement. In 1989, EFA became Evangelical Friends International (EFI) – a worldwide conglomerate of evangelical Quakers, now working today under the title Evangelical Friends Church International (EFCI).<sup>54</sup>

Although the continuum that today is the Evangelical Friends Church International has usually been seen as starting with the 1947 Association of Evangelical Friends conference,<sup>55</sup> it is clear that AEF and Evangelical Friends Alliance were started under two different impulses. While the former was based on fellowship and inspiration, the latter was formed out of a perceived need for proper doctrine and good governance.

---

<sup>53</sup> Roberts, *Association of Evangelical Friends*, 1.

<sup>54</sup> The headquarters for EFCI today are located in Evangelical Friends Church – Eastern Region (formerly, Ohio Yearly Meeting). The constituent YMs are as follows: Northwest Yearly Meeting (formerly, Oregon YM), Evangelical Friends Church – Eastern Region (formerly, Ohio YM), Evangelical Friends Church – Mid America (formerly, Kansas YM), Southwest Yearly Meeting (formerly, California YM), Alaska Yearly Meeting, Bundelkhand Yearly Meeting (India), Burundi Yearly Meeting and Rwanda Yearly Meeting.

<sup>55</sup> Hamm pinpoints this conference as the beginning of the ‘fourth strain’ of American Quakerism. See Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 60.

## GLOSSARY

### PECULIAR TERMINOLOGY OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) has some peculiar terminology, not always familiar even to those with a religious background. Here is a brief glossary of some of those terms unique to the Society and used in this work. This glossary is intentionally slanted toward American Quakerism – particularly evangelical Friends – for the sake of this work. Words defined below are indicated with a [g] upon first use in the text. This Glossary is not a comprehensive list of unique terms used in the Society, but rather limited to the terminology used within this work.<sup>1</sup>

---

**Area Meeting** – See Quarterly Meeting.

**Clerk** – The person released into the role of helping the larger group or committee discern the will of God in a particular matter. The Clerk provides structure to the order of business, helps with minute formation and helps the members ascertain if the will of God has been correctly heard by the larger body or committee. Typically, every committee has its own Clerk, as does each Monthly Meeting, Quarterly Meeting and Yearly Meeting. OYM's first Discipline (1895) refers to the Clerk's role as: 'It shall be the duty of the Clerk of any business meeting to preside over it, to arrange the business and give it direction according to the Form of Government and the Rules of Discipline, and to decide upon all questions considered according to the prevailing sentiment of the meeting as expressed by individuals singly or by vote...Due time and opportunity should be given for a full and free discussion of the questions, after which he should obtain the sentiment of the meeting by asking those favoring the proposition shall make it known by uplifted hand, and those opposing it, in the same way. If need be a rising vote may be called'.<sup>2</sup> By 1924, The Discipline of OYM was far less prescriptive regarding the methods of the

---

<sup>1</sup> For a more complete dictionary of the Religious Society of Friends see, *The A to Z of the Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. (ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003).

<sup>2</sup> *The Discipline of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church-1895* (Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting, 1895), 40-41. Hereafter, *Discipline of OYM* followed by respective year and page number.

Clerk, simply saying, ‘The clerk, or presiding officer, of a business meeting has the care of its business, which he lays before it for consideration and determines what conclusions the meeting reaches. In a meeting for business it should be the chief desire to ascertain what may be the mind of the Lord, and the clerks should be chosen with a special reference to their sound judgment and gift of spiritual discernment.’<sup>3</sup>

**Church** – See Meeting.

**Convincement** – Quakers speak of convincement rather than conversion. For them convincement represents the first step in the process toward Christian perfection. Convincement was something that ‘preceded repentance’ when one was convinced of ‘the truth of Christianity’. Conversion, then, was the ‘work of the power and Spirit of Christ’ in the life of the convinced.<sup>4</sup>

**Discipline** – See Faith and Practice.

**Faith and Practice** – Historically known as the Book of Discipline, or simply the Discipline, it became used increasingly throughout the Society during the eighteenth-century to refine Friends’ practices.<sup>5</sup> Used by evangelical Friends today primarily for two purposes, first to establish a clear statement of belief on issues of theology; and second, to establish pragmatic guidelines for the function and governance of the church. From 1895 – 1934, OYM used the ‘Discipline’ nomenclature. In 1945, they started to call it the ‘Constitution and Discipline’. In 1987, the YM changed to the modern usage of ‘Faith and Practice’.<sup>6</sup>

**Friends** – Shorthand expression for the Religious Society of Friends, often synonymous with the word ‘Quakers’.

**Friends Church** – Originally Friends called themselves *Children of the Light*. Second generation Quakers took the names of *Publishers of Truth*, *Friends of Truth*, and *Friends in the Truth*. In the nineteenth-century, the Religious Society of Friends became more popular.<sup>7</sup> The name is frequently shortened, in context, to the Friends or the Society.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1924*, 45.

<sup>4</sup> Dean Freiday in Robert Barclay, *Barclay’s Apology: In Modern English*, ed. Dean Freiday (Newberg, OR: The Barclay Press, 1991), 254, n. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Jan Hoffman, ‘Discipline’, in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. (ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003), 72.

<sup>6</sup> See *Discipline of OYM* for each of the respective years.

<sup>7</sup> Margery Post Abbott, ‘Religious Society of Friends’, in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. (ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003), 241.

Today, evangelical Friends, such as OYM, more frequently refer to the denomination as the Friends Church.<sup>8</sup>

**General Meeting** – See Quarterly Meeting.

**Inward Light of Christ** (Inner Light, Light of Christ Within, Inward Light) – For early Friends, the Inward Light was a direct and immediate experience in reference to Christ.<sup>9</sup> The experience was both ethical (inward teacher) and redemptive (causing a turning away from evil).<sup>10</sup> At times in Quaker history, it has been difficult for Friends to agree on what exactly was meant by their ‘Light Theology’, especially as it related to the authority of the Scriptures. In the later part of the nineteenth-century, the idea of ‘Light Theology’ began to be repudiated by some evangelical Friends as ‘dangerous, unsound, and unscriptural’,<sup>11</sup> whereas it has now today become normative to liberal Friends to connote the idea of ongoing revelation ‘whatever quarter it may come from.’<sup>12</sup>

**Meeting** – In protest to the perceived spiritual vacuity and empty form of the visible church in seventeenth-century England, Friends adopted the nomenclature of ‘Meeting’ to denote their more simple local gatherings. A Monthly Meeting is the official title for ‘the basic unit of organization, which records membership and makes basic local decisions’.<sup>13</sup> The Monthly Meeting will typically have a monthly cycle for their business meetings. In the later nineteenth and twentieth-centuries, the evangelical wing of Friends embraced the term church instead. Today, the term church has become the more common (though not absolute) idiom for programmed (pastoral) meetings, while unprogrammed meetings have tended to maintain the distinction. From its first Discipline (1895), OYM referred to its denomination as ‘The Friends Church’,<sup>14</sup> and called the Monthly Meetings, ‘any regularly organized church’.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 5.

<sup>9</sup> Wilmer A. Cooper, *A Living Faith: An Historical Study of Quaker Beliefs* (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1990), 17.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> 1878 Ohio YM Statement, as quoted in Thomas D. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends 1800-1907* (Richmond, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988), 123.

<sup>12</sup> 1995 British YM Faith and Practice, as quoted in Pink Dandelion, *An Introduction to Quakerism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 131.

<sup>13</sup> Pink Dandelion, ‘Meeting’, in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. (ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003), 169. 168-170.

<sup>14</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 5.

<sup>15</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 27. In 1934, the Discipline was largely unchanged saying, ‘A congregation of members is called a meeting or a church.’ See *Discipline of OYM – 1934*, 44.

**Minute** – The official legal documented action or decision of a business meeting regarding a particular matter. More than just a legal formality, a minute is also intended to be ‘a statement of the sense of the meeting on an item of business by those in attendance.’<sup>16</sup> Friends believe they receive truth corporately and the minute reflects such revelation. Minutes are agreed and adopted by the body within the Meeting.

**Monthly Meeting** – See Meeting.

**Peace Testimony** – From their inception in the middle of the seventeenth-century in England up until the American Civil War, Quakers in America had a long-standing practice of anti-war beliefs and active pacifism which was well adhered to by a majority of its members. Friends had a long history, through several centuries of wars, of rejecting military service (even enlisting for alternative non-combative service was still ultimately considered assisting the agents of war). Friends defended this right in previous conflicts with their lives, imprisonment and financial punishment.<sup>17</sup> Since OYM uses the Richmond Declaration of Faith as an essential faith forming document, its statement on Peace has been unchanged throughout every rendition of the Discipline.<sup>18</sup>

**Programmed (Pastoral) Meetings** – From 1875 onward, some meetings within the Society started the practice of hiring ministers released for the duties of pastoral care, which usually included intentionally planned sermons or homilies within the service structure (rather than the historically accepted Quaker practice of silent unprogrammed meetings, waiting for divinely inspired speaking). By 1900, its perceived benefits became evident to so many Friends that a pastoral system was an established method in a large part of Gurneyite Quakerism outside Philadelphia and Baltimore Yearly Meetings.<sup>19</sup> Those meetings adopting this new form of worship were known as programmed meetings, or pastoral meetings – rather than unprogrammed meetings. No theological differences between the two groups can be ascertained from just this differentiation alone – though, historically, programmed meetings have embraced a more evangelical theology. Unprogrammed meetings, while predominately liberal, have more theological variety and include a significant minority of Christ-centred Friends. The phrase is technically meant to delineate ecclesiastical forms of worship only and is less helpful

---

<sup>16</sup> Jan Hoffman, ‘Minute’, in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. (ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003), 180.

