

AMERICAN PACIFISTS: THE QUAKERS, THE  
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST, AND THE CIVIL WAR

By

ANDREW BENJAMIN SMITH

Bachelor of Arts, History

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

2011

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS  
July, 2013

AMERICAN PACIFISTS: THE QUAKERS, THE  
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST, AND THE CIVIL WAR

Thesis Approved:

Dr. James L. Huston

---

Thesis Adviser

Dr. L.G. Moses

---

Dr. Jason Lavery

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my advisor, Dr. James Huston, for the illuminating guidance and indelible discernment he provided on this project and throughout my time at Oklahoma State. Dr. Huston helped me to determine my specific interest in the interactions between religious history and the Civil War. Not to be forgotten, the other members of my committee, Dr. L.G. Moses and Dr. Jason Lavery were also great advocates for me. Dr. Moses's kindness and patience gave me confidence to excel at graduate-level work. Dr. Lavery provided invaluable insight into European history. All of them contributed to the success of my graduate career. Dr. Michael Logan, Dr. Elizabeth Williams, Dr. William Bryans, Dr. James Cooper, and Dr. Ron McCoy all imparted knowledge to me during my graduate career. I am especially indebted to Dr. Richard Rohrs, who taught me how to write.

I also need to thank the intrepid librarians I consulted on this project. Without these scholars, this thesis would have been impossible. John Phillips at the Edmon Low Library at my very own Oklahoma State University has been a great help to me throughout my graduate career. I am indebted to Max Burson of the Edmund Stanley Library at Friends University. Chris Rosser at Oklahoma Christian University showed me many of the Disciples' primary materials that I used in this study. John Imbler and Sandy Shapoval at Philips Theological Seminary provided me with excellent resources for my research. Each of these librarians showed me great kindness and incredible generosity for the regrettably brief period I interacted with them.

I need to thank some of my fellow graduate students. Michael Seaman greatly increased my knowledge of American religious history and sharpened me in many edifying ways. He proofread this work and provided me with many helpful suggestions. Matt Ray suggested that I include the few paragraphs on slavery, and encouraged me as we endured the thesis-writing process together. The other students in my department who impacted me, and thus this work, in a positive manner are too many to name but I am going to try. Ry Marcatillio-McCracken, Matthew Deepe, Zach Daughtrey, Lori Lindsay, Drew Folk, Cody Edwards, Mary Sanders, Bryan Carter, Shawn Broyles, Justin Prince, Cody Smith, Kristin Morgan, and Kevin Anders, among others, helped me through my graduate school experience.

Of course, I would not be where I am without my wonderful parents, Richard and Kathy Smith. Thank you for your love, encouragement, patience, and financial support. I love you.

Name: ANDREW BENJAMIN SMITH

Date of Degree: JULY, 2013

Title of Study: AMERICAN PACIFISTS: THE QUAKERS, THE DISCIPLES OF  
CHRIST AND THE CIVIL WAR

Major Field: HISTORY

Abstract:

This essay is a comparative study of two religious sects that faced the Civil War. The Quakers and the Disciples of Christ began on two different continents and developed different theologies, but had pacifism in common. They faced the same war with the same view of war, but reacted differently. While the Quakers seem to have largely maintained their peace testimony, the Disciples' pacifism disintegrated under the pressure of intense sectional conflict. After the war, the Quakers initially renewed their commitment to peace and dreamed of a system of international arbitration, but slowly retreated from their traditional positions, including pacifism. The split that occurred among the Disciples during the war worsened, leading to an official separation in 1906. What caused these radically different results from two denominations that endured the same war with the same perspective? Tradition, education, geography, organization, theology, and political views all influenced the outcome. The Quakers had a longer and more viable tradition of pacifism than did the Disciples of Christ. This is seen in the ways they educated their younger members. For all Americans, region was important in determining one's response to the Civil War. Geography affected the strength of the pacifist's convictions. The rigidity of the Quakers organization allowed them to remain united during and after the war, while the dearth of uniformity among the Disciples led to a permanent split. Finally, the Quakers and Disciples of Christ believed that the Christian should respond differently to the civil government. Unlike the Quakers, however, the Disciples never reached a united position on civil government. Some agreed with the Friends that Christians should not be involved at all. Others advocated at least some form of responsibility and involvement. For both the Quakers and the Disciples of Christ, the Civil War proved a catalyst for adherence to their doctrines of peace.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PACIFIST ORIGINS .....	20
III. CIVIL WAR REACTIONS .....	36
IV. POST-WAR CHANGES .....	66
V. CONCLUSION.....	78
REFERENCES .....	86

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The American Civil War presented advocates of peace with a great challenge. Many religious denominations espoused peace before the war. When conflict came, however, they discussed the cause in righteous terms and fully supported it. Only a few sects maintained a pacifist stance at the outset of the Civil War. The most significant were the Quakers (Society of Friends) and the Disciples of Christ (Christian Church). Various sources suggest there were roughly 100,000 to 200,000 Quakers in the United States of America around the time of the Civil War.<sup>1</sup> In 1860, scholars estimate that there were between 200,000 and 350,000 Disciples of Christ.<sup>2</sup> Other pacifist religious groups

---

<sup>1</sup> These numbers are discussed in detail on pages 13-15.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Brock, *Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 836; Darin A. Tuck, "Battle Cry of Peace: The Leadership of the Disciples of Christ Movement during the American Civil War, 1861-1865" (MA thesis, Kansas State University, 2010), 8; *The American Christian Record: Containing the History, Confession of Faith, and Statistics of each Religious Denomination in the United States and Europe; A List of All Clergymen with their Post Office Address, Etc., Etc., Etc.* (New York: W.R.C. Clark & Meeker, 1860), 45-46; Charles C. Goss, *Statistical History of the First Century of American Methodism: With a Summary of the Origin and Present Operations of Other Denominations* (New York: Carlton & Porter, 1866), 112, Hathi Trust Digital Library <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/dul1.ark:/13960/t8ff49s7f> (accessed March 4, 2013). After numbering the Disciples of Christ, or "Campbellites" at 200,000, Goss wrote, "The "Campbellites" and several others are mere estimates, but considered by many as far too large. They are, however, estimates of their own,

existed, such as the Mennonites, Amish, Seventh-Day Adventists, Dunkards, Schwenkfelders, Shakers, and Christadelphians, but they accounted for a much less significant segment of the population.<sup>3</sup>

This essay is a comparative study of two religious sects that faced the Civil War. The Quakers and the Disciples of Christ began on two different continents and developed different theologies but had pacifism in common. They faced the same war with the same view of war, but reacted differently. While the Quakers seem to have largely maintained their peace testimony, the Disciples' pacifism disintegrated under the pressure of intense sectional conflict. After the war, the Quakers initially renewed their commitment to peace and dreamed of a system of international arbitration, but then slowly retreated from their traditional positions, including pacifism. The split that occurred among the Disciples during the war worsened, leading to an official separation in 1906. Several factors produced these radically different results from two denominations that endured the same war with the same perspective. Tradition, education, geography, organization, theology, and political views all influenced the outcome. The Quakers had a longer and more viable tradition of pacifism than did the Disciples of Christ. This is evident in the ways they educated their younger members. In addition, for all Americans, region was important in determining one's response to the Civil War. Geography affected the strength of the pacifist's convictions. The rigidity of the Quaker's organization allowed them to remain

---

except the Campbellites, which we have reduced from 300,000 to 200,000, which is thought to be a more correct estimate" (112-113).

<sup>3</sup> The Dunkards (163 churches), Mennonites (109 churches), Adventists (70 churches), and Shakers (12 churches) only combined for 354 churches in the 1860 Census. Their churches could accommodate no more than 127,000 people combined and the accommodations were much lower than actual membership. Amish, Schwenkfelders, and Christadelphians were not accounted for in 1860 (U.S. Census of 1860, 497, 500). The Quakers had 726 churches and the Disciples had over 1,000 churches in 1860.

united during and after the war, while the dearth of uniformity among the Disciples led to a permanent split. Finally, the Quakers and Disciples of Christ believed that the Christian should respond differently to the civil government. Unlike the Quakers, however, the Disciples never reached a united position on civil government. Some agreed with the Friends that Christians should not be involved at all. Others advocated at least some form of responsibility and involvement. For both the Quakers and the Disciples of Christ, the Civil War proved a catalyst that tested their adherence to their doctrines of peace.

By 1860, the Quakers had maintained a reputation as a peace church for two hundred years. They carried that reputation across the Atlantic as they established meetings (or churches) in the American colonies. In the American wars of the nineteenth century, the Quakers held fast to their pacifist principles. While there is some evidence that many Friends wavered on these principles during the Civil War, most of them maintained a stance of non-violence. Post-war periodicals reveal that pacifism remained an important part of the Quaker identity into the late nineteenth century, though it faded in the twentieth.

Most Americans did not consider the Disciples of Christ to be a traditional peace church, although the leadership espoused non-violence. As a part of the Restoration Movement of the early nineteenth century (which coincided with the Second Great Awakening from 1790-1870), it seems clear that the Disciples leaders expected their adherents to find clear injunctions against war in the New Testament. However, enough questions about the Christian's proper response to war were posed to leaders such as Alexander Campbell that many of them sought to provide clarity. Like the Quakers, their chosen instrument of communication were weekly or monthly periodicals. During the



Civil War, although many influential leaders encouraged pacifism, most Disciples were involved in the war on one side or the other. After the war, little semblance of the Disciples' pacifism remained.

Of the broader works on the Civil War and religion in the Civil War, only Phillip Shaw Paludan covered the pacifists response adequately. He noted that many Quakers struggled to reconcile their pacifism and anti-slavery positions. Some of them saw a war to end slavery as an acceptable cause to support. Paludan devoted numerous pages to the Quaker's response to the Civil War, but limited the scope of his work to the North.<sup>4</sup> George Rable, in his religious history of the war, briefly discussed the Quakers at several points, also identifying the dilemma of pacifism and a justifiable war.<sup>5</sup> Though brief, Paludan and Rable gave a valid description of the Quaker struggles. In his survey of the Civil War and Reconstruction, William L. Barney hardly mentioned pacifism, conscientious objection, Quakers, or religious peace movements.<sup>6</sup> Harry Stout, in his moral history of the war, did not mention the Quakers or any other peace church.<sup>7</sup> Civil War historian James McPherson discussed political peace movements but not religious peace movements in the latest edition of *Ordeal by Fire*.<sup>8</sup> None of the above authors

---

<sup>4</sup> Phillip Shaw Paludan, *A People's Contest: The Union and Civil War, 1861-1865*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996), 357-362.

<sup>5</sup> George C. Rable, *God's Almost Chosen Peoples: A Religious History of the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 66, 150, 228-230, 353-354.

<sup>6</sup> William L. Barney, *Battleground for the Union: The Era of the Civil War and Reconstruction, 1848-1877* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1990).

<sup>7</sup> Harry S. Stout, *Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the American Civil War* (New York: Viking Penguin, 2006).

<sup>8</sup> James M. McPherson and James K. Hogue, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010).

mentioned the Disciples of Christ. If any pacifist religious group was mentioned, it was the Quakers, and only briefly.

Some less popular works do deal with the Civil War reactions of the Quakers and Disciples of Christ. Peter Brock published a massive tome on American pacifism in 1968. He discussed pacifist groups in the United States (or what would become the United States) from the colonial era to the First World War. His purpose is “to tell the story of the religious groups whose members refused military service on the basis of their objection to war, and of that section of the organized peace movement which from its beginnings in 1815 repudiated all war.”<sup>9</sup> Brock included groups that were pacifist in all wars and those that were pacifist only in the Civil War. He spent most of his chapter on Civil War pacifism discussing the Quakers and Mennonites, which were the two largest traditional religious peace groups (the Disciples were larger than both, but were not considered a traditional peace church). Brock classified the Quakers as conscientious objectors, but noted that there was not unanimity on this position. He mentioned the Southern Quakers and the struggles they faced as conscientious objectors in the Confederacy. Brock also discussed the Disciples of Christ in his 1968 book. He agreed with the classical view that the Civil War did not divide the church, and he credited the strength of Alexander Campbell’s leadership. Due to their loose structure, Brock believed, and lack of a widespread doctrine, the Disciples remained united. The fact that they did not splinter into Northern Disciples and Southern Disciples like so many other denominations proves that they remained united.

---

<sup>9</sup> Brock, *Pacifism in the United States*, vii.

Edward Needles Wright wrote *Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War* in 1931.<sup>10</sup> He lacks a definitive thesis, but wanted to know, what kind of people and religious denominations were conscientious objectors, how they went about acquiring that status, how the civil and military authorities treated them, how many conscientious objectors there were, and how conscientious objection in the Civil War compared to conscientious objection in World War One. He limited his study to the North and South from 1861 to 1865. Importantly, and unlike Brock, Wright only included groups that were opposed to all wars, and not just those opposed to the Civil War. He found that most Confederate objectors were also opposed to slavery and secession. There were fewer conscientious objectors in the South than the North, and they were usually the most abused. While Wright covered some minor pacifist religious sects, his work primarily deals with Quakers in the North and South because they were the largest body of conscientious objectors in the nation. They were more likely to apply their peace doctrines and they kept the best records. Lastly, “they were the only organized body of objectors who claimed unconditional exemption from military service on grounds of conscience.”<sup>11</sup> Wright used numerous primary sources to illustrate pacifism during the Civil War and the trials that various groups endured. He used minutes from Quaker meetings (mostly in the North), government records from the Adjutant General’s Office, census data on the various religious groups, state government documents from Iowa,

---

<sup>10</sup> Edward Needles Wright, *Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War* (1931; repr., New York: A.S. Barnes & Company, Inc., 1961).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 4-5.

Virginia, and North Carolina, newspapers, pamphlets, personal papers, and memoirs. Wright's book is important because he used many printed sources for the first time.<sup>12</sup>

Jacquelyn S. Nelson wrote about the Indiana Quaker's response to the Civil War in 1991.<sup>13</sup> Nelson's goal is to counter the myth that Quakers were always pacifists and did not fight in the Civil War. She disagreed with Wright's interpretation of the Quakers as a peace sect. While he focused on their refusal to join the military, she found that many of them were involved. Nelson limited her study to Quakers who lived in the state of Indiana from 1861 to 1865. She garnered most of her information from local church records, as well as manuscript collections, regimental records, and meeting minutes. Peter Brock, with most other historians that have worked with the Quakers and pacifism, believed that only a small number of Quakers joined the military. Most scholars estimate that only a few hundred Quakers were active in the military (6.0 to 7.5 percent of Indiana Quakers).<sup>14</sup> Nelson's records of Indiana Quakers tell a different story. She determined that at least 1,212 (21 percent of Indiana Quakers) took up arms, and over 200 of those gave their lives.<sup>15</sup> In contrast, over 2000 Quakers claimed conscientious objection when drafted. Of the 1,212 Indiana Quakers who served in the military, only 368 either apologized for it or were disowned by their communities. This was because Quaker numbers were in decline and they had begun to reduce their strict views to attract and keep membership, Nelson says. Her research agreed with Wright's and Brock's that

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>13</sup> Jacquelyn S. Nelson, *Indiana Quakers Confront the Civil War* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1991).

<sup>14</sup> James L. Burke and Donald E. Bensch, "Mount Pleasant and the Early Quakers of Ohio," *Ohio History* 83 no. 4 (December 1974), 251.

<sup>15</sup> Nelson, *Indiana Quakers*, 20-21.

military authorities often abused the Quakers. However, Indiana Quakers suffered little. While it is certain that about 21 percent of Indiana Quakers served in the military, it is possible that the number was as high as 45 percent. Even the low estimate of 21 percent is considerably higher than any previous scholar has presumed. In Indiana, whether by contributing men or money, Quakers tended to support the Union.<sup>16</sup>

When it comes to the literature on the Disciples' involvement in the Civil War, interpretations vary. Institutional historians dominate the discussion. The most important issue is whether the war divided the Disciples of Christ. Most authors point to the 1862 and 1863 meetings of the American Christian Mission Society (ACMS) as evidence of sectional cleavage within the movement. Although a majority resided in the North, there were a significant number of Disciples in the South. The missionary society was based in Cincinnati and was dominated by Northern members. Winfred Garrison and Alfred DeGroot wrote a comprehensive history of the Disciples of Christ in 1948. Their purpose was to record the genesis of the Disciples movement and how it had grown.<sup>17</sup> Included is a chapter on the Disciples' reaction to the Civil War and the post-war period. This work illustrates a clear delineation in loyalties during the war. Some Disciples supported the Union, some the Confederacy, and some were pacifists. The authors did not highlight any differences between the pacifists. Garrison and DeGroot claimed that the 1863 ACMS decision did not affect disunion among the Disciples because there was no official union

---

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 96.

<sup>17</sup> Winfred Ernest Garrison and Alfred T. DeGroot, *The Disciples of Christ: A History* (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1948), 11.

in the first place. Their view was that while the war itself did not divide the Disciples, issues that came up after the war did.<sup>18</sup>

In 1966, David Harrell wrote what is probably the most thorough history of the Disciples of Christ. Harrell determined the stance and actions of the Disciples on various social issues, war being one of them. While most histories of religious groups focus on theological aspects and relationships with the divine, Harrell emphasized the relationship with man. He considered the Disciples' position on issues like economics, slavery, war, capital punishment, Indians, and women's rights. According to Harrell, the Disciples were divided even before the war. He identified four blocs among the Disciples before the Civil War: abolitionists, antislavery moderates, proslavery moderates, and proslavery radicals. Harrell found that while most of the Disciples' leadership was pacifist, their congregations were not. The division over the American Christian Missionary Society revealed three sides among the Disciples. The issue divided them between the Unionist North, the neutral Border States, and the Confederate South. It was a preview of the Disciples' official division in 1906. Unequivocally, the author states, "In fact, if not in theory, the Disciples of Christ were divided by the Civil War."<sup>19</sup>

The Religious Society of Friends, or Quakers, began in England in the 1651. One of the variety of sects that abounded during the era of Cromwell's Puritan Republic, the Quakers were rather radical. It is not surprising then, that they gained inspiration from the radical Puritans. Theologically, the Quakers trace their heritage back to the Anabaptists,

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 333-337.

<sup>19</sup> David Edwin Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America: The Disciples of Christ and American Society to 1866* (Nashville: The Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1966) 137-174.

Puritans, Baptists, and other Protestant dissenters. Fringe religious sects also influenced Quaker founder George Fox.<sup>20</sup> With the restoration of the English monarchy in 1660, the Quakers experienced harsh persecution. Scholars Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost compare the Quakers early regional revivals to the American Great Awakening. They note, “The nickname “Quaker” reflected the physical shaking aroused by inner struggles of individuals facing their inner motives “under the Light” in the Quaker meetings.”<sup>21</sup>

Founder George Fox focused his brand of Christianity on the individual’s relationship with God. An Inner Light led the Quakers. The Inner Light was an intensely personal experience of immediate communication, or revelation, from God. Thomas D. Hamm explains,

Fox’s understanding of this Light, the Inward or Inner Light, as Friends have come to call it, was complicated, and his writings and the writings of other early Friends lend themselves to varied interpretations. What is clear is that Fox and other Quakers agreed that all people had within them a certain measure of the Light of Christ. If they heeded it, that Inward Light would show them their sinful conditions and their need for Christ, and would lead them to salvation. But if they ignored it or failed to heed its admonitions, they would be lost and ultimately damned.<sup>22</sup>

Puritans and other Christian sects saw direct and personal revelation as blasphemy. Because of this and their other radical and bizarre behavior, Quakers were heavily persecuted in England. Fox and companion James Naylor were beaten and stoned because they asserted that God spoke to them personally. Quakers rejected ecclesiastic

---

<sup>20</sup> John Merriman, *A History of Modern Europe: From the Renaissance to the Age of Napoleon Vol. 1*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010), 222-224, 226; Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, *The Quakers* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), 12-20.

<sup>21</sup> Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 28.

<sup>22</sup> Thomas D. Hamm, *The Quakers in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 15.

hierarchies as were found in Catholicism, Anglicanism, and other Protestant sects, as well as other church institutions like clergy, theologies, and sacraments. Friends did not observe holy days or the Roman names for days and months, and they did not respect titles. Rather than establishing large, elaborate buildings, Fox and his followers met in homes and later in meetinghouses. They elevated the influence and importance of the Holy Spirit over the Scriptures and any kind of church organization or hierarchy. Generally, Quakers held their meetings in silence so that each individual could meditate, pray, and listen to God. If the Holy Spirit moved anyone to speak, they did so. In part because of their disdain for paid ministers, the Quakers promoted gender equality. The Quakers allowed women to speak during their meetings and take leadership roles in their communities. If a community was large enough, there were separate Yearly Meetings for men and women. Early leaders of the movement for women's rights, such as Susan B. Anthony and Lucretia Mott, were Friends.<sup>23</sup>

Almost from its genesis, Quakerism spread abroad. The first generations of Quakers were zealous evangelists, taking their doctrine all over the world. In 1656, two female Friends sailed into Boston Harbor. Local Puritans met them, searched and jailed them, confiscated their literature, and unceremoniously banished them. The Puritans saw Quakerism as a false teaching, which led them to suppress cruelly any Friends who set foot in Massachusetts. In 1659 and 1660, Massachusetts authorities hanged four Quakers charged with blasphemy and public disorder. To Puritans in the New World, the Quakers' lack of deference and social and theological radicalism were a threat to society. Despite

---

<sup>23</sup> Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 30-31.



harsh persecution, the Quakers established early communities in Rhode Island and Maryland.<sup>24</sup>

After the English monarchy was restored in 1660, Fox and the Quakers became less radical and more structured. Fox condemned certain acts by other Quakers as too radical and several divisions occurred over doctrine in next two decades. The Quakers desired uniform purity and accountability among members. Fox's solution was the establishment of local, Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly Meetings. Quakers like William Penn promoted toleration and reform instead of radical exclusion and disruption. In addition, Quakers began to look for a community free of hostility. Penn inherited land in the New World that had been given to his father for service to King Charles II, and established the colony of Pennsylvania in 1681. Penn attempted to conduct a Holy Experiment for Quakers and as sole proprietor possessing complete control he allowed for the free worship of any religion, divorcing the government from any denominational affiliation (though Penn did require government officials to be Christians). Quakers flocked to Penn's colony, but other religious groups soon outnumbered them. Penn established friendly relations with local Indian tribes and the ecclesiastically eclectic colony thrived economically.<sup>25</sup>

The eighteenth century brought a period of Quaker history referred to by scholars as the Quietist period. This related to the humility, austerity, and plainness of the worship experience. English toleration of dissenting religious groups and the deaths of charismatic leaders Fox, Robert Barclay, and Penn in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth

---

<sup>24</sup> Hamm, *The Quakers in America*, 22-24.