<sup>17</sup> The most comprehensive historical examination of the Friends Peace Testimony is Peter Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony: 1660 to 1914* (York, Sessions Book Trust, 1990).

<sup>18</sup> ‘We feel bound explicitly to avow our unshaken persuasion that all war is utterly incompatible with the plain precepts of our divine Lord and Law-giver, and the whole spirit of His Gospel, and that no plea of necessity or policy, however urgent or peculiar, can avail to release either individuals or nations from the paramount allegiance which they owe to Him who hath said “Love your enemies.”’ *Richmond Declaration of Faith*, section entitled ‘Peace’. Reprinted in *Discipline of OYM-1895*.

<sup>19</sup> Rufus M. Jones, *The Later Periods of Quakerism*, vol. 2 (London: Macmillan and CO, 1921), 917.



today in the twenty-first century in attempting to differentiate Quaker theological typologies. For evangelical Friends in the twentieth century, such as those in OYM, the difference was a minor point and most could agree with Everett Cattell, who, in 1959, said, 'The question of pastoral and non-pastoral Friends is a question of methodology and few of us would cross the continent to discuss it. This is an area in which differences of opinion could well be tolerated and arrangements could easily be made for both concerns to be implemented if there is a spirit of unity and good will on both sides.'<sup>20</sup> More recently, Carole Spencer has argued for the relative 'unimportance of form' among Friends as they have been mostly the result of past 'reactions to the social and cultural climate, rather than an essential element.'<sup>21</sup>

**Quakers** – Used derivatively by others to describe members of the Society in the seventeenth-century. Today the term is embraced self-descriptively and seen as synonymous by most with the term Friends.

**Quarterly Meeting** – Comprised of several Monthly Meetings, a sub-set of a Yearly Meeting with a business meeting cycle occurring four times a year. Sometimes, in America, a Quarterly Meeting is referred to as an Area Meeting or a General Meeting, particularly as the historic practice of meeting four-times a year has not been adhered to consistently. In OYM, the QM was considered a mid-level entity in the bureaucratic structure – 'subordinate to the YM',<sup>22</sup> while at the same time having 'authority over the MM'.<sup>23</sup>

**Queries** – Originally used in the seventeenth-century to solicit statistical information from subordinate meetings, by the eighteenth-century, Advices and Queries were used to influence faith and practice, especially moral conduct.<sup>24</sup> Today, queries are, 'seen by both individual Friends and meetings or churches as a means of engaging their hearts, minds, and spirits in an examination of their spiritual condition.'<sup>25</sup>

**Religious Society of Friends** – See Friends Church.

---

<sup>20</sup> Everett L. Cattell, 'Passion for Unity: A Critical Survey of Contemporary Quakerdom'. Speech given at the 1959 gathering of the Association of Evangelical Friends in Newberg, Oregon. Reprinted in *Concern*, vol. I, no. 3 (Fall 1959): 4.

<sup>21</sup> Carole Spencer, *Holiness: The Soul of Quakerism* (CO: Paternoster, 2007), 239.

<sup>22</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 32.

<sup>23</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1895*, 33.

<sup>24</sup> Wilmer A. Cooper, *A Living Faith: An Historical Study of Quaker Beliefs* (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1990), 82.

<sup>25</sup> Jan Hoffman, 'Queries and Advices', in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. (ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003), 236.

**Society** (the) – Shorthand expression for the Religious Society of Friends.

**Testimony** – ‘A term referring to the public witness of actions, beliefs, and behaviors that Friends hold to be consistent with Truth.’<sup>26</sup> As Cooper defined it, ‘A testimony is an outward expression of an inward leading of the Spirit, or an outward sign of what Friends believe to be an inward revelation or truth.’<sup>27</sup> Over time some consistency has developed in the Society around five main testimonies which are identity forming constructs of the Society: ‘integrity, simplicity, community, peace and equality.’<sup>28</sup> Of these five, the Peace Testimony has garnered the most public recognition for the Society.<sup>29</sup>

**Unprogrammed Meetings** – See Programmed (Pastoral) Meeting.

**Yearly Meeting** – The term Yearly Meeting is usually integrated into the legal title of an incorporated geographical regional body of Friends (such as Oregon Yearly Meeting, New York Yearly Meeting or Ireland Yearly Meeting). Although different Yearly Meetings in different areas have joined together for collaborative purposes, and sometimes these collaborations have led to legally incorporated alliances (such as Friends General Conference or Friends United Meeting), there has been no single worldwide legal entity having obligatory sway on all Quaker polity. Each Yearly Meeting sets Faith and Practice standards based on their own perceived corporate revelation. More literally, the term refers to the frequency with which members of a particular Yearly Meeting come together as a representative body for administrative business and oversight (annually). Thus one could both be a member of a Yearly Meeting and attend the sessions of a Yearly Meeting. In OYM for the respective years of this research, the YM was defined by, ‘the members of the Quarterly Meeting subordinate to it’<sup>30</sup> and it was deemed to have ‘complete legislative, judicial, and administrative authority’.<sup>31</sup> New business could be introduced to the sessions of Yearly Meetings via one of the following methods ‘reports from the Quarterly Meeting, from the Permanent Board, from the Standing Committees of the Yearly Meeting, from a Special Committee on New Business, and in

---

<sup>26</sup> Margery Post Abbot, ‘Testimony’, in *Historical Dictionary of the Friends (Quakers)*, Margery Post Abbot, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. ed. (Oxford: Scarecrow Press, 2003), 280.

<sup>27</sup> Cooper, *Living Faith*, 128.

<sup>28</sup> Abbott, *Historical Dictionary*, 280. Dandelion has somewhat altered this list to say ‘community or stewardship’. Dandelion, *Introduction*, 221. Cooper has a list of only four testimonies, rather than five. His list includes integrity, simplicity, peace and equality. Cooper, *Living Faith*, 131-140.

<sup>29</sup> Hamm says, ‘If outsiders know nothing else about Quaker faith, they usually know that historically Quakers have been pacifists who believe that all wars and fighting are wrong.’ Hamm, *Quakers in America*, 161.

<sup>30</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1902*, 28. Unchanged in the 1924, 1934 or 1945 renditions.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

communication from Five-Years Meeting and from other Yearly Meetings. Business may also be laid before a Yearly Meeting by any of its members with the consent of the Clerk.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> *Discipline of OYM-1902*, 29. In 1945, no criteria were given as to how new business would be brought to the YM sessions. See *Discipline of OYM-1945*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### **Primary Sources - Unpublished Archives** (Listed in alphabetical sequence under archive location)

American Friends Service Committee unpublished archives. Located at American Friends Service Committee headquarters – Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

*AFSC Annual Report 1918*, bulletin 16. AFSC Archives, bound volume, 'AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947.'

*AFSC Annual Report 1920*, bulletin 33. AFSC Archives, bound volume, 'AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947.'

*AFSC Annual Report 1923*, bulletin 58. AFSC Archives, bound volume, 'AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947.'

*AFSC Annual Report 1926*, bulletin 67. AFSC Archives, bound volume, 'AFSC Annual Reports 1917-1947.'

*AFSC Board Minutes April 30, 1917*. AFSC Archives, Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1917-1921', Folder, 'AFSC Minutes General Meeting 1917.'

*AFSC Board Minutes, May 28, 1917*. AFSC Archives, Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1917-1921', Folder, 'AFSC Minutes General Meeting 1917.'

*AFSC Board Minutes, June 11, 1917*. AFSC Archives, Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1917-1921', Folder, 'AFSC Minutes General Meeting 1917.'

*AFSC Executive Board Minutes, August 1, 1918*. AFSC Archives, Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1917-1921', Folder, 'AFSC Minutes Executive Board 1918.'

*AFSC Executive Board Minutes, June 6, 1928*. AFSC Archives, Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1926-1928', file, 'AFSC Minutes Executive Board 1928.'

*AFSC Executive Board Minutes, December 19, 1928*. AFSC Archives, Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1926-1928', File, 'AFSC Minutes Executive Board 1928.'

*AFSC General Committee Minutes, August 22, 1918*. AFSC Archives, Box, 'AFSC Minutes 1917-1921', Folder, 'AFSC General Meeting 1918.'

Hoskins, Lewis. *Letter to Roy Clampitt dated April 7, 1950*. AFSC Archives, General Administration Communications and Organizations -1950, file labeled 'evangelical Friends'.

No Author Noted, *Foreign Mission Work of American Friends* (published by the American Friends Mission Board, 1912) 138.

Pennington, Levi T. *Letter to Clarence E. Pickett dated July 2 1938*. AFSC Archives – General File 1938.

Pennington, Levi T. *Letter to Clarence Pickett dated June 17, 1938*. AFSC Archives, box labeled ‘General File 1938’, file labeled ‘Society of Friends Yearly Meetings’.

Pickett, Clarence E. *Letter to Levi T. Pennington dated June 27, 1938*. AFSC Archives – General File 1938.

Ross, Milo. *Letter to Clarence Pickett dated December 17, 1937*. AFSC Archives, General File 1937 ‘complaints’.

Five-Years Meeting (and Friends United Meeting) unpublished archives. Located at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana:

*Constitution and Discipline for the American Yearly Meeting of Friends*

*Stenographer’s report of the Five Years Meeting of Friends in America – 1922,*

*Stenographer’s report of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends in America – 1912.*

North Pacific Evangelistic Institute (including Portland Bible Institute and Cascade College) unpublished archives. Section sub-divided into those archives located at the Oregon Historical Society, Portland, Oregon and those archives located at Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, Washington.

NPEI (PBI & CC) archives located at Oregon Historical Society, Portland Oregon:

*Annual Catalogue – 1919*. OHSA, Box labeled ‘MSS 1417’.

*Annual Catalogue – 1920*. OHSA, Box labeled ‘MSS 1417’.

*Annual Catalogue – 1922*. OHSA, Box labeled ‘MSS 1417’.

*Annual Catalogue – 1925*. OHSA, Box labeled ‘MSS 1417’.

Ballantyne, V. A. General letter, undated. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file labeled 'Merger George Fox.'

Beals, Charles. Secretary of George Fox College Board of Trustees letter to Mr. Ronald E. DeFresne, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Cascade College, dated June 14, 1960. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file labeled 'Merger George Fox.'

Cascade College Bulletin, Catalog issue 1968-1969, March-April 1968. OHSA.

Cascade College Bulletin, Catalog issue 1968-1969, March-April 1968: stapled insert. 5. OHSA.

'Cascade to Terminate Eventful Era'. *Cascade College Bulletin* vol. 39 no 6. May- June 1969: 1. OHSA.

Clapp, Philip S. Letter entitled *Reflections: To Merge?* OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1411', file labeled 'George Fox-Cascade 1966-67'.

Coffee, Wilber N. *The Proper Emphasis To Be Placed Upon Divine Healing And The Gift of Tongues*. First delivered at a Bible Conference at North Pacific Evangelistic Institute in 1923 and reprinted in *The Institute Bulletin* vol. 6, no. 1. November 1924: 3-4. OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

Hadley, Lewis. 'Testimony of God's Leading and Blessing'. *Institute Bulletin* vol. 1 no. 1 (May 1919,): OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

*Institute Bulletin* vol. 1 no. 1 (May 1919,): OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

Merger with George Fox documents. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1411', file labeled 'George Fox-Cascade 1966-67'.

*Northwest Bulletin*, vol. II no 4. November 1922. OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

'Progress and Prosperity'. *The Institute Bulletin* vol. 1, no. 2. January 1920: 1. OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

Student enrolment lists for the respective years. OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

Terrell, Lurana. North Pacific Evangelistic Institute Bulletin, May 1919  
vol. 1, number 1 OHSA, Box labeled 'MSS 1417'.

Trustee Minutes, April 6, 1918. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, June 19, 1918. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, December 2, 1918. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, February 11, 1922. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, May 8, 1922. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, October 15, 1924. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, September 26, 1930. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417',  
file labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, June 6, 1933. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, July 1, 1933. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1918-1929'.

Trustee Minutes, May 15, 1939. OHSA. Box labeled 'MSS 1417', file  
labeled 'Trustee Minutes: 1929-1939'.

Victor Phillips, *A History of Choral Literature at Cascade College: 1918-1964* (1965 Cascade College History Seminar Paper for Dr. Lee M. Nash). Seattle Pacific University Archives, Box labeled, 'SPU Archives Cascade College Box 383 of 840.

NPEI (PBI & CC) Archives located at Seattle Pacific University, Seattle,  
Washington:

Baker, Fred B. Questionnaire form filled out for Keister, Donald M.  
*Edward Mott: The Influence of his Presidency on the Development  
of Cascade College*. Cascade College History Seminar for Dr. Lee

Nash, 1967. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled, 'SPU Archives Cascade College Box 384 of 840'.

Beardsley, Ray. *The Expansion Years: A History of Academic Growth, Cascade College, 1939-1949*. Cascade College History Seminar Paper for Dr. Lee Nash, 1963. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled 'SPU Archives Cascade College Box 383 of 840'.

Hadley, Lewis. Letter to Chester Hadley, dated October 10, 1917. As quoted in Hein, Arthur. *Lewis Isaac Hadley: A Short Biography of the Life of Reverend Hadley*. Cascade College History Seminar Course for Dr. Lee M. Nash 1962. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled 'SPU Archives Cascade College Box 383 of 840'.

Hein, Arthur. *Lewis Isaac Hadley: A Short Biography of the Life of Reverend Hadley* (March 1962, Cascade College History Seminar Course for Dr. Lee M. Nash) 2. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled 'SPU Archives Cascade College Box 383 of 840'.

Klages, Esther M. Winters. Questionnaire form filled out for Keister, Donald M. *Edward Mott: The Influence of his Presidency on the Development of Cascade College*. Cascade College History Seminar for Dr. Lee Nash 1967. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled 'SPU Archives, Cascade College Box 384 of 840'.

Keister, Donald M. *Edward Mott: The Influence of his Presidency on the Development of Cascade College* (March 1967, Cascade College History Seminar for Dr. Lee Nash) 6-7. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled 'SPU Archives, Cascade College Box 384 of 840'.

Plowman, Roscoe E. Questionnaire form filled out for Keister, Donald M. *Edward Mott: The Influence of his Presidency on the Development of Cascade College*. Cascade College History Seminar for Dr. Lee Nash 1967. Seattle Pacific University Archives. Box labeled 'SPU Archives, Cascade College Box 384 of 840'.

Oregon Yearly Meeting (including Northwest Yearly Meeting) unpublished archives. Located at George Fox University Archives & George Fox University Special Collections Room:



1954 Mid-Winter Executive Committee Minutes regarding the American Friends Service Committee. GFU Archives, box labeled 'Dean and Fred Gregory's Collection' file labeled 'A.F.S.C. Correspondence up to Sept. 1. 1956'.

Ad-Hoc Committee for Revival. *A White Paper: Suggestions for the Spiritual Life of Northwest Yearly Meeting*. October 2002. In author's possession.

Cammack, Paul, Joseph G. Reece and Allen Dunbar. Minority Report, dated August 1, 1945. GFU Archives. Section SU2. Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

*Constitution of Association of Evangelical Friends*, adopted July 13, 1956. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. GFU Archives. Arthur Roberts' Papers, box #2, folder 2.1.1.

*Evangelical Friends Conference Report-1947*. GFU Archives. Arthur Roberts' Papers, box #2, folder 2.1.1.

General letter sent by Pacific College Board, dated July 10, 1945. GFU Archives. Section SU2. Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

Gregory, Dean. Letter to Lewis Hoskins, dated August 27, 1954. GFU Archives, box labeled 'Dean and Fred Gregory's Collection' file labeled 'A.F.S.C. Correspondence up to Sept. 1. 1956'.

Gulley, Emmett. Letter to Levi Pennington, dated January 18, 1945. GFU Archives. Levi Pennington Papers, box 33, labeled 'Bulk Range: 1922; 1942-1964' file labeled 'Gulley 45-49'.

Gulley, Emmett. Letter to Levi T. Pennington, dated June 12, 1945. GFU Archives. Levi Pennington Papers, box 33, labeled 'Bulk Range: 1922; 1942-1964' file labeled 'Gulley 45-49'.

Gulley, Emmett. Letter to George Moore, dated August 1, 1945. GFU Archives. Section SU2. Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

Gulley, Emmett. Letter to Pacific College Board, dated November 12, 1946. GFU Archives. Section SU2 Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

Gulley, Emmett. Letter to prospective AFSC donors, dated August 18, 1947. GFU Archives. Levi Pennington Papers, box 33, labeled 'Bulk Range: 1922; 1942-1964' file labeled 'Gulley, Emmett – 45-49'.

Handwritten obituary for A. Clark Smith. GFU Archives, section FR-3, file labeled 'People - Clark Smith'.