<sup>25</sup> Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 68-70, 76-77.

century tempered Quaker enthusiasm for proselytes.<sup>26</sup> Howard Brinton called the years 1700-1740 the “Golden Age of Quakerism in America.” They dominated politics in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Rhode Island. Though not numerically dominant in Pennsylvania, Quaker culture remained prevalent.<sup>27</sup> The Friends continued to expand in the eighteenth century, with monthly meetings in every state by 1790. The early nineteenth century brought division within American Quakerism. An anti-evangelical faction known as Hicksite Quakers gained a majority in areas of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. In the 1840s and 1850s, two rival groups known as Wilburites and Gurneyites split the New England Quakers. They disagreed over how much emphasis to put on the Inner Light. Gurneyite Friends promoted Bible study, Sunday school, and higher education. Wilburite Friends thought that the Gurneyites focused too much on outward actions. However, each faction, including the Orthodox Friends, maintained a position against war.<sup>28</sup>

There is a great deal of disagreement over how many Quakers were in the United States during the antebellum years and the Civil War. Richard J. Carwardine notes that there were 64,000 Friends in 1855.<sup>29</sup> He cited Timothy L. Smith’s 1965 work, *Revivalism and Social Reform*. Smith estimated that there were 64,500 Quakers in 1855 and 94,672

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 83-86.

<sup>27</sup> Howard Brinton, *Friends for 300 Years: The History and Beliefs of the Society of Friends since George Fox Started the Quaker Movement* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), 183-184.

<sup>28</sup> Edwin Scott Gaustad and Philip L. Barlow, *New Historical Atlas of Religions in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 140-141.

<sup>29</sup> Richard J. Carwardine, *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 6.

Quakers in 1865.<sup>30</sup> This is a considerable increase, and a puzzling one, given that, per the U.S. Census records, there was the same number of Friends churches in 1860 as there was in 1850 (726 churches), and by 1870 that number had decreased (692 churches).<sup>31</sup> Smith cited primary works by the Presbyterian Robert Baird, Baptist Joseph Belcher, and Methodist Charles C. Goss. Baird and Belcher simply parroted the 1850 Census records (offering no specifics on Quaker membership) while Goss gave the exact number of Quakers as being 94,672 but offered no explanation as to how he acquired such a number.<sup>32</sup> Hamm estimated that there were 100,000 Quakers in North America by 1775.<sup>33</sup> It seems unlikely that they would not have grown at all in 90 years. However, around the same period (late eighteenth century), Edwin Gaustad and Philip L. Barlow calculated that there were approximately 50,000 Quakers in America.<sup>34</sup> Howard Brinton did not offer a number, but asserted that the zenith of American Quakerism occurred around 1800.<sup>35</sup> In contrast to these scholars, John Hayward, in his 1857 *Book of*

---

<sup>30</sup> Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 17.

<sup>31</sup> *The Statistics of the Population of the United States...Compiled from the Original Returns of the Ninth Census* (1872; repr., New York: Norman Ross Publishing Inc., 1990), 512.

<sup>32</sup> Joseph Belcher, *The Religious Denominations in the United States: Their History, Doctrine, Government, and Statistics* (Philadelphia: J.E. Potter, 1854), 834; Robert Baird, *State and Prospects of Religion in America; Being a Report Made at the Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, in Paris, August 25<sup>th</sup>, 1855* (London: Edward Suter, Aylott and Co., and Hatchard and Son, 1855), 40; Goss, *Statistical History of the First Century of American Methodism*, 31, 113, Hathi Trust Digital Library <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/dul1.ark:/13960/t8ff49s7f> (accessed March 4, 2013).

<sup>33</sup> Hamm, *The Quakers in America*, 33.

<sup>34</sup> Gaustad and Barlow, *New Historical Atlas of Religions in America*, 44.

<sup>35</sup> Brinton, *Friends for 300 Years*, 185.

*Religions*, numbered the Quakers in America at 200,000. At least one contemporary newspaper stated that there were 183,000 Quakers in 1856.<sup>36</sup>

The United States Census first published religious statistics in 1850. In the reports of 1850, 1860, and 1870, the census gave the number of churches (in 1870 it gave the number of organizations and edifices in an attempt to diminish ambiguity), accommodations or sittings (the number of people who could be seated in the church buildings), and the total value of church property. Not until the 1890 Census was church membership or number of communicants calculated. In 1860, the 726 Friends churches could accommodate a maximum of 269,084 people.<sup>37</sup> However, using the 1890 Census as a guide, the membership numbers of 1890 were considerably lower than the accommodation numbers. In 1890, the 1,056 Friends organizations could accommodate 302,218 people, but the number of communicants was just 107,208. According to the 1890 Census, there were nearly three (2.82) seats for every member or communicant.<sup>38</sup> If one extrapolates that equation (total number of seats divided by 2.82), there were approximately 95,420 members of Friends churches in the United States in 1860.

---

<sup>36</sup> John Hayward, *The Book of Religions, Comprising the Views, Creeds, Sentiments, or Opinions, of all the Principal Religious Sects in the World, Particularly of All Christian Denominations in Europe and America; To Which are Added Church and Missionary Statistics, Together with Biographical Sketches* (Boston: Sanborn, Carter, Bazin and Company, 1857), 319, *Sabin Americana*. Gale, Cengage Learning. Oklahoma State University Library.  
<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY111656454&srchtp=a&ste=14> (accessed March 7, 2013); "Quakers in the United States," *New Orleans Daily Creole* (July 1, 1856), 2.

<sup>37</sup> *Statistics of the United States, (Including Mortality, Property, &c.,) in 1860; Compiled from the Original Returns and being the Final Exhibit of the Eighth Census, under the Direction of the Secretary of the Interior* (1866; repr., New York: Norman Ross Publishing Inc., 1990), 498.

<sup>38</sup> Department of the Interior, Census Office, *Report on the Statistics of Churches in the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890* (1894; repr., New York: Norman Ross Publishing Inc., 1990), xxii, 383-384.

While the Quakers were well known for their aversion to war by the Civil War era, the Disciples of Christ were a relatively new Christian sect. They came out of the Restoration Movement (1794-1906), which focused on bringing the church back to the basics of Scripture alone.<sup>39</sup> Contrary to the Quakers, the Disciples gave supreme authority to Scripture, and they believed that every man had the ability to read and interpret the words of God for himself. The Disciples of Christ were a significant religious sect that, in part, counted pacifism as one of its doctrines. For a sect that also elevated Christian unity as a primary tenet, it is not surprising that this translated to a desire for national unity. The church could not accomplish Christian unity in a divided nation. The most important proponents of pacifism among the Disciples were Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, and David Lipscomb.

The Disciples of Christ are the first religious denomination indigenous to the United States of America. Its origins lay primarily with two key figures, Barton W. Stone and Alexander Campbell. Although there were other influential leaders of the Restoration Movement like Elias Smith, Abner Jones, and James O'Kelly, Stone and Campbell were the two men involved in what would later become the Disciples of Christ. Stone was a Kentucky minister who preached during the famous Cane Ridge revival in 1801. He was originally a Presbyterian but broke away from that branch in 1803. At this time, he formed the short-lived Springfield Presbytery with four other ministers. Nine months later, in June of 1804, these men met at the Cane Ridge meetinghouse to dissolve their

---

<sup>39</sup> The Restoration Movement of the early nineteenth century happened at about the same time in many different places. The various groups, although held together by similar theologies, went by different names. Various sources refer to the sect as the Restoration Movement, the Stone-Campbell movement, Church of Christ, Christian Church, Disciples of Christ, Campbellites, or simply Christians. For clarity and simplicity, I will refer to them throughout as the Disciples of Christ or the Disciples. I will use the terms pacifism, non-violence, and anti-war interchangeably.

presbytery and become independent “Christian” churches. There, they signed “The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery.” In this document, they rejected church hierarchy and ecclesiastical central government. Eventually, his Springfield cohorts either became Shakers or returned to the Presbyterian Church, but Stone and his followers (called Stonites) remained independent. When he began publishing *The Christian Messenger* in 1826, most of his followers were in Ohio and Kentucky, with some in Indiana and Tennessee.<sup>40</sup> Stone espoused Christian unity, exclusive biblical authority, and local congregational autonomy.<sup>41</sup> He rejected Calvinism completely, and embraced Arminianism.<sup>42</sup> In 1827, there were an estimated 13,000 to 15,000 members of Stone’s Christian Church.<sup>43</sup>

Alexander Campbell was a Scottish immigrant who settled in Pennsylvania in 1809. His father, Thomas Campbell, had immigrated in 1807. Like Stone, they were originally Calvinist Presbyterians. The elder Campbell, who belonged to a certain sect of Presbyterians called Seceder Presbyterians, was soon accused of heresy by the American Seceder Presbyterians because he refused to acknowledge the emotional experience of

---

<sup>40</sup> Paul L. Conkin, *Cane Ridge: America’s Pentecost* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), 126-128, 145-146; Earl Irvin West, *The Search for the Ancient Order: A History of the Restoration Movement, 1849-1906* vol. 1 (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1957), 18-31.

<sup>41</sup> Ben Brewster, *Torn Asunder: The Civil War and the 1906 Division of the Disciples* (Joplin, MO: College Press Publishing Company, 2006), 25.

<sup>42</sup> In general, Calvinism refers to a belief that, before God created the universe, he decided which people would follow him and believe in him. In other words, people have no choice in whether or not they will believe in God. Followers of Arminianism, in general, believe that people have a choice whether or not they will believe in God.

<sup>43</sup> Garrison and DeGroot, *The Disciples of Christ*, 115; Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 6.

faith. To him (and to his son), faith was a rational response to evidence.<sup>44</sup> The presbytery merely rebuked Campbell, but the damage was done. Soon after his 1808 hearing, he left the church, which later officially deposed him. A few months later, Campbell and his supporters wrote the document that would express the foundational statement of the Disciples of Christ. In 1809, they published Campbell's *Declaration and Address*. This document contained the statement that perfectly illustrated the Disciples' view of the Bible: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent." The Disciples eschewed the theologians of old and held firmly to the words of Scripture and nothing else. Campbell's work established a "society, formed for the sole purpose of promoting simple evangelical Christianity" and the Disciples' key tenets of Christian unity and biblical authority.<sup>45</sup>

Arriving in the United States at age twenty-one, the drive to be a successful minister consumed Alexander Campbell. He gave, "an hour every day to the study of Greek, an hour to Latin, half an hour to Hebrew," and followed that up with "two hours to memorizing ten verses of Scripture, reading them in the original language and studying the commentaries on them, and as much time as remained to the reading of church history."<sup>46</sup> The Campbell's opened a log church at Brush Run, Pennsylvania, in 1811. By 1815, they had affiliated with the Baptist church. The younger Campbell began publishing and editing *The Christian Baptist* in 1823. He continued editing this work

---

<sup>44</sup> Samuel S. Hill and Charles H. Lippy, eds., *Encyclopedia of Religion in the South*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2005), s.vv. "Alexander Campbell," "Thomas Campbell."