Hoskins, Lewis. Letter to Dean Gregory, dated June 30, 1955. GFU Archives, box labeled 'Dean and Fred Gregory's Collection' file labeled 'A.F.S.C. Correspondence up to Sept. 1. 1956'.

Kenworthy, Melvin W. Memorial written for Chester A. Hadley. GFU Archives, section FR-1, file labeled 'People – Chester A. Hadley'.

Kuhn, Harold. 'Ministering to the Need in Europe'. Paper given at the 1950 AEF gathering in Wichita, Kansas, June 21-25 and reprinted in *The Story of the Second American Conference of Evangelical Friends*. GFU Archives. Arthur Roberts' Papers, Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

McNeal, Madenia. Handwritten letter from, on behalf of Marion Monthly Meeting for Ministry and Oversight, dated August 7 1945. GFU Archives. Section SU2 Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

Meeting to Discuss a Holiness Bible School, dated October 25, 1944. October 27, 1944 and October 31, 1944. GFU Archives. Section SU2 Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

*Meeting of Oregon Yearly Meeting Committee on Proposed Withdrawal of Oregon from the Five Years Meeting*. April 9, 1926. GFU Archives, section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

*Memorial Service Report*. GFU Archives, file FR2, folder named 'Dr. Elias Jessup'.

Mickelson, Herald. 'Are We Good Samaritans?' Conference paper presented at the 1947 gathering of evangelical Friends, June 25-29, 1947, Colorado Springs. Reprinted in *Evangelical Conference Report*, p 36-40. GFU Archives, Arthur Roberts' Papers, Box #2, folder 2.1.1.

Ministerial Association. Letter to Pacific College Board of Managers, dated October 6, 1945. GFU Archives. Section SU2. Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.

*Minutes from Conference at Newberg Friends Church on Tentative Report of Committee on Oregon Yearly Meeting's Relation to the Five Year Meeting*. April 11, 1926. GFU Archives, section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

*Minutes from Conference at Newberg Friends Church on Tentative Report of Committee on Oregon Yearly Meeting's Relation to the Five Year Meeting*. April 25, 1926. GFU Archives, section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

*Minutes from Conference at South Salem Friends Church on Tentative Report of Committee on Oregon Yearly Meeting's Relation to the Five Year Meeting.* May 2, 1926. GFU Archives, section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

*Minutes of the Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board Minutes – Called Meeting,* October 5, 1939. GFU Archives, section FB-3, file labeled 'Oregon Yearly Meeting Permanent Board'.

Moore, George. Letter to Emmett Gulley, undated. GFU Archives. Section SU2 Box labeled '“Joseph Reece’ Collection’.

Moore, George. Letter to prospective Board Member, John C. Brougher, dated August 16, 1945. GFU Archives. Section SU2 Box labeled '“Joseph Reece’ Collection’.

Mott, Edward. Letter to Levi Pennington, undated. GFU Archives, Section FA-4, file labeled 'Edward Mott'.

Mott, Edward. Letter to Emmett Gulley, dated July 11, 1945. George Fox University Archives, section FA-4, file labeled 'Mott, Edward'.

No author noted, but a list of almost 40 names are under the 'Presented By' section, *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, A Negative Argument.* No publisher noted, 1920. GFU Archives, section SU-2, box labeled, 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

*OYM Report of Board of Foreign Missions* as found in the YM minutes for the respective years.

Pennington Levi T. 'The Canon of the Scriptures and Its Preservation', Speech manuscript. 1923. GFU Archives. Levi Pennington Papers.

Pennington, Levi. Letter to J. W. Harvey Theobald, dated October 6, 1939. GFU Archives, Levi Pennington Papers, box 4, labeled 'Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Other Addenda 1930's, 40's, 50's'.

Pennington, Levi. Letter to 'The President', dated October 18, 1939. GFU Archives, Levi Pennington Papers, box 4, labeled 'Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Other Addenda 1930's, 40's, 50'.

Pennington, Levi. Letter to Clarence E. Pickett, dated October 24, 1939. GFU Archives Levi Pennington Papers, box 4, labeled 'Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Other Addenda 1930's, 40's, 50's'.

- Pennington, Levi. Letter to Chester A. Hadley, dated October 25, 1939. GFU Archives, Levi Pennington Papers, box 4, labeled 'Bulk Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Other Addenda 1930's 1940's'.
- Pennington, Levi. Letter to Mary (daughter), dated June 6, 1940. GFU Archives, Levi Pennington Papers, box 4, labeled 'Date Range: 1920-1950,' file 'Jan.-June 1940'.
- Pennington, Levi. Letter to Mary (daughter), dated June 13, 1940. GFU Archives, Levi Pennington Papers, box 4, labeled 'Date Range: 1920-1950', file labeled 'Jan.-June 1940'.
- Pennington, Levi. Letter to Pacific College Board, dated November 25, 1946. GFU Archives, section SU2, box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection'.
- Pennington, Levi. Letter to Clarence E. Pickett, dated December 15, 1948. GFU Archives, section FA-4, file labeled 'American Friends Service Committee'.
- Pennington, Levi. Letter to Joseph Reece, dated January 5, 1949. GFU Archives, section FA-4, file labeled 'American Friends Service Committee'.
- Pickett, Clarence. Letter to Levi Pennington, dated December 29, 1948. GFU Archives, section FA-4, file labeled 'American Friends Service Committee'.
- Portland Quarterly Meeting Peace Committee Minute.* GFU Archives, section FA-4, file labeled 'Peace Correspondence'.
- Report of Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*, held in Denver Colorado, July 11-15, p 44-48. GFU Archive, Arthur Roberts' Papers, box #2, folder 2.1.1
- Report of the Third Conference of Evangelical Friends in America*, held in Oskaloosa, Iowa June 30-July4, 1954. GFU Archives, Arthur Roberts' Papers, box #2, folder 2.1.1.
- Roberts, Arthur. 'Exploring the Nature and Possible Functions of an Organization of Evangelical Friends', February 24 1955. GFU Archives, Arthur Roberts' Papers, box #2, folder 2.2.6.
- Roberts, Arthur. 'Significant Doctrinal Trends Affecting Friends'. Paper given at the 1956 AEF conference, Denver, Colorado, June 11-15. Reprinted in the *Report of the Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. GFU Archives, Arthur Roberts' Papers, box #2, folder 2.1.1.

Taylor, W. Lloyd. *Our Imminent Peril: An open letter with special reference to the educational movement, the Forward Movement and Inter-Church World Movement as related to Friends of Oregon Yearly Meeting and The Five Years Meeting*. GFU Archives, section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

Taylor, W. Lloyd. *Shall Oregon Yearly Meeting Withdraw from the Five Years Meeting, An Affirmative Argument*. GFU Archives, section SU-2, box labeled 'Five Years Meeting Controversy'.

Warlaw, Alice. Handwritten letter on behalf of Ontario Heights Monthly Meeting of Friends to H. M. Hoskins, dated August 6, 1945. GFU Archives. Section SU2, Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection".

Williams, Kenneth. Memorial written on George Moore, dated August 1, 1985. GFU Archives, section FR1, folder labeled 'George Moore'.

Pacific College (Including George Fox University) unpublished archives. Located at George Fox University Archives, Newberg, Oregon:

Board and Executive Committee Minutes, June 8, 1944. GFU Archives, section SL-2. Folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

Board and Executive Committee Minutes, May 12 1944. GFU Archives, section SL-2. Folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

Board and Executive Committee Minutes, March 10, 1945. GFU Archives, section SL-2. Folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

Board and Executive Committee Minutes, June 8 1945. GFU Archives, section SL-2. Folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

Board and Executive Committee Minutes, June 9 1945. GFU Archives, section SL-2. Folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

Board and Executive Committee Minutes, July 6 1945. GFU Archives, section SL-2. Folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

- Board of Managers Meeting Minutes. August 13, 1948. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Managers Meeting Minutes. September 12, 1948. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Managers Meeting Minutes. October 16, 1948. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board Meeting Minutes. August 15, 1953. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. August 10, 1945. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. October 11, 1944. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. May 10, 1946. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. June 14, 1946. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. November 8, 1946. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. January 3, 1947. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.
- Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. January 3, 1947. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes. February 10, 1950. George Fox University Archives, section SL-2, folder labeled 'Pacific – George Fox College Board and Executive Committee Minutes May 8, 1942 to Sep. 1, 1953'.

General letter sent by Pacific College Board, dated July 10, 1945. GFU Archives. Section SU2. Box labeled "'Joseph Reece' Collection".

Pennington, Levi T. Letter to the Board and Faculty of Pacific College, dated March 1, 1940. GFU Archives, section SL-2, booklet labeled 'Pacific College Board Minutes June 12, 1925 to March 24, 1942'.

### **Primary Sources – Published**

Baker, Frederick B. 'Group Attends National Association of Evangelicals', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 23 no. 5. May 1944: 2, 4, 8-9, 15.