<sup>45</sup> Garrison and DeGroot, *Disciples of Christ*, 124-147; Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 6; James DeForest Murch, *Christians Only: A History of the Restoration Movement* (Cincinnati, OH: Standard Publishing, 1962), 39-41; West, *Search for the Ancient Order*, 46-49.

<sup>46</sup> Garrison and DeGroot, *Disciples of Christ*, 153.

until 1830. The circulation of this publication enhanced Campbell's reputation, spread his teaching, and earned him followers. Campbell disassociated himself from the Baptists in 1830 and began editing *The Millennial Harbinger*, which Disciples' leaders published until 1870. By 1830, both Alexander Campbell and Barton Stone had developed strong independent ministries based on Christian unity and biblical authority.<sup>47</sup>

Stone and Campbell realized they had much in common when they met for the first time in 1824. Each man made a priority of primitive Christianity, Christian freedom, and Christian unity. Both men held that opinions and inferences were not valid methods to interpret Scripture. In 1830, a "Campbell" church and a "Stone" church combined in Millersburg, Kentucky. In 1831 in Lexington, Kentucky, Barton Stone (representing the Stone movement) and "Raccoon" John Smith (representing the Campbell movement) officially agreed to merge the two churches.<sup>48</sup> Stone and Campbell both advocated primitive Christianity, which meant that they answered to the authority of Scripture alone and rejected all tradition and church history, modeling the church after the New Testament church of the first century. They believed that Christians should not separate into denominations, but that they should unite behind the person of Christ and the teachings of the Bible. They thought that each Christian had the ability to read, comprehend, and interpret Scripture on their own. In addition, they were both pacifists. The two leaders did not agree on everything, however. Stone was a Unitarian, while

---

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>48</sup> Brewster, *Torn Asunder*, 26; Kentucky preacher "Raccoon" John Smith got his nickname because the town he hailed from, Stockton's Valley, had raccoon-infested saltpeter caves.



Campbell was a Trinitarian.<sup>49</sup> Stone was a typical western revivalist preacher, speaking with emotion and emphasizing the Holy Spirit. Campbell was trained in Lockean and Realist philosophy, a rationalist who thought that common sense led one to understand the Bible.<sup>50</sup> Campbell best expressed the most essential belief of the Disciples of Christ when he wrote, “We take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of all Christian union and communion.”<sup>51</sup>

One can find most of the information and most of the primary sources in this essay in other works, such as the institutional histories. The unique part about this essay is in its organization and analysis, primarily the comparative element. Comparing the two denominations reveals an interesting dynamic about why each sect reacted the way they did to the Civil War. Secondly, most authors who discuss the religious groups do not make pacifism the central issue. Here, interactions with war are paramount. Other authors have researched the nineteenth-century history of the Quakers and Disciples of Christ, but have not interpreted it through the issue of pacifism. Another part of this essay that makes it original in its organization is that the Civil War is the period of focus. This essay is divided into three parts: How the Quakers and Disciples reacted to war before the Civil War, during the Civil War, and after the Civil War. The Civil War was a catalyst for change within the Quakers and the Disciples of Christ. Again, this is a perspective that is mentioned in some previous works, but it is not the primary focus of any previous work.

---

<sup>49</sup> Unitarians believe that there is one God manifested in one Person. God the Father, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are identical. Trinitarians believe that there is one God manifested in three distinct Persons. God the Father, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are separate but equal.

<sup>50</sup> Casey, *The Battle over Hermeneutics*, 107-109.

<sup>51</sup> Alexander Campbell, preface to the second edition of *The Christian System*, fourth ed. (1866; repr., New York: Arno Press & the New York Times, 1969), 12.

## CHAPTER II

### PACIFIST ORIGINS

Before the Civil War, the Quakers and Disciples of Christ had to deal with the issue of warfare. How they responded to war in the past influenced their reaction to the Civil War. The Quakers first confronted the war issue in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Shortly after their founding, early leaders developed the doctrine of peace that set the Quakers apart from most other Christian denominations. Their peace doctrine developed as Quakerism spread to the American colonies, and the early wars of the United States revealed the Quaker's strong commitment to pacifism. The Disciples of Christ, of course, were a considerably younger movement and first confronted war as an established church during the Mexican-American War in the 1840s. Disciples' reactions were mixed, although church leaders produced powerful arguments that they hoped would settle the issue. However, the incongruity of the Disciples' perspective on war revealed itself at the same time. Studying the origins of their pacifism reveals many of the issues that influenced how they maintained the position during the Civil War.

In 1651, English authorities imprisoned Quaker founder George Fox. They offered his release if he would become a soldier and fight for the Commonwealth against

the King. Fox replied that he “lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars” and that he “was come into the covenant of peace which before wars and strifes was.”<sup>1</sup> By 1660, Fox was convinced that all violence was against God’s will. With Quaker leaders, he issued “A Declaration from the Harmless & Innocent People of God” that made explicit their views on war and violence. The Quakers, branded as radicals, were constantly suspected of intrigue against the government.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of the missive was to clear up all accusations of Quaker “Plots, Insurrections, and Riotous Meetings” against the government. Fox and eleven others attested, “All bloody Principles & Practices we (as to our own particular) do utterly deny, with all outward wars & strife, & fightings with outward Weapons, for any end, or under any pretence whatsoever.” The document outlined Scriptural reasons for why the Quakers were against war. Among the arguments were Christ’s admonition to Peter to put away his sword; Christ’s cautionary statement that “He that taketh the Sword, shall perish with the Sword”; and that God’s ultimate plan for man called for peace.<sup>3</sup> Quaker scholar H. Larry Ingle thinks that the Quaker’s anti-war position was a calculated move, citing Fox’s sudden change of

---

<sup>1</sup> George Fox, *The Journal*, ed. Nigel Smith (1694; repr., London: Penguin Books, 1998), 54.

<sup>2</sup> H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 194-196.

<sup>3</sup> George Fox et al., *A Declaration from the Harmless & Innocent People of God, called Quakers, against all plotters and fighters in the world for the removing of the ground of jealousy and suspicion from both magistrates and people in the kingdom concerning wars and fightings, and also something in answer to that clause of the King’s late proclamation, which mentions the Quakers, to clear them from the Plot and Fighting, which therein is mentioned, and for the clearing of their innocence* (London: unknown, 1660), 8, 2, 3 in Early English Books, [http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full\\_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=12131663&FILE=../session/1361302629\\_7698&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var\\_spell.cfg&ECCO=undefined&DISPLAY=AUTHOR&HIGHLIGHT\\_KEYWORD=default](http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=12131663&FILE=../session/1361302629_7698&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&ECCO=undefined&DISPLAY=AUTHOR&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=default) (accessed February 19, 2013)

position and the political realities of the time.<sup>4</sup> What better way to dissuade critics who charge you with plotting to overthrow the government than to proclaim that you were against violence? Fox realized that the Quakers would now have to cement pacifism as a doctrine. Fox himself was committed to non-violence but had not mandated it to his followers. But he had little difficulty finding a biblical basis for pacifism, and within a decade Quakers had a reputation as a peace church. Robert Barclay's careful examination of Quaker doctrine offered both a Scriptural and humanitarian argument for pacifism. Along with William Penn, Barclay ensured that pacifism would remain a cornerstone of Quaker doctrine.<sup>5</sup>

The Quakers carried their peace principles across the Atlantic. During the Revolutionary War, the majority of Quakers were Loyalist pacifists. They did not support the revolutionaries, but neither did they oppose them. Revolutionary War-era Quakers strove to remain neutral, though their sympathies lay with the incumbent British government. Many were fined for their refusal to fight or assist in wartime activities. Very few were physically harmed, though some were imprisoned for short periods. Local meetings promptly disowned those who took up arms for one side or the other, as well as those who gained economically from the war. The latter offered wagons, beasts, or ships to the military in exchange for money. In some cases, the Loyalist tendencies of the Quakers were overt, and their local communities jeered and chastised them. Only in rare

---

<sup>4</sup> Fox had no problem meddling in politics. He sought to influence Cromwell, and his followers exercised influence on political officials, including army officers. Some early Quakers recruited for the army and served in the army, and Fox did nothing to dissuade them (Ingle, *First Among Friends*, 120-121, 173). Thomas Hamm disagrees with Ingle, proposing that Fox had seen Christianity as a religion of peace long before 1660 (Hamm, *The Quakers in America*, 25).

<sup>5</sup>Peter Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony, 1660-1914* (New York: Syracuse University Press, Inc., 1990), 25, 29-31.

instances, however, was physical violence involved. While a few Quakers fought in the American Army during the Revolutionary War, most refrained from any involvement. Many harbored Loyalist feelings, and their pacifism put them under suspicion.<sup>6</sup>

At the Constitutional Convention, James Madison proposed an addition to the Bill of Rights that would exempt religious conscientious objectors from military service. It failed to pass. Because the United States relied primarily on state militia, national lawmakers left legislation dealing with conscientious objectors to the states. Congress proposed a national conscription act in 1814, during the War of 1812, but it was eventually defeated.<sup>7</sup> After the War of 1812, in which Quakers largely maintained their peace testimony, several states passed exemption acts for conscientious objectors. Generally, these exemption acts required a monetary fee in exchange for military service. The government used that money to hire a substitute or to support the military in some other way. During this period, the Quakers continued to disown those who participated in martial activities.

The Mexican War from 1846-1848 did not test Quaker pacifism because the majority of volunteers came from Texas and other Southwestern states. Due to the eagerness of volunteers, no conscription legislation was proposed.<sup>8</sup> The Quakers had yet to establish a significant presence in the Southwest, but this did not stop the Friends'

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 146-153; Edwin S. Gaustad and Leigh E. Schmidt, *The Religious History of America*, rev. ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 2004), 89.

<sup>7</sup> Jack Franklin Leach, *Conscription in the United States: Historical Background* (Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle Publishing Company, 1952), 116.

<sup>8</sup> Lillian Schlissel, ed., *Conscience in America: A Documentary History of Conscientious Objection in America, 1757-1967* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1968), 57-58; Otis A. Singletary, *The Mexican War* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), 26; Leach, *Conscription in the United States*, 127.

periodicals from condemning the war and promoting peace. The *Friends' Review* published news of the war, often lamenting the breaking of an armistice or encouraging the two sides to make peace. The same publication offered a synopsis of an American Peace Society tract that warned of the physical and moral afflictions that war occasioned.<sup>9</sup> New England Quakers encouraged their members to remain true to the Society's peace doctrine and condemned the war as an attempt to expand slavery.<sup>10</sup> Until the Civil War, the Quakers maintained their reputation as a peace church, and disowned members if they compromised. The *Friends' Intelligencer* summed up the Quaker's antebellum stance on war in 1859: "The Society of Friends believe that all wars and fightings, whether offensive or defensive, are contrary to the peaceable spirit of Christ, and therefore not lawful for Christians."<sup>11</sup>

Although Barton Stone and Alexander Campbell were both pacifists, the reasons for their pacifism varied. Subsequently, other Disciples' leaders subscribed to one of the founders' positions on war. Stone believed that Christians should not be involved in any area of government. Disciples' preachers Tolbert Fanning and David Lipscomb fell in line with this view.<sup>12</sup> Campbell's postmillennialism led him to encourage Christian involvement in government to prepare the world for the second coming of Christ. Christians should seek peace to improve society. Disciples' publisher Isaac Errett and

---

<sup>9</sup> "The Contest With Mexico," *Friends' Review* 1 no. 3 (October 9, 1847), 42; "The Mexican War," *Friends' Review* 1 no. 7 (November 6, 1847), 104-105; "The Peace Manual," *Friends' Review* 1 no. 9 (November 20, 1847), 136.

<sup>10</sup> *New England Yearly Meeting Minutes, 1847*, 23-24.

<sup>11</sup> *Friends' Intelligencer* 15 no. 45 (January 22, 1859), 709.

<sup>12</sup> Tolbert Fanning, "May Not Christians Engage in a War Against Their Brethren or Others?" *Gospel Advocate* 7 no. 7 (July 1861), 218-219.

teacher, soldier, and future president of the United States James Garfield followed Campbell's pacifism. Leaders in Stone's tradition were firmer in their stance when war came, while leaders in Campbell's tradition were prone to siding with the Union during the Civil War.<sup>13</sup>

Barton Stone was born in 1772, and he grew up in Revolutionary War era Maryland. His home was often within earshot of exchanges of cannon fire. When Stone's neighbors returned from war, they exhibited unsavory habits such as drunkenness, profanity, brawling, and gambling. Stone recalled that they soon influenced the whole society to fall into vice. This led him to conclude in his autobiography, "Such are universally the effects of war, than which a greater evil cannot assail and afflict a nation."<sup>14</sup> In 1827, Stone noted in his *Christian Messenger* that war, along with slavery, was one of the "greatest evils in the world."<sup>15</sup> Richard T. Hughes considers Stone's theology to be "apocalyptic." This does not refer to a specific viewpoint on the millennium or the second coming of Christ, but that, from Stone's perspective, only the creator has the right to control that which he has created. This meant that, because God created the world, he alone had the right to rule. Any human government was illegitimate. For this reason, Stone and his followers did not involve themselves in civil government (aside from paying taxes and submitting to civil laws, both commanded in Scripture). In the ideal world, there would be no human government and no human law,

---

<sup>13</sup> Howes, "A House Divided", 6.

<sup>14</sup> Barton W. Stone and John Rogers, *The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone* (1847; repr.; New York: Arno Press, 1972), 3.

<sup>15</sup> Barton W. Stone, "Queries Proposed for Investigation by a Worthy Brother," *Christian Messenger* 2 no. 2 (December 1827), 36.

and thus no war.<sup>16</sup> “If genuine christianity were to overspread the earth, wars would cease,” Stone decided, “and the world would be bound together in the bonds of peace. This is Christ’s kingdom—the kingdom of peace.” Stone’s last and most forceful words on war came in 1844, only months before his death. They were an ominous warning to a nation that would invade Mexico in 1846: “A nation professing christianity, yet teaching, learning and practicing the arts of war cannot be of the kingdom of Christ.”<sup>17</sup> He went so far as to consider such a nation an ally of Satan that was doomed to the same eternally painful fate.

Publishing from Northern Virginia, Alexander Campbell explained his pacifism through his newspaper writings. In 1828, he referred proponents of war to a peace tract.<sup>18</sup> Although he discussed war briefly in the *Christian Baptist*, he really expressed his views in a piece in the *Millennial Harbinger* in 1834. He published an article by another author (whose opinion Campbell emphatically agreed with) that made the answer simple and clear: “War ought to be abolished, because Christianity forbids it.”<sup>19</sup> When his readers clamored for his perspective during the Mexican-American War in 1846, Campbell quoted Jesus’ words from John 18:36: “My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would have been fighting, that I might not be delivered over to the Jews. But my kingdom is not from the world.” Campbell noted, “My kingdom

---

<sup>16</sup> Richard T. Hughes, “The Apocalyptic Outlook of Barton W. Stone,” in *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996), 92-116.

<sup>17</sup> Barton W. Stone, “Lecture on Matt. V. VI. And VII. Chapters,” *Christian Messenger* 14 no. 3 (July 1844), 65.

<sup>18</sup> Alexander Campbell, “New Publication,” *The Christian Baptist* 6 (Monday, August 4, 1828), 143.

<sup>19</sup> R.M.C., “Duties of Laboring Assiduously and Praying Unceasingly for the Abolition of War,” *Millennial Harbinger* 5 no. 7 (July 1834), 306.



being not of this world, my servants cannot fight for me, not even in a defensive war. This passage, from such a person on such an occasion, methinks ought to settle the question forever.”<sup>20</sup> Though ministers would often carry a weapon for self-defense when they traveled, Campbell took none. His biographer Robert Richardson attributed this to Campbell’s “feelings of regard for man” and his “undoubting trust in the protection of Providence.” Campbell’s explanation was more pragmatic. He stated, “It is the carrying of arms that creates the idea of the possession of money and invites attack, but the being without arms has the directly contrary effect, and I am persuaded that many persons lose their lives simply from carrying arms.”<sup>21</sup>

The Mexican-American War from 1846-1848 demanded that the leaders of Disciples of Christ take a stand on war. Some Disciples, especially those in the Southwest, did go to war.<sup>22</sup> Barton Stone died in 1844, but his acolyte Tolbert Fanning expressed his pacific views. Fanning’s arguments laid the foundation for the pacifist case during the Civil War.<sup>23</sup> Disciples’ evangelist Walter Scott preached against the war. Curiously, Alexander Campbell delivered his most clear and vigorous statement on war, titled “An Address on War,” in 1848, after the war in Mexico had ended in American victory. This illustrated Campbell’s aversion to war. During the war, he rarely said a

---

<sup>20</sup> Holy Bible, English Standard Version; Alexander Campbell, “War—No. 1,” *Millennial Harbinger* 3 No. 11 (November 1846), 640.

<sup>21</sup> Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Embracing a View of the Origin, Progress and Principles of the Religious Reformation which He Advocated* (Cincinnati: R.W. Carroll & Co., Publishers, 1872), 661, 663.

<sup>22</sup> Colby D. Hall, *Texas Disciples* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1953), 64.

<sup>23</sup> David Edwin Harrell, Jr., “Disciples of Christ Pacifism in Nineteenth-Century Tennessee,” in *The Stone-Campbell Movement: An International Religious Tradition*, eds. Michael W. Casey and Douglas A. Foster (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2002), 455-465.

word and did not publish any reports in his *Millennial Harbinger* about the conflict. He was concerned with other things, and thought all Christians should have the same reaction. It was as if his readers pressured him into laying out his opinion.

In the article, he noted the great cost in citizens and treasure that wars inflicted on a nation. In typical fashion, he painstakingly analyzed the language of his central question: “Has one Christian nation a right to wage war against another Christian nation?”<sup>24</sup> Admitting that an actual Christian nation “is not found in any country under the whole heavens,” and that only God could give a nation the “right” to wage war, Campbell eventually reduced the matter to this: “Can an individual, not a public functionary, morally do that in obedience to his government which he cannot do in his own cause?”<sup>25</sup> As he was wont to do, he cited numerous biblical passages professing peace and argued against the few that some claimed permitted war. To prove his point further, he referenced a tract from the Peace Society of Massachusetts. This group found that, out of 286 wars fought by “Christian nations,” not one of them was fought solely for reasons of defense.<sup>26</sup> No war was just or right. All wars were aggressive in nature.

In addition, Campbell noted, the soldiers engaged in conflict have no grievance towards the men they are fighting. “Politicians, merchants, knaves, and princes” create wars to get what they want, so, “The soldiers on either side have no enmity against the soldiers on the other side, because with them they have no quarrel.”<sup>27</sup> The death,

---

<sup>24</sup> Alexander Campbell, “An Address on War,” *Millennial Harbinger* 5 No. 7 (July 1848), 364.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 365, 371.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 377.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 377, 378.

destruction, and desolation of war should cause the Christian to avoid it at all costs. Like Stone, Campbell considered the moral degradation of society to be the worst result of war because it affected not only the soldiers but also the women and children to whom they returned. He proposed a solution for war. Because war arose over international disputes, nations should establish a “High Court of Nations for adjudicating and terminating all international misunderstandings and complaints, redressing and remedying all wrongs and grievances.”<sup>28</sup> He was not alone in this sentiment. Another Christian periodical advocated the use of third parties to solve international disputes.<sup>29</sup> Campbell regretted that he had not written this piece on war two or three years earlier, lest he could have saved the lives of “some hot-brained youths.”<sup>30</sup> War was wrong for the Christian because it corrupted society and made a mockery of Christian virtues.<sup>31</sup>

Before the Civil War, most Disciples were moderately pro-slavery.<sup>32</sup> This makes sense considering the Disciples of Christ were most populous in the Border States. The Disciples never came to a consensus on the slavery issue. Some were abolitionists, others were slave owners and defenders of the “peculiar institution,” and others were moderates on both sides. Northern Disciples, such as James A. Garfield and Isaac Errett, were anti-

---

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 382-383.

<sup>29</sup> D. Millard, “War—National Evils—The Christian’s Duty,” *Christian Messenger* 14 no. 11 (March 1845), 327. This article was originally published in the *Christian Palladium*, a publication of the Christian Connexion. The Christian Connexion was part of the Restoration Movement in the Northeastern area of the country.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 385.

<sup>31</sup> Campbell expressed these views again in 1850: Campbell, “War and Christianity Antipodal,” *Millennial Harbinger* 7 No. 9 (September 1850), 523-524.

<sup>32</sup> Henry E. Webb, *In Search of Christian Unity: A History of the Restoration Movement*, rev. ed. (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2003), 194.

slavery, and others were abolitionists. The works of abolitionists Pardee Butler and John G. Fee were nationally known. Fee was a radical who taught that Christians should not even fraternize with slave owners.<sup>33</sup> Thomas Campbell found a difference between biblical slavery (which he approved of) and American slavery (which he denounced).<sup>34</sup> Alexander Campbell was moderate, writing in 1851, “Neither slavery, as practiced at the South, nor abolitionism, as understood and practiced at the North, will ever find an advocate in me.” He affirmed the rule of law at the time, which allowed slavery, while acknowledging that those who desired to do so could attempt to change those laws.<sup>35</sup> His goal, as usual, was Christian union, which required national union. In the wake of the Methodist split over slavery Campbell wrote, “Every man who loves the American Union, as well as every man who desires a constitutional end of American slavery, is bound to prevent, as far as possible, any breach of communion between Christians at the South and at the North.”<sup>36</sup> Some Disciples favored emancipation. Barton W. Stone was convinced that slavery was wrong but that freedmen in America would “open the flood gates of incalculable evils both to the emancipated and the emancipators.”<sup>37</sup> Therefore, he favored colonization and encouraged others do so. Campbell and Stone both owned

---

<sup>33</sup> Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 130; John G. Fee, *Non-Fellowship with Slaveholders: The Duty of Christians* (New York: John A. Gray, 1855), 3ff.

<sup>34</sup> Thomas Campbell, “Elder Thomas Campbell’s Views of Slavery,” *Millennial Harbinger* 2 no. 1 (January 1845), 3-8.

<sup>35</sup> Alexander Campbell, “The Design of Civil Government and the Extent of Its Authority,” *Millennial Harbinger* 1 no. 8 (August 1851), 460; Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. III,” *Millennial Harbinger* 2 no. 3 (March 1845), 108-109.

<sup>36</sup> Alexander Campbell, “Our Position to American Slavery—No. V,” *Millennial Harbinger* 2 no. 5 (May 1845), 195.