Baker, Frederick B. 'Friends Journalism in the Northwest', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 47 no. 5. July-August 1967: 4-6.

Baker, Frederick and Carter, Ray. *Introduction to Edward Mott, Sixty Years of Gospel Ministry*. Printed 1968.

Barclay, Robert. *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity: Being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People Called Quakers, Ninth edition*. London: Printed for Thomas Tegg, 1825.

Barker, Earl P. 'Why I Never can be a Modernist', *Friendly Endeavor* vol. 17 no. 4. April 1938: 4-5.

Barker, Earl P. 'Paper to be Called "The Northwest Friend"', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 21 no. 7. July 1942: 1, 6.

Barker, Earl B. 'N.W. Peace', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 21 no. 11. December 1942: 6-7.

Beebe, Ralph K. *A Garden of the Lord: A History of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church*. Newberg, OR: The Barclay Press. 1968.

Cadbury, Henry J. 'The Status Quo of the AFSC', *American Friend*, vol. 17 no. 6. February 7 1929: 96.

Cadbury, Henry J. *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Cadbury, Henry. *Jesus: What Manner of Man*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1947.

- California Yearly Meeting Minutes – 1921 & 1931*. Whittier, CA: California Yearly Meeting of Friends Church, 1921.
- Cammack, Helen. 'Light for the Soul', *Soul Cry of the Aymara*, vol. IV no. 4. December 1939: 3-4.
- Cattell, Everett L. 'Passion for Unity: A Critical Survey of Contemporary Quakerdom'. Speech given at the 1959 gathering of the Association of Evangelical Friends in Newberg, Oregon. Reprinted in *Concern*, vol. 1 no. 3. Fall 1959: 3-18.
- Carter, Ray. 'What About the AFSC?' *Northwest Friend*, vol. 7 no. 2. December 1948: 2.
- Carter, Ray. 'The Christian and Social Service'. *Northwest Friend*, vol. 32 no. 12. February 1954: 2, 4.
- Clark, Dugan. 'A Fervent Plea for Orthodoxy', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 17 no. 3. Sermon originally given at Earlham College in 1891, republished March 1938: 4-5, 7.
- Choate, Calvin. 'The Cheyenne Conference of 1927', *Concern* vol. 4 no 4. October 1963: 9-12.
- Conant, J. E. *The Growing Menace of the 'Social Gospel'*. Chicago, IL: The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1937.
- Conant Wayne. 'Social Concerns Workshop', *Concern*. January 1963: 24.
- Cooper, Wilmer A. 'Shall Friends Train Their Own Leaders?', *American Friend*, vol. XLVII no. 23. November 16, 1959: 360-366.
- Cope, F. J. 'Co-Operation Impossible', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 6 no. 3. March 1927: 6.
- Cronk, Gerald E. 'The New RSV Bible', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 32 no. 1. February 1953: 3.
- Cronk, Gerald E. 'The New RSV Bible – Part II', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 32 no. 2. March 1953: 5.
- Dillon, Gerald. 'The Gospel of Christ', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 11. February 1948: 6-7.
- Dillon, Gerald W. 'What of the Future?' Speech given at the 1956 AEF conference. Printed in Reports of the *Fourth Triennial Conference of Evangelical Friends*. Archive located at George Fox University in Arthur Roberts' Papers, Box #2, folder 2.1.1. Newberg, Oregon.



- Dillon, Gerald. 'Alliance---Association', *Concern* vol. 4 no 4. October 1963: 1-4.
- Discipline of Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends Church – for the years 1895, 1902, 1924, 1934, 1945, 1958 and 1970.* Newberg OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting.
- Eichenberger, Bertha M. 'Conversation', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol.6 no. 3. March 1927: 1.
- Fosdick, Harry Emerson. 'Shall the Fundamentalists Win?' sermon originally delivered June 10, 1922. Reprinted in part in *Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism: A Documentary Reader*, ed. Barry Hankin. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2008: 52-58.
- Fox, George. *The Journal*, ed. Nigel Smith. London: Penguin Books. 1998.
- Gates, Chester P. 'Modernism vs. Fundamentalism', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 6 no. 3. March 1927: 7.
- Gavitt, Fred (as told to Arthur Roberts). 'Impressions of The Cheyenne Conference', *Concern* vol. 4 no 4. October 1963: 12-15.
- Gregory, Dean. 'Western School of Evangelical Religion', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 6. December 1947: 6.
- Gulley, Emmett. *Tall Tales by a Tall Quaker*, privately printed, 1973.
- Hadley, Chester P. 'Observation by the Superintendant', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 17 no. 3. March 1938: 4-5, 7.
- Hadley, Chester. 'Permanent Board Called To Meet', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 18 no 9. October 1939: 3.
- Hanson, S. Lewis & Smith, Rebecca. 'Peace Position of Friends Reaffirmed', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 18 no 10. November 1939: 2.
- Heacock, Donna. 'Coming to Pacific College', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 2. March 1947: 6.
- Hendricks, Richard H. *An Historical Look at Friends Memorial Church*, Privately printed, with no date listed. Document located at North Seattle Friends Church, Seattle Washington.
- Henry, Carl F. H. *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947.
- Henry, Carl F. H. *Remaking the Modern Mind* . Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans

- Publishing Company, 1946.
- Indiana Yearly Meeting Minutes – 1921*. Richmond IN: Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1921.
- Iowa Yearly Meeting Minutes – 1996*. Oskaloosa, IA: Iowa Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, 1996.
- Jones, Rufus M. *A Service of Love in War Time: American Friends Relief Work in Europe, 1917-1919*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1920.
- Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes – 1919, 1920, 1921, 1936 and 1937*. Wichita, KS: Kansas Yearly Meeting of Friends.
- Langdon, Paul. ‘Opportunities for C.O.’s’, *Concern*, January 1963: 25-27.
- Lee, Walter P. ‘The “Wet” Deception’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 11 no. 10. October 1932: 1-2.
- Lee, Walter P. ‘Caution ... Pagan Education in America’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 28 no. 3. April 1949: 3 & 28.
- Lindsell, Harold. *Park Street Prophet: A Life of Harold John Ockenga*. Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press, 1951.
- Lippman, Walter. *A Preface to Morals*, New York, NY: The McMillan Company, 1929.
- Malone, J. Walter. Address given at the opening of the college, as printed in Bryon Lindley Osborne. *The Malone Story: The Dream of Two Quaker Young People*. Newton, KS: United Printing, 1970.
- McIntire, Carl. *Twentieth Century Reformation*, Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1944.
- McIntyre, Ross. ‘From the Superintendent of World Service’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 27 no. 9. November 1948: 14.
- Merica, C. M. ‘Music vs. Ragtime and Jazz’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 4 no. 11. November 1926: 1-2.
- Minutes of the Five Years Meeting of Friends – 1902, 1907, 1912, 1917, 1922, 1927, 1945, 1950, 1960 and 1963*. Richmond, IN: Five Years Meeting.
- Moore, George H. ‘With Our College’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 11. December 1946: 14-15.

- Mott, Edward. 'Righteousness-Peace', Sermon originally preached at Portland Quarterly Meeting in December 1930, reprinted in *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 10 no. 1. January 1931: 3-4.
- Mott, Edward. 'Christ the Evangel'. Speech given at the 1929 gathering of all Friends in Oskaloosa, Iowa. Reprinted in Edward Mott. *The Friends Church in the Light of Its Recent History*. Portland, OR: Published by Edward Mott, 1935.
- Mott, Edward. *The Friends Church in the Light of Its Recent History*. Portland, OR: Published by Edward Mott, 1935.
- Mott, Edward. *God's Plan for the Restoration of Man*. Portland OR: Published by Edward Mott, 1941.
- Mott, Edward. 'Evangelism and Social Service', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 24 no. 7. July 1945: 15.
- Mott, Edward. 'Can a Church Organization be both Orthodox and Heterodox?' *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 4. April 1946: 2, 14-15.
- Mott, Edward. 'The Problem of Unity', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 8. September 1946: 2, 15-16.
- Mott, Edward. 'The Basic Principles of Unity'. *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 10. November 1946: 2, 14-15.
- Mott, Edward. 'Two Yearly Meetings United', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 12. January 1947: 2, 14-16.
- Mott, Edward. 'The Cheyenne Conference', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 3. April 1947: 2, 10, 16.
- Mott, Edward Mott. 'The Objectives of the Conference', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 4. May 1947: 1, 15, 16.
- Mott, Edward. *Sixty Years of Gospel Ministry*. Portland, OR: Published by Edward Mott, 1948.
- Nebraska Yearly Meeting Minutes – 1956*. Central City, Nebraska: Nebraska: Nebraska Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1956.
- Nebraska Yearly Meeting Minutes – 1957*. Central City, Nebraska: Nebraska: Nebraska Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1957.
- Oregon Yearly Meeting Minutes – 1893 - 1954*. Newberg, OR: Friends Church of Oregon Yearly Meeting.