<sup>37</sup> Barton W. Stone, “Queries Proposed for Investigation by a Worthy Brother,” *Christian Messenger* 2 no. 2 (December 1827), 37.

slaves at one point, but both gradually emancipated them.<sup>38</sup> Walter Scott saw slavery as a political problem that originated with government and should end with government. He thought that the church should stay out of the debate, but he published articles in favor of immediate emancipation.<sup>39</sup>

James Shannon was the president of the Disciples' Bacon College at Harrodsburg, Kentucky (later affiliated with the University of Kentucky). He became the second president of the University of Missouri in 1850 and served until 1856. Unabashedly pro-slavery, he supported Missouri's border ruffians going into Kansas, using vitriolic language in his addresses. Shannon also supported the Mexican War, seeing it as an excellent opportunity to expand the institution of slavery. He defended slavery as a divinely sanctioned right.<sup>40</sup> In 1855, he prophesied that, "The repeated invasion of the Constitutional rights of slaveholders by the foul demon of anti-slavery fanaticism, if not speedily arrested, will, at no distant day, force a dissolution of the Union."<sup>41</sup> It is likely that many Southerners, including Southern Disciples, held similar views to Shannon. Disciples' evangelist John Allen Gano, preacher T.M. Allen, and others owned slaves.<sup>42</sup> Interestingly, there were black and white Disciples congregations in Nashville, and some

---

<sup>38</sup> A.T. DeGroot, *Disciple Thought: A History* (Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University, 1965), 161.

<sup>39</sup> Walter Scott, "Reply," *The Evangelist* 4 no. 4 (April 6, 1835), 81-82; Liberator, "Liberator," *The Evangelist* 4 no. 8 (August 3, 1835), 174.

<sup>40</sup> James Shannon, *The Philosophy of Slavery, As Identified with the Philosophy of Human Happiness* (Frankfort, KY: A.G. Hodges & Co., 1849), 3ff; Earl Irvin West, *Trials of the Ancient Order, 1844-1865* (Germantown, TN: Religious Book Service, 1993), 302-304; Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 142; Parker Pillsbury, *The Church as It Is, Or, the Forlorn Hope of Slavery* (Boston: A. Forbes, 1847), 60.

<sup>41</sup> James Shannon, *An Address Delivered before the Pro-Slavery Convention of the State of Missouri on Domestic Slavery* (St. Louis: Printed at the Republican Book and Job Office, 1855), 7.

<sup>42</sup> Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 130; West, *Trials of the Ancient Order*, 325.

of the black members attended the white church. The congregation of the black church counted nearly as many members as the white church.<sup>43</sup> After the Civil War, some Southern Disciples begrudgingly accepted the emancipation of the nearly four million freedmen. One Tennessee preacher wrote, “Whether right or wrong, the yoke was broken and those people are free... On the other hand, that a great cloud and burden of evil was lifted from the owners of them and from the government that had made it legal to carry on such bondage, very many believe.”<sup>44</sup>

One fascinating encounter illustrated the Disciples’ difference of opinion on slavery. In 1846, the co-editor of the *Millennial Harbinger*, W.K. Pendleton, shared a voyage across the Atlantic with the fiery abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, who did not make a good impression on Pendleton. Garrison came across as sulking, angry, and radical. Pendleton denounced Garrison as an atheist whose abolitionist principles, though for a noble cause, came from the wrong place. Pendleton noted, “The very elements of his nature are gall and wormwood” and referred to him as a wicked bigot, concluding that he was “an enemy to the church, an enemy to religion, and an unwitting enemy to the cause of human emancipation.”<sup>45</sup>

Quakers had been associated with the abolition of slavery since the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. John Woolman and Anthony Benezet traveled throughout the young nation in the eighteenth century, warning local meetings of the hypocrisy of slavery. Their influence led to a surge of anti-slavery and abolitionist views

---

<sup>43</sup> Philip Fall, “Letter from Elder Philip Fall,” *Millennial Harbinger* 4 no. 9 (September 1861), 530.

<sup>44</sup> E.G. Sewell, “Reminiscences of Civil War Times,” *Gospel Advocate* 49 no. 27 (July 4, 1907), 424.

<sup>45</sup> W.K. Pendleton, “Our Voyage,” *Millennial Harbinger* 3 no. 12 (December 1846), 684-685; W.K. Pendleton, “William Lloyd Garrison,” *Millennial Harbinger* 4 no. 2 (February 1847), 111-112.

among the Friends. By the 1790s, many Quaker Meetings, even in the South, made it a disownable offense to own slaves.<sup>46</sup> The Books of Discipline for various meetings clearly stated the disgust the Friends held for slavery. They were discouraged from owning, buying, or selling slaves, acting as executors of estates where slaves were involved, or promoting slavery in any way. A violation of any of the points of Discipline could result in the Yearly Meeting disowning the offender.<sup>47</sup> Often, they intertwined the doctrines of pacifism and abolition. “War sustains slavery,” declared the female Friends of Philadelphia in 1860.<sup>48</sup> Cyrus Pringle referred to slavery and war as “twin relics of barbarism” and New York Quakers hyperbolically declared, “The Church which sanctions or apologizes for Slavery and War, or which neglects or refuses to take the side of the oppressed and down-trodden, is controlled by the spirit of practical infidelity and atheism.”<sup>49</sup> Throughout the antebellum period, many Southern Quakers moved northwest to Indiana, Illinois, or Kentucky to avoid slavery. This migration increased during the Civil War. The Quakers who stayed in the South were mostly found in North Carolina, Virginia, or East Tennessee.

Quakers had a reputation for being abolitionists, but those in Northern Virginia had not made much of an impact by 1860. Other abolitionists accused the Quakers of not

---

<sup>46</sup> Stephen B. Weeks, *Southern Quakers and Slavery* (1896; repr., New York: Bergman Publishers, 1968), 213.

<sup>47</sup> Indiana Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of the Society of Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting* (Cincinnati: A. Pugh, 1854), 89-91. Each yearly meeting published Books of Discipline every year. They contained statements of the theological beliefs of the Society of Friends, key documents, and guides for living. At each meeting, the books were used as guides to hold each Quaker accountable to their beliefs.

<sup>48</sup> *Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Women Friends Minutes*, 1860, 11.

<sup>49</sup> Cyrus Pringle, *The Civil War Diary of Cyrus Pringle* (Lebanon, PA: Sowers Printing Company, 1962), 26; Thomas McClintock and Rhoda DeGarmo, “Meeting at Waterloo,” *The North Star* 2 no. 27 (June 29, 1849), 3.

being radical enough because they chose to elect slave owners to public office. As the debate over slavery increased, it became more difficult for the Quakers to remain both antislavery and pacifist. The Quakers were very limited in the assistance they could provide to African Americans. They promoted free labor, agricultural improvement, economic development, and education, but radical abolitionism often meant arming slaves and using force to free them, in the tradition of Nat Turner or John Brown. The Quaker ideal of pacifism prohibited this. Some Quaker groups desired the radical route, but most admonished one another to stay out of political arena entirely.<sup>50</sup> The Quaker publication *The Non-Slaveholder* openly encouraged and praised those who helped fugitive slaves escape to freedom. The same periodical eagerly reported on foreign attempts to reduce slavery and war.<sup>51</sup>

While most Quakers promoted abolition, only a minority approved of immediate abolition. Quaker abolitionists tried to make pacifism synonymous with their anti-government position. They were extreme, believing that the Quakers should not be involved with a government that condoned slavery. Quaker leaders tried to quell this abolitionist sentiment. However, many pacifist Quakers defied civil law by assisting escaped slaves. Levi Coffin and his family were instrumental in the creation and operation of the Underground Railroad. Anti-slavery and abolition societies began to encourage resistance to the state by ignoring the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. The Quaker

---

<sup>50</sup> Glenn A. Crothers, *Living in the Lion's Mouth: The Society of Friends in Northern Virginia, 1730-1865* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012), 206. Virginia Quakers were often stuck between their religious discipline and local government. Quakers in Virginia belonged to the Yearly Meeting of Baltimore, which prompted its members to educate free blacks. However, under Virginia law, this was illegal ("A Difficult Case," *The North Star* 1 no. 20 (May 12, 1848), 3.

<sup>51</sup> Samuel Rhoads, "The Arrest of William L. Chaplin," *The Non-Slaveholder* 5 no. 9 (September 1850), 202-205; "Settlement of Colored People in Michigan," *The Non-Slaveholder* 5 no. 10 (October 1850), 228; "Peace Congress at Frankfurt," *The Non-Slaveholder* 5 no. 10 (October 1850), 229.



abolitionists had to reconcile their abolitionism with their pacifism. Quakers who were not abolitionists had to plead with people that the anti-slavery position did not have to be violent. On the eve of the Civil War, many abolitionist Quakers realized that they could no longer be pacifists. Some even supported John Brown's violence. Two of Brown's Harper's Ferry cohorts were brothers who were raised in the Quaker faith, but abandoned both it and pacifism.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Ryan P. Jordan, *Slavery and the Meetinghouse: The Quakers and the Abolitionist Dilemma, 1820-1865* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2007), 128-129.

## CHAPTER III

### CIVIL WAR REACTIONS

By 1860, the Quakers and Disciples of Christ had established a doctrine of pacifism. This ideal was widely held among the Quakers and less so among the Disciples, though many of the influential Disciples' leaders promoted it. A local and sectional war would test that doctrine more than any other war in American history. Had the war been a short one, as many contemporaries believed, it is likely that it would have had little effect on these two churches. This was a fantasy, and the longer the war lasted, the more discordant it became. The issues at the center of the conflict, first the right of secession from the United States and whether or not the Constitution allowed it, then the brutal practice of slavery, struck at the core of most Americans, making involvement in the war difficult to resist. For the most part, the Quakers withstood the trial with their peace principles intact. The pacifism of the Disciples of Christ, on the other hand, largely collapsed. By 1863, many Disciples had chosen a side and left peace behind. Conscription presented a battle of its own for both sides, but especially the Quakers who wished to avoid military service. Others volunteered willingly. There were Quakers and Disciples who kept their peaceful scruples. Some of these men endured great difficulty

because of it. Pacifists aside, the more popular trend among churches was to support the war, in favor of one side or the other.

To understand the uniqueness of religious pacifism during the Civil War, it is helpful to understand how the major Christian churches responded to the sectional crisis. C.C. Goen argued that the antebellum severing of the three largest churches in the United States foreshadowed the national schism. Evangelical Christianity was a national unifying force. The three largest denominations in the country—Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian—performed an important role in American society in the nineteenth century. Slavery slowly divided the churches as well as the nation, and the churches shattered over the issue in the decades leading up to the Civil War. The failure of church leadership to react rationally to the slavery issue led to division. Goen concluded that the ecclesiastical breach “established a precedent of sectional independence” and “exacerbated the moral outrage that each section felt against the other.”<sup>1</sup>

Gary Wills wrote, “The Civil War was a religious war before it was a military war” because the nation’s largest churches split over slavery before the geographic sections did.<sup>2</sup> David Brion Davis agreed, saying, “Even for more moderate churches, slavery played a central part in the national division of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist churches, institutions that had served as the main cultural bridges between North and South.”<sup>3</sup> The Presbyterians split in 1837 and 1838 between the New School and the Old School. The New School accepted “comparatively liberal” New Haven Theology.

---

<sup>1</sup> C.C. Goen, *Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the American Civil War* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 12-13.

<sup>2</sup> Gary Wills, *Head and Heart: America’s Christianities* (New York: Penguin Press, 2007), 303.

<sup>3</sup> David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 264.

The Old School was prevalent in the South and remained staunchly Calvinist. Those in the New School were condemned as abolitionists.<sup>4</sup>

The Methodist Church was the largest church in the South. It broke apart in 1844. Bishop James Osgood Andrew of Georgia owned slaves that he had acquired through marriage after his election to the episcopacy. Because of this, Northern Methodists pressured him to step down. Southern Methodists defended him, saying he had the right to own slaves. The General Assembly of 1844 voted (110 to 69) to depose Andrew, prompting the Southern Methodists to separate and form the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (MECS).<sup>5</sup>

The Baptist Church separated in 1845. At the time, each Baptist church was independent. There was no umbrella of authority. The churches had previously formed two mission societies, the Foreign Mission Board and the Home Mission Society, which were the only uniting bodies of the Baptist Church. In the early 1840s, each board agreed to take a neutral stance on slavery. However, in 1844, the Georgia Baptists nominated a slaveholder to be a missionary to the Indians. When the Home Mission Society refused to accept him, Southerners tried to make sure a similar fate would not happen to someone nominated for the Foreign Mission Board. When they were denied that request, the Georgia Baptists separated and formed the Southern Baptist Convention in 1845.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Wills, *Head and Heart*, 308; Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992), 316.

<sup>5</sup> Wills, *Head and Heart*, 310; Noll, *A History of Christianity*, 316.

<sup>6</sup> Wills, *Head and Heart*, 310; Noll, *A History of Christianity*, 316.

In every above case, the Southern faction initiated the split. The mainline churches in the North, along with most other religious denominations, supported the Union cause in the war.<sup>7</sup> They split along with the nation, across sectional lines. With a ferocity many found shocking, churches of all beliefs vigorously promoted war. Mark Noll argues that the war spirit so consumed the churches that very little theological reflection went into their actions. There were no new directions in theology or doctrine produced during the war period.<sup>8</sup> The war was so divisive that it tore apart every part of American society. Almost everyone was preoccupied by war. Archbishop John Hughes of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City openly encouraged men to volunteer and fully supported the draft.<sup>9</sup> Northern clergymen, many of whom had long been of an anti-slavery or abolitionist sentiment, interpreted the war as God's judgment on the United States for slavery. Slavery was a horrible abomination against God, so Northern Christians were convinced He was on their side. An equally pervasive sentiment in the North was that secession violated the Constitution. Americans viewed the document that united the nation as sacred, so secession was also a sin.<sup>10</sup>

In the early days of the Civil War, it was easy for a religious pacifist, or anyone with conscientious scruples against war, to avoid it. One would simply not volunteer. This option was not available for long. In April 1862, the Confederacy instituted the first

---

<sup>7</sup> "The War and the Christianity of the Land," *The New York Times*, October 24, 1864, <http://www.nytimes.com/1864/10/24/news/the-war-and-the-christianity-of-the-land.html> (accessed March 25, 2013).

<sup>8</sup> Mark A. Noll, *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 16.

<sup>9</sup> *Harper's Weekly* 6 no. 296 (August 30, 1862), 547.

<sup>10</sup> Stout, *Upon the Altar of the Nation*, 54.

draft in American history. The First Conscription Act made all able-bodied white males between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five eligible for a three-year conscription. Exempt were various workers, as well as militia officers, civil servants, clergymen, apothecaries, and teachers. Substitutes were allowed. A second piece of legislation was passed in September 1862 that raised the upper age limit to forty-five. Only pacifists with the financial ability to pay for a substitute could avoid serving in the military. By 1863, a substitute was worth \$300 (\$6000 in Confederate currency).<sup>11</sup> Many Quakers could afford the exemption fee, but the Disciples of Christ were not one of the richer denominations. In 1860, though they had the eighth most churches and accommodations in the country, the value of their church property was only the twelfth highest. They had over 1000 more churches than the Quakers, but the Quakers, with fewer churches, had a higher total property value. Moreover, Southern Disciples and Southern Friends were not as well off as their Northern brethren.<sup>12</sup> It is likely that many could not afford a substitute if they wanted one. The Confederate draft forced Southern pacifists into the military, either by force or by prodding them to volunteer instead. The Confederate government so emphasized recruiting and volunteering for the army that many Friends emigrated north. Sometimes authorities arrested and returned those who tried to leave.

In December 1863, the Confederate government repealed the substitution clause, and two months later, they raised the upper age limit to fifty and reduced the lower age limit to seventeen. All who were currently in the army were required to remain in the

---

<sup>11</sup> McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire*, 202-203.

<sup>12</sup> *Statistics of the United States, (Including Mortality, Property, &c.,) in 1860; Compiled from the Original Returns and being the Final Exhibit of the Eighth Census, under the Direction of the Secretary of the Interior* (1866; repr., New York: Norman Ross Publishing Inc., 1990), 498.

army.<sup>13</sup> Southern Friends petitioned the Confederate government and state governments in an attempt to gain exemption from the draft. In North Carolina in 1864, Quakers asked that the Confederate Congress release all their members who had been drafted since 1862.<sup>14</sup> Virginia Friends made a particularly impassioned plea that drew on Christian history and Scripture for support. Included was a telling statement about the seriousness with which some Quakers viewed their peace testimony. They stated, “For we ourselves believe, that by taking up the weapons of carnal warfare, even in the defense of our dearest rights, or life itself, we would endanger the welfare of our immortal souls.”<sup>15</sup> Fighting in war presented more than a physical detriment to the Quakers, but a serious spiritual detriment. This helps explain the fortitude that the Friends displayed in the face of the draft and the war.

The United States held off national conscription only a year longer than the Confederacy. The federal government encouraged state conscription with the Militia Act of July 1862. Under this legislation, some states, such as New York, offered exemption to churches such as the Quakers.<sup>16</sup> The Enrollment Act, passed on March 3, 1863, made every able-bodied male citizen between the ages of twenty to forty-five eligible for the draft. There was no provision for occupational exceptions, but it allowed for substitution, or a draftee could pay a \$300 commutation fee. This fee applied only to the current draft,

---

<sup>13</sup> McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire*, 203.

<sup>14</sup> Religious Society of Friends of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *Memorial at a Meeting for Sufferings* (Greensboro, NC: Unknown, 1864), 1.

<sup>15</sup> Religious Society of Friends of the Virginia Half-Yearly Meeting, *Memorial to the Legislature of Virginia* (Richmond: G.W. Gary, 1863), 4.

<sup>16</sup> Fred Albert Shannon, *The Organization and Administration of the Union Army, 1861-1865* vol. 1 (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1928), 276-277, 285; A.B., “Exemption from Military Service,” *Friends’ Review* 15 no. 49 (August 9, 1862), 777.

not future drafts. In July 1864, the commutation provision was abolished except in the case of conscientious objectors. Draftees could still pay for substitutes, but prices went up after the latest act struck down commutation.<sup>17</sup> Brock found that most Quakers accepted the United States' February 1864 law that allowed religious objectors to perform hospital duty instead of military duty, even though this was still unacceptable according to the Quaker discipline.<sup>18</sup> As in the South, Disciples and Quakers who could not afford the commutation fee had little recourse other than to volunteer or answer the draft. Some Quakers had the financial ability to pay the commutation fee for their brethren, and this happened occasionally.

Many Quakers refused even to pay the commutation fee for a replacement. Secretary of State William Seward assured the Quakers that their fees would not go toward paying a substitute, but would go to hospital services or to help former slaves. Still the Quakers refused. When Seward asked why they refused to pay the fee, Quaker Ethan Foster wrote, "We told him we could see no difference between the responsibility of doing an act ourselves and that of hiring another to do it for us."<sup>19</sup> President Lincoln was worried that others would take advantage of his lenience with the Quakers and that the army would lose a significant number of fighting men. If he exempted one group from service, where would it stop? Lincoln did not want to force a true religious objector to fight, but he initially saw few alternatives. Lincoln sent the Quaker emissaries to Secretary of War Edwin Stanton and Secretary of State William Seward. After

---

<sup>17</sup> McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire*, 384-385.

<sup>18</sup> Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony*, 169.

<sup>19</sup> Ethan Foster, *The Conscript Quakers, Being a Narrative of the Distress and Relief of Four Young Men from the Draft for the War in 1863* (1883; repr., New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1972), 15.



discouraging meetings with them, Foster and his companion Charles Perry returned to Lincoln and restated their case. They left on good terms. A few weeks later, authorities granted parole to the men they represented. Lincoln was initially obstinate, but eventually gave the Quakers an order granting them parole until the army could recall them. As was intended, the men were never recalled. After pleading and discussing the matter with President Lincoln, Secretary of War Stanton, Secretary of State Seward, and multiple military officials, Foster and Perry succeeded in gaining the release of the four Quakers.<sup>20</sup> A minority faction among the Quakers approved of paying the commutation fee. They saw the fee as a tax. Quakers had never had an issue with paying taxes because Christ commanded it. Paying for a substitute was as simple as paying another tax. The money belonged to the government, so those taxed did not have the authority to refuse its requisition.<sup>21</sup> Because this position was contrary to Quaker tradition and discipline, its popularity was unlikely.

The periodicals and Yearly Meetings were the voices of traditional pacifism during the Civil War. Similar to Alexander Campbell, some Quakers advocated a system of courts or councils to adjudicate between warring nations. To them, war was simply murder on a larger scale. The crime of war should have consequences, but it could be abrogated if the nations involved could present their arguments to an impartial third party that would settle the matter.<sup>22</sup> Others focused on educating the next generation, so that

---

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 25-27.

<sup>21</sup> N.R., "Friends and Government Requisitions," *Friends' Intelligencer* 20 no. 16 (June 27, 1863), 245-246.

<sup>22</sup> D. Irish, "Peace," *Friends Intelligencer* 18 no. 46 (January 25, 1862), 725; D. Irish, "The Advocates of Peace Should Not be the Voluntary Abettors of War," *Friends' Intelligencer* 19 no. 51 (February 28, 1863), 807.

they would know the sect's traditional peace doctrine. If a Quaker did enlist, he was likely young. Friends' leaders saw this as a failure to educate the youth in the principles of peace.<sup>23</sup> Like the Disciples, the Quakers observed the financial and human cost of war and concluded that the practice benefited no one.<sup>24</sup> Through the end of the war, periodicals encouraged Quakers to maintain the traditional peace principles.<sup>25</sup> Unlike most of the Disciples' publications, the *Friends' Review* published regular updates and news on the war. The *Review* and the *Intelligencer* published news about Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation and the *Review* updated its readers on the Union draft policy.<sup>26</sup> Quaker discipline forbade them from being involved in war in any way, from enlisting to watching military parades to serving in military hospitals. The Western Yearly Meeting of 1861, composed of Quakers from Indiana and some from Ohio, encouraged its members to refrain from martial activity. They exhorted member to remember the "horrors and devastations, and the awful guilt" of war. All who attended the meeting testified that they were against serving in the military.<sup>27</sup> In 1864 and 1865, the same yearly meeting reported, "a few of our member have engaged in military service." Decisions in these cases were usually put off until after the war. The Society

---

<sup>23</sup> *Friends' Intelligencer* 18 no. 10 (May 18, 1861), 147; Gideon Frost, "War and Peace," *Friends' Intelligencer* 19 no. 41 (December 20, 1862), 644.