- Orr, James. 'Science and Christian Faith', in *The Fundamentals: The Famous Sourcebook of Foundational Christian Truth*, ed. R. A. Torrey, updated by Charles L. Feinberg. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1990: 125-134.
- Osborne, Bryon L. *The Malone Story: The Dream of Two Quaker Young People*. Newton, KS: United Printing Inc., 1970.
- Parisho, E. H. 'Criticism', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II no. 6. December 1919: 1, 4.
- Pennington, Levi T. 'The Present Crisis – What Shall We Do?', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 18, no. 10. November 1939: 1, 3, 4.
- Pennington, Levi T.. *Rambling Recollections of Ninety Happy Years*. Portland OR: Published by Levi Pennington, 1967.
- Pickett, Clarence E. *For More than Bread: An Autobiographical Account of Twenty-Two Year's Work with the American Friends Service Committee*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1953.
- Proceedings of the Conference of Friends in America – 1887*. Richmond, IN: Published by Direction of the Conference, 1887.
- Proceedings of the Conference of Friends in America – 1892*. Indianapolis, IN: Published by Direction of the Conference, 1892.
- Proceedings of the Conference of Friends of America – 1897*. Indianapolis, IN: Published by Direction of the Conference, 1898.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter. *Christianity and the Social Order*, reprinted in Winthrop S. Hudson, *Selected Writings of Walter Rauschenbusch*. New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1984.
- Roberts, Arthur. 'AFSC', *Concern* vol. 2 no. 4. October, 1960: 1.
- Roberts, Arthur. *The Association of Evangelical Friends: A Story of Quaker Renewal in the Twentieth Century*. Newberg, OR: The Barclay Press, 1975.
- Roosevelt, Eleanor. *The Autobiography of Eleanor Roosevelt*, Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, reprinted 1992.
- Ross, Milo C. 'How a Church Grows: Educational Facilities', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 23 no. 3. March 1944: 4.
- Ross, Milo C. 'Policies of Our College', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 34 no. 3. May 1955: 5.

- Ross, Milo C. 'Recollections of conversations between Edward Mott and Milo Ross concerning the first evangelical conference held in Cheyenne, Wyoming, 1927', *Concern*. October 1963: 15-17.
- Russell, Elbert. *The History of Quakerism*, New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1943.
- Smith, Wm. M. 'The Critics Method', *Friendly Endeavor* vol. II no. 9. March 1920: 1-3.
- Tamplin, Carroll G. 'Second Annual Report of the Field Superintendent of the Board of Foreign Missions of Oregon Yearly Meeting', reprinted in *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 11 no. 10. October 1932: 3- 4.
- Thomas, George. *Relations of Oregon Yearly Meeting and the American Friends Service Committee*, Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Pacific College, 1941. Archive in author's possession.
- Time, S. S. 'The Up-To-Date Girl', *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 4 no. 12. December 1925: 1-2.
- Western Yearly Meeting Minute – 1922*. Plainfield, IN: Western Yearly Meeting of Friends Church, 1922.
- Willcuts, J. L. 'Evangelical Friends Alliance', *Concern*, vol. 4 no 4. October 1963: 5-8.
- Willcuts, Jack. 'Time for Change', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 47 no. 5. July-August 1967: 3.
- Williams, Kenneth. 'God and Education', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 30 no. 7. September 1951: 2 & 11.
- Woodward, Walter C. 'Editorial Correspondence – Rose and Thorns in Oregon', *American Friend* vol. VII, no. 28. Seventh Month 10, 1919: 589-590.
- Woodward, Walter C. 'From the Watershed into the Valley', *American Friend* vol. X, no. 39. September 28, 1922: 773.

#### **Primary Sources - Published with no Author Noted:**

- 1830 proposed draft of an appointed committee to consider the propriety of establishing a Friends school in a central location. As quoted in, *A History of Haverford College*. Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1892.
- 'A Conference of Evangelicals Friends', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 25 no. 9. October 1946: 15.
- A History of Haverford College*. Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1892.

‘A Quaker Press’, *Northwest Friend* vol. XXXIX no. 5. July 1959: 28.

‘Better Training for our Ministers and Missionaries’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 4. May 1947: 6-7.

‘Borne of Four’, *Evangelical Friend* vol. I, no. 1. September 1967: 10.

‘The Eighteenth Amendment’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 6 no. 7. August 1927: 6.

*Evangelical Friend* vol. I, no. 1. September 1967.

‘Evangelistic Institute to Enter Fourth Year of Work with Increase in Faculty’, *Oregonian*. August 23, 1921. 13

*Friendly Endeavor*, vol. I no. 1. July 1918: 2.

*Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II no. 9. March 1920: 4.

*Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II, no 4. October 1919: 4.

*Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II, no 9. December 1919: 4.

*Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 4, no 2. Feb 1925: 4.

*Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 4, no 3. March 1925: 6.

*Friendly Endeavor*, vol. 4. May 1925: 5 & 7.

‘Friends in Action at World Survey Conference’, *American Friend* vol. VIII no. 4. January 22, 1920: 91-92, 95.

‘Friends Unit Locating Here – Emmett Gulley to Be Secretary’, *Oregonian*. June 19, 1947: 22.

‘Friends Vote Peace Pledge; Anti-war Stand Renewed at Meet’, *Oregonian*. October 7, 1939: 3.

‘Former College President Dies’, *Newberg Graphic*. March 4, 1981: 16.

‘Gulley Resigns’, *The Crescent*, vol. 30, no 4. November 18, 1946: 1.

‘Interesting Data’, *The Soul Cry of the Aymara*, vol. I, no. 1. September 1937: 8.

‘National Association of Evangelicals’, *Northwest Friend*, vol. 23 no. 11. December 1944: 12, 15.

- ‘Nobel Award to be Shown’, *Newberg Graphic*, vol. LIX. April 8, 1948.
- Northwest Friend*, vol. 1 no. 1. September 1942.
- Northwest Friend*, vol. 26 no. 10. January 1948: 6-9.
- ‘Our First Ad’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. II no. 4. October 1919: 4.
- ‘Presenting WSER’. *Northwest Friend*, vol. 27 no. 10. December 1948: 5.
- ‘President Gulley Resigns as P.C. Head: Part of Staff may Quit Now’, *Newberg Graphic* vol. LVI, no. 41. June 14, 1945: 1
- ‘Revised List of the Unit’, *L’Équipe (The Unit) American Friends Reconstruction Unit no. 1*. August 14 1917. GFU Archives, section FA-4, file labeled ‘Conscientious Objectors World War I – Friends Reconstruction Service’. Newberg, Oregon.
- ‘Secretary Reports’, *The Crescent* vol. 30 no. 4. November 18, 1946: 1.
- ‘The Soul Cry of the Aymara’, *The Soul Cry of the Aymara*, vol. I, no.1. September, 1937: 2.
- ‘Which Were You?’, *Friendly Endeavor*, vol. III no. 5. November 1920: 1-2.
- ‘W.K. Thomas Resigns as AFSC Secretary: Questions of Future Place and Function of Service Committee are Considered’, *American Friend* 17, no. 6. February 7 1929: 95

### Websites Accessed

- Azusa Pacific University. [www.apu.edu/about/cornerstones/](http://www.apu.edu/about/cornerstones/). Accessed May 28, 2011.
- Barclay College. [www.barclaycollege.com](http://www.barclaycollege.com). Accessed May 28, 2011.
- Barclay Press, <http://www.barclaypress.com/bpauthors.php/2008/04/11/ralph-k-beebe>, Accessed April 23, 2009.
- Barclay Press – about page. <http://barclaypress.com/57>. Accessed October 18, 2012.
- Barclay Press – authors bio page. <http://www.barclaypress.com/bpauthors.php/2008/04/11/ralph-k-beebe>. Accessed April 23, 2009.
- Evangelical Friends Church International. <http://www.evangelicalfriends.org/>. Accessed March 12, 2009.

Evangelical Friends Mission website – about us page. <http://friendsmission.com/about-efm/about-us>. Accessed October 2, 2011.

Friends United Meeting – staff page. See <http://fum.org/staff/>. Accessed October 4, 2012.

George Fox University – about page - <http://www.georgefox.edu/about/index.html>. Accessed October 2, 2011 and March 27, 2012.

Malone College. [www.malone.edu/about/mission-statement.php](http://www.malone.edu/about/mission-statement.php). Accessed May 28, 2011.

Office of the Clerk – House of Representatives website, [http://clerk.house.gov/art\\_history/house\\_history/congApp.html](http://clerk.house.gov/art_history/house_history/congApp.html). Accessed April 23, 2009.

Union Bible College. [www.ubca.org](http://www.ubca.org). Accessed May 28, 2011.

Swarthmore College Online Peace Collection – Lake Mohonk Collection. <http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/peace/DG051-099/DG054LakeMohonk.htm>. Accessed December 6, 2011.

World Evangelical Alliance – about us page. <http://www.worldevangelicals.org/aboutwea/>. Accessed February 25, 2011.

## Secondary Sources

*The A to Z of the Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003.

Abbott, M.P., Chijioke, M.E., Dandelion, P. & Oliver, J.WI, Jr. *Historical Dictionary of the Friends (Quakers)*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2003.

Abbott, Margery Post. 'Friends Church', in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. Lanham, ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003: 107-108.

Abbott, Margery Post. 'Religious Society of Friends', in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. Lanham, ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003: 241.

Abbott, Margery Post. 'Testimony', in *Historical Dictionary of the Friends (Quakers)*, Margery Post Abbot, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. ed. Oxford: Scarecrow Press, 2003: 280.



- Abrams, Irwin. *The Nobel Peace Prize and the Laureates: An Illustrated Biographical History, 1901-2001*. Nantucket, MA: Science History Publications, 2001.
- Ahlstrom, Sydney E. *A Religious History of the American People*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Aiken, Guy. 'Who Took the Christ out of Quakerism? Rufus Jones and the Person and Work of Christ', *Quaker Religious Thought*, no. 116-117. December 2011: 37-53.
- Ankeny, Mark. *Levi T. Pennington, Quaker Leader and Educator: Pacific College Presidential Years 1911-1941*. Unpublished PhD, Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1997.
- Appelbaum, Patricia. *Kingdom to Commune, Protestant Pacifist Culture between World War I and the Vietnam Era*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Aubrey, Edwin Ewart. 'What is Modernism?' *Journal of Religion*, vol. 15 no. 4. October 1935: 426-447.
- Bacon, Margaret Hope. *Let this Life Speak: The Legacy of Henry Joel Cadbury*. Philadelphia, PN: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.
- Balmer, Randall. *Blessed Assurance: A History of Evangelicalism in America*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1999.
- Barbour, Hugh and J. William Frost. *The Quakers*. New York, NY: The Greenwood Press, 1988.
- Barr, James. *Fundamentalism*. London: SCM Press, 1977.
- Bebbington, D.W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730's to the 1980's*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Bebbington, David. 'Holiness in the Evangelical Tradition', in *Holiness Past and Present*, ed. Stephen C. Barton. London: T&T Clark, 2003: 298-315.
- Bebbington, D.W. *The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- Bebbington, David. 'Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism in Britain'. Concluding paper from a series of conferences held between January 2008 and June 2009 by The Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism in Britain Network.

- Bloesch, Donald G. *Essentials of Evangelical Theology: Volume 1, God, Authority and Salvation*. Peabody, MA: Prince Press, 1998.
- Bloesch, Donald G. 'Justification and Atonement', in *The Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010: 222-235.
- Bonner, Edwin B. *Preface to Errol T. Elliot, Quakers on the American Frontier*. Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1969.
- Braithwaite, William C. *The Beginnings of Quakerism*. London: MacMillan and Co, 1912.
- Braithwaite, William C. *The Second Period of Quakerism*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1919.
- Brock, Peter. *The Quaker Peace Testimony: 1660 to 1914*. York: William Sessions Limited, 1991.
- Carpenter, Joel A. 'Editor's Note' in *Fundamentalist versus Modernist*, ed. Joel A. Carpenter. New York, NY: Garland Publishing Inc. 1988. Not paginated.
- Carpenter, Joel. 'Introduction' to *Fighting Fundamentalism: Polemic Thrusts of the 1930s and 1940s*, ed. Joel A. Carpenter. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1988.
- Carpenter, Joel A. *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Cole, Stewart. *The History of Fundamentalism*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1931.
- Cooper, Wilmer A. *A Living Faith: An Historical Study of Quaker Beliefs*. Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1990.
- Curran, Francis X. *Major Trends in American Church History*. New York, NY: America Press, 1946.
- Dandelion, Pink. 'Meeting', in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. Lanham, ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003: 168-170.
- Dandelion, Pink. *An Introduction to Quakerism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Davie, Martin. *British Quaker Theology Since 1895*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1997.

- Davie, Martin. 'Manchester Conference (1895)' in *The A to Z of the Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. Lanham, ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003: 164-165.
- Davies, Oliver. 'Holiness', in *The New SCM Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, Philip Sheldrake, ed. London, SCM Press, 2005: 343-342.
- Dayton, Donald W. 'Some Doubts about the Usefulness of the Category "Evangelical"', in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston. IL: Intervarsity Press, 1991, 245-251.
- Dayton, Donald W. 'The Search for the Historical Evangelicalism; George Marsden's History of Fuller Seminary as a Case Study', *Christian Scholar's Review* 23, no. 1. September 1993: 12-33.
- Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. Strategies. 'Introduction', in *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, ed. Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication, Inc. 1998.
- Dieter, Melvin E. *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1980.
- Dieter, Melvin E. 'The Wesleyan Perspective', in *Five Views of Sanctification*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987: 11-46.
- Diment, Veldon J. *The First Fifty Years*. Newberg, OR: Published by authority of the Board of Managers, no dated given.
- Donovan, Peter. 'Neutrality in Religious Studies', in *The Insider / Outsider Problem in the Study of Religion*, Russell T. McCutcheon, ed. London: Cassell, 1999: 235-247.
- Elliot, Charles, Jr. *Whittier College: The first century on the poet campus*. Redondo Beach, CA: Legends Press, 1986.
- Elliot, Errol T. *Quakers on the American Frontier*. Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1969.
- Emerson, Elizabeth H. *Walter C. Woodward: Friend on the Frontier, A Biography*. Printed by the Walter C. Woodward Memorial Commission, 1952.
- Evans, Christopher H. 'Historical Integrity and Theological Recovery: A Reintroduction of the Social Gospel', in *The Social Gospel Today*, ed Christopher H. Evans. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001: 1-13.

- Freiday, Dean. *Introduction & Notes*, in Robert Barclay, *Barclay's Apology: In Modern English*, ed. Dean Freiday. Newberg, OR: The Barclay Press, 1991.
- Frost, J. William. "'Our Deeds Carry Our Message': The Early History of the American Friends Service Committee", *Quaker History* 81. Spring 1991: 1-51.
- Furniss, Norman F. *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1954, reprinted 1963.
- Gasper, Louis. *The Fundamentalist Movement*. Paris: Mouton and Co. 1963.
- Gavitt, Fred as told to the author. 'Impressions of the Cheyenne Conference', *Concern* vol. 4 no 4. October 1963: 12-15.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers, 1973.
- Good, Lyle. *The Founding and Early Years of North Pacific Evangelistic Institute*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Oregon, 1969.
- Gordon, James M. *Evangelical Spirituality: From the Wesleys to John Stott*. London: SPCK, 1991.
- Gorrell, Donald K. *The Age of Social Responsibility: The Social Gospel in the Progressive Era 1900-1920*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Guba, Egon G. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. *Fourth Generation Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1989.
- Gundry, Stanley N. *Five Views on Sanctification*, Stanley N. Gundry ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987.
- Gwyn, Douglas. *Apocalypse of the Word*. Richmond, IN: Friends University Press, 1984.
- Hanks, Barry. *Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism: A Documentary Reader*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2008.
- Harris, Harriet A. *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Hamm, Thomas D. *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends 1800-1907*. Richmond, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Hamm, Thomas D. *Earlham College: A History, 1847-1997*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997.

- Hamm, Thomas. 'North America: United States', in *Historical Dictionary of the Friends (Quakers)* Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr, ed. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press Inc. 2003: 198-200.
- Hamm, Thomas D. *The Quakers in American*, Columbia Contemporary American Religion Series. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2003.
- Hamm, Thomas. 'Theoretical Reflections of a Skeptic about Theory', in *The Creation of Quaker Theory; Insider Perspective*, ed. Pink Dandelion. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004: 172-187.
- Hamm, Thomas D. 'Friends United Meeting and its Identity: An Interpretative History'. *Quaker Life*. January/February 2009: 10-15.
- Handy, Robert T. *The Social Gospel in America 1870-1920*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Harris, Herbert E. *The Quaker and the West: The First Sixty Years of Whittier College*. No publisher noted, 1948.
- Hinshaw, David. *Herbert Hoover: American Quaker*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Company, 1950.
- Hinshaw, Seth B. *The Carolina Quaker Experience: 1665-1985*. Greensboro, NC: North Carolina Friends Historical Society, 1984.
- Hirst, Margaret. *The Quakers in Peace and War*. London: The Swarthmore Press LTD. 1923.
- Hoffman, Jan. 'Discipline', in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. Lanham, ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003: 72-74.
- Hoffman, Jan. 'Minute', in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. Lanham, ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003: 180.
- Hoffman, Jan. 'Queries and Advices', in *The A to Z of Friends (Quakers)*, eds. Margery Post Abbott, Mary Ellen Chijioke, Pink Dandelion and John William Oliver Jr. Lanham, ML: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003: 235-236.
- Hopkins, Charles Howard. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism: 1865-19156*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1940.

- Huebner, Harry J. 'Introduction' in *An Introduction to Christian Ethics: History, Movements, People*, ed. Harry J Huebner. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012: 1-10.
- Jackson, Sheldon G. *Barclay College: Lighthouse on the Prairies*. Haviland, KS: Barclay College, 1992.
- Johnston, Robert K. 'American Evangelicalism: An Extended Family', in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1991, 252-272.
- Jones, Charles Edwin. *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974.
- Jones, Mary Hoxie. *Swords Into Ploughshares: An account of The American Friends Service Committee 1917-1937*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1937.
- Jones, Rufus M. *Studies in Mystical Religion*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1909.
- Jones, Rufus M. *The Quakers in the American Colonies*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1911.
- Jones, Rufus M. *Spiritual Reformers in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914.
- Jones, Rufus, M. *The Later Periods of Quakerism*, vol. 1 and 2. London: Macmillan and Co., 1921.
- Juhnke, James C. *Vision, Doctrine, War: Mennonite Identity and Organization in America, 1890-1930*. Scottdale, PN: Herald Press, 1989.
- Kennedy, Thomas. *British Quakerism, 1860-1920: The Transformation of a Religious Community*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001.
- König, Adrio. 'Evangelical Theology', in *Initiation into Theology*, ed. Simon Maimela and Adrio König. Pretoria, JL van Schaik Publisher, 1998: 81-110.
- Kostlevy, William C. 'Introduction' in *Historical Dictionary of the Holiness Movement*, ed. William C. Kostlevy. Lanham, ML: The Scarecrow Press, 2001: 1-5.
- Kovac, Jeffrey. *Refusing War, Affirming Peace: The History of Civilian Public Service Camp #21 at Cascade Locks*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press, 2009.
- Kraus, C. Norman. 'A Mennonite Critique', in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1991, 184-203.

- Larsen, Timothy. 'Defining and Locating Evangelicalism', in *The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology*, ed. Timothy Larsen and Daniel J. Treier. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007: 1-14
- Larsen, Timothy. 'The reception given *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* since its publication in 1989', in *The Emergence of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*, Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J Stewart, ed. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2008: 21-36.
- LeShana, David C. *Quakers in California: The Effects of 19<sup>th</sup> Century Revivalism on Western Quakerism*. Newberg OR: The Barclay Press, 1969.
- Lewy, Guenter. *Peace and Revolution: The Moral Crisis of American Pacifism*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.
- Lippman, Walter. *A Preface to Morals*. New York, NY: The McMillan Company, 1929.
- Livingstone, E.A. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of the Christian Church*, revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Longfield, Bradley. *The Presbyterian Controversy, Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Lund, Clair E. *A History of Missions in Bolivia of the Oregon Yearly Meeting of Friends*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Western Evangelical Seminary. 1954. Currently held in George Fox University Archives, Special Collections Room; Newberg, Oregon.
- Marietta, Jack D. *The Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.
- Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, new edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980 reprinted 2006.
- Marsden, George M. *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1987.
- Marsden, George M. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1991.
- Marsden, George M. *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- McCune, Rolland D. 'The Formation of the New Evangelicalism (Part One): Historical and Theological Beginnings,' *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* vol. 3. Fall, 1998: 3-34.
- McCune, Rolland D. 'The Formation of the New Evangelicalism (Part Two): Historical Beginnings,' *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* vol. 4. Fall, 1999: 109-150.
- McDermott, Gerald R. 'Introduction' to *The Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, ed. Gerald R. McDermott. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010: 3-18.
- McGrath, Alister E. 'Modernism', in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Modern Christian Thought*, Alister E. McGrath, ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1993: 383-384.
- McLoughlin, William G. *The American Evangelicals, 1800-1900: An Anthology*. New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1968.
- McNichols, Donald. *Portrait of a Quaker: Levi T. Pennington*. Newberg, OR: The Barclay Press, 1980.
- Miller, Lawrence McK. *Witness for Humanity: A Biography of Clarence E. Pickett*. Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill, 1999.
- Mowry, George E. *The Urban Nation, 1920-1960*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 1965.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. 'Fundamentalism', *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, eds. E. R. A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1937: 526-527.
- Nineham, Dennis. 'Higher Criticism', in *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*, Alan Richardson and John Bowden, eds. London, SCM Press, 1983: 255-258.
- Noll, Mark A. *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992.
- Noll, Mark A. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1994.
- Noll, Mark A. *American Evangelical Christianity: An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Noll, Mark A. *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield, and the Wesleys*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003.
- Noll, Mark A. 'What is an Evangelical?' in *The Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, ed. Gerald R. McDermott. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. 19-34.



- Ockenga, Harold John. Introduction to Carl Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947.
- Ockenga, Harold John. 'Resurgent Evangelical Leadership', in *Christianity Today Reader*, ed Frank E. Gaebelein. New York, NY: Meredith Press, 1966.
- Osborne, Bryon L. *The Malone Story: The Dream of Two Quaker Young People*. Newton, KS: United Printing, 1970.
- Price, Robert M. 'Neo-evangelicals and Scripture: A Forgotten Period of Ferment.' *Christian Scholars Review* vol. 15, no. 4. 1986: 315-330
- Punshon, John. *Portrait in Grey: A Short History of the Quakers*. London: Quaker Books, 1984.
- Punshon, John. *Reason For Hope: The Faith and Future of the Friends Church*. Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 2001.
- Ranke, L. von. *Histories of the Latin and German Nations from 1494 to 1514*, extract translated in G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London: Longman, 1952.
- Roberts, Arthur. 'Follow Peace and Holiness', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 33 no. 10. January 1955: 2, 7.
- Roberts, Arthur. 'Follow Peace and Holiness [continued]', *Northwest Friend*, vol. 33 no. 11. February 1955: 2, 11.
- Roberts, Arthur O. *The Association of Evangelical Friends: A Story of Quaker Renewal in the Twentieth Century*. Newberg, OR: The Barclay Press, 1975.
- Roberts, Arthur O. *Tomorrow is Growing Old: Stories of the Quakers in Alaska*. Newberg, OR: The Barclay Press, 1978.
- Roberts, Arthur O. *Through Flaming Sword: the Life and Legacy of George Fox*. Newberg, OR: The Barclay Press, 2008.
- Rogerson, J.W. 'Higher Criticism', in *The Oxford Companion to Christian Thought*, Adrian Hastings, Alistair Mason and Hugh Pyper, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2000: 297-298.
- Russell, C. Allyn. *Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1976.

- Russell, Elbert. *The History of Quakerism*. New York, NY, The Macmillan Company, 1942.
- Sandeen, Ernest R. *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1970, reprinted 1978.
- Schmidt, Jean Miller. *Souls or the Social Order*. Brooklyn, NY: Carlson Publishing Inc., 1991.
- Sounders, Floyd and Norma Sounders. *Friends University: 1898-1973*. Wichita, KS: Published as a Part of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary Celebration of Friends University, 1974.
- Southern, Alice. *The Rowntree Series and the Growth of Liberal Quakerism: 1895-1925*. Master of Philosophy, University of Birmingham, March 2010.
- Spencer, Carole Dale, *Holiness: The Soul of Quakerism*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2007.
- Sweeney, Douglas A. *The American Evangelical Story: A History of the Movement*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Thornburg, Opal. *Earlham: The Story of the College 1847-1962*. Richmond, IN: The Earlham College Press, 1963.
- Tippy, Worth. 'The Church and Social Service: Social Work and the Federal Council of Churches', *The Journal of Social Forces*, vol. 1 no. 1. November 1922: 36-38.
- Tolles, Frederick B. *Quakers and the Atlantic Culture*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1947.
- Tolles, Frederick B. *The Atlantic Community of the Early Friends*. London: Friends Historical Society, 1952.
- Tosh, John. *The Pursuit of History: Aim, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History*. London: Longman, 1984.
- Tosh, John. *Why History Matters*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Townsend, Sophia E. *Our College, A History of Cascade College from 1918-1957*. Portland OR: Privately printed, 1957.
- Trueblood, Elton. *Robert Barclay*. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968.

- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. 'Scripture and Hermeneutics', in *The Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology*, ed. Gerald R. McDermott. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010: 35-52.
- Wallis, Roy. *The Elementary Forms of the New Religious Life*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul plc, 1984.
- Watson, S, Arthur. *William Penn College: A Product and a Producer*. Oskaloosa: William Penn College Publisher, 1971.
- Webber, Robert E. *Common Roots, A Call to Evangelical Maturity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Webber, Robert E. 'Who are the Evangelicals?', *USA Today* vol. 115 no. 2504. May 1987: 88-89.
- White, Ronald C. Jr. & C. Howard Hopkins, *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1976.
- Williams Jr., Walter. *The Rich Heritage of Quakerism*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.