<sup>24</sup> "Items," *Friends' Intelligencer* 18 no. 22 (August 10, 1861), 351-352; "The Terrible Havoc of War," *Friends' Intelligencer* 18 no. 16 (June 29, 1861), 254-255.

<sup>25</sup> William Grover, "Some Remarks on the Religious Principles of the People Called Quakers, as to Wars and Fightings," *Friends' Intelligencer* 20 no. 48 (February 6, 1864), 756.

<sup>26</sup> "By the President of the United States of America: A Proclamation," *Friends' Intelligencer* 19 no. 30 (October 4, 1862), 478-479; "Extracts from the President's Message," *Friends' Review* 17 no. 16 (December 19, 1863), 251-254; "Drafting the Militia," *Friends' Review* 15 no. 50 (August 16, 1862), 792-793; "The Military Draft," *Friends' Review* 17 no. 48 (July 30, 1864), 760-761.

<sup>27</sup> *Western Yearly Meeting Minutes*, 1861, 6, 9-10.

restored most members, but disowned a few.<sup>28</sup> Nelson found that over a thousand Indiana Quakers enlisted, but the Society only disowned a small number.<sup>29</sup> The New England Yearly Meeting reported in 1861, 1862, and 1865 that most members were pacifists, aside from “several instances of a military nature” which were dealt with accordingly.<sup>30</sup> North Carolina Quakers submitted a similar report in 1861, and noted in 1864 that at least one of their members had hired a substitute.<sup>31</sup>

If this was a war to free the slaves, as it became after Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation in September 1862, Quakers had a serious dilemma. One Quaker wrote in 1863, “This war having been begun by slaveholders more firmly to secure themselves in their authority over slaves, we cannot be sorry to see that authority overthrown; yet it is done by a means that we, as Christians, cannot recommend or uphold.”<sup>32</sup> Another declared,

While I firmly believe that the present unhappy, and may I not say wicked war, which is desolating so much of our country, and making so many widows and orphans in our land, will ultimately result in the freedom of the African race, so long held in bonds, yet I cannot see the propriety of adopting the adage, “that the end will justify the means,” and be led to laud those by whose success in arms it may be accomplished.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *Western Yearly Meeting Minutes*, 1864, 11; *Ibid.*, 1865, 17.

<sup>29</sup> Nelson, *Indiana Quakers*, 20-21.

<sup>30</sup> *Minutes of the New England Yearly Meeting*, 1861, 19; *Ibid.*, 1862, 14-15; *Ibid.*, 1865, 15.

<sup>31</sup> *Minutes of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting*, 1861, 2-3; *Ibid.*, 1864, 3.

<sup>32</sup> Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony*, 167.

<sup>33</sup> John J. Cornell, “Thoughts on the Manner in Which Friends Ought to Carry Out Their Testimony against War,” *Friends’ Intelligencer* 20 no. 7 (April 25, 1863), 100.

This was not the conclusion of all Quakers, but certainly a majority agreed with these perspectives. Representatives from the Yearly Meetings of New York, New England, Ohio, Indiana, Western, and Baltimore met in Baltimore on December 7, 1863 for a conference. They released a joint statement that said in part,

We believe it right for us first to record our united sense and judgment that Friends continue to be solemnly bound unswervingly to maintain our ancient faith and belief that war is forbidden in the Gospel; and that as followers of the Prince of Peace we cannot contribute to its support or in any way participate in its spirit; that to render other service as an equivalent for, or in lieu of, requisitions for military purposes is a compromise of a vital principle which we feel consciously bound to support under all circumstances, and notwithstanding any trials to which we may be subjected.<sup>34</sup>

Quaker leadership, which consisted of appointed elders and influential members, encouraged the rest of the Friends to maintain the traditional pacifist principles.

Although Northern Quakers generally escaped suffering, there was a smattering of contrary cases. Cyrus Pringle, a Quaker from Vermont, was drafted on July 13, 1863. He was steadfast in upholding the Quaker ideal of pacifism, and he refused to pay for a substitute. Pringle explained,

We confess to a higher duty than that to country; and, asking no military protection of our Government and grateful for none, deny any obligation to support so unlawful a system, as we hold a war to be even when waged in opposition to an evil and oppressive power and ostensibly in defense of liberty, virtue, and free institutions; and, though touched by the kind interest of friends, we could not relieve their distress by a means we held even more sinful than that of serving ourselves, as by supplying money to

---

<sup>34</sup> Fernando G. Cartland, *Southern Heroes or The Friends in War Time* (1895; repr., New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1972), 131.

hire a substitute we would not only be responsible for the result, but be the agents in bringing others into evil.<sup>35</sup>

Pringle was twenty-five years old when he was drafted. Pringle and a fellow Quaker, Lindley M. Macomber, reported to camp. He compared his fellow draftees to “caged lions.” He lamented the shiftlessness of army life, but still more the murderous (in his view) nature of the soldiers’ craft: “Idle life blends with violent death-struggles till the man is unmade a man; and henceforth there is little of manhood about him.”<sup>36</sup> Authorities placed Pringle, Macomber, and fellow Vermont Quaker Peter Dakin in the guardhouse after they refused police duty. The Quaker conscripts endured much haranguing from the officers, who tried in vain to get them to serve. They refused an offer to transfer to hospital duty. Other Friends encouraged Pringle and Macomber to accept hospital duty. Still, the men stuck to their principles. Despite their refusal to train, the Quakers were shipped through Fortress Monroe and up the Potomac to a camp near Culpeper, Virginia. They refused to carry the weapons given to them, so the officers strapped the weapons to them and sent them on with the rest of their regiment. When the three Quakers declined to arrive at the inspection of arms, they were threatened, bound, and placed under guard. Their colonel told them that they could be killed if they did not comply, and implored them to accept work in the hospital. They tried hospital duty, but were under such conviction of wrong that after one day they refused any more. On one occasion, after he refused to clean his rifle, officers commanded Pringle to “lie down on my back, and stretching my limbs apart tied cords to my wrists and ankles and these to four stakes

---

<sup>35</sup> Pringle, *Civil War Diary*, 8.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

driven in the ground somewhat in the form of an X.” He remained in that position for two hours.<sup>37</sup>

Isaac Newton, the Commissioner of Agriculture, used his influence to gain the Quaker’s relief. Pringle, Macomber, and Dakin, along with two other Quakers, travelled to Washington and were encouraged to accept hospital duty. This time, however, they would only care for the sick. They would not release any patients for further active military duty. To this proposition, the five Quakers succumbed. They held great hope that Newton would soon affect their release back into civilian life. After nearly two weeks at the hospital, Pringle reported, “our situation is becoming intolerable.” After over two weeks more, Newton finally obtained the ear of President Lincoln. At once, Lincoln ordered Secretary of War Edwin Stanton to release all Quakers in the army. Pringle and his fellow Friends were finally free. On November 11, 1863, after nearly four months desiring his release, Cyrus Pringle began his journey home.<sup>38</sup> Although his story was atypical among Northern Quakers, it illustrates the fact that it was not easy for pacifists to escape the draft.

Many Southern Quakers moved northwest because of slavery, and could be found in Indiana, Illinois, or Kentucky during the Civil War. The Quakers who stayed in the South were mostly found in North Carolina, Virginia, or East Tennessee. There were far fewer Quakers in the South by 1860. Migration, splits (such as the Hicksites), and the difficulties of maintaining the Quaker’s high standards led to the decrease of a Friendly

---

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 31-32.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 38; Fred Albert Shannon, *The Organization and Administration of the Union Army, 1861-1865*, vol. 2 (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1928), 255-256.

presence south of Mason and Dixon's line. Other denominations, such as the Methodists, absorbed many of the Quakers who remained in the South.<sup>39</sup> A reputation as a pacifist was enough to bring suspicion on a Quaker. Neighbors often suspected pacifists to be Unionists, and many Quakers were both Union sympathizers and pacifists.

Confederate Quaker conscripts who refused to fight could be subject to severe discipline. Army officers disciplined one North Carolina Quaker by a process known as "bucking-down." Soldiers tied Gideon Macon's wrists and his arms were placed over his knees. A strong stick or pole was then placed above the arms and below the knees so that the man could not move. He was punished in this way for hours, yet he refused to carry a gun. The commanding general ordered him hanged, but before the execution could take place, the Union troops advanced and drove the Confederates from their position. Macon later endured verbal abuse, beatings, and imprisonment. After many months of this treatment, Macon was released when Lee surrendered at Appomattox.<sup>40</sup> Although emigration diminished the membership of many Friends' meetings, many men suffered at the hands of Southern officers. Some Quakers were suspended by their thumbs for hours in the snow, whipped with a hundred switches, hung by the neck (but not to death), deprived of sleep, food, and water, court-martialed, threatened with execution, beaten, cut four inches deep with bayonets, forced to enter battle with guns tied to them, and imprisoned. Some died in prison or in hospitals.<sup>41</sup> Another Quaker accepted a gun from the Confederates and, as soon as was expedient, surrendered his weapon to Federal

---

<sup>39</sup> Weeks, *Southern Quakers*, 291-293.

<sup>40</sup> Cartland, *Southern Heroes*, 186-188.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 205-213, 222, 224, 271, 318; Foster, *The Conscript Quakers*, 18.

authorities. Apparently, he served no prison time at Union hands and made his way to live peacefully in Indiana. Many Southern Quakers paid the exemption fee and were conscripted anyway. Many refused to do any military service, but some performed medical duties while being processed for release.<sup>42</sup> Cartland's work contains dozens of stories of the horrible injustices that Southern Quakers endured during the war. He embellishes. In 1862, Quakers in North Carolina and Tennessee reported that they were relatively unmolested by Confederate authorities. Some were drafted, but were treated well and easily obtained release on conscientious grounds. They sent many young men north to avoid conscription.<sup>43</sup>

Officially, the Quakers maintained their longstanding tradition of pacifism. However, many younger Quakers and those who were new to the sect did not feel strongly about pacifist teaching. Patriotism and a sense of adventure, along with a desire to end slavery motivated Northern Quakers who fought in the Union Army. Some just wanted a paycheck. Jacquelyn Nelson found that 21 percent of Quakers in Indiana enlisted for military service, a number far higher than any other scholars thought.<sup>44</sup> The *New York Times* reported in 1862 that "a respectable number" of Quakers had enlisted. One young captain in the Seventh Maine was disowned by his local meeting when he

---

<sup>42</sup> Cartland, *Southern Heroes*, 225, 227.

<sup>43</sup> "Friends in North Carolina," *Friends' Review* 15 no. 40 (June 7, 1862), 633-634; "Friends in North Carolina and Tennessee," *Friends' Review* 15 no. 44 (July 5, 1862), 696; "Friends in East Tennessee," *Friends' Review* 17 no. 37 (May 14, 1864), 584; "News from Washington," *New York Times* (September 30, 1862), 5.

<sup>44</sup> Nelson, *Indiana Quakers*, 20-21. Nelson's data on Indiana suggests that a much higher number of Quakers went to war than was previously thought. However, more state studies like Nelson's are needed to confirm this idea.



enlisted.<sup>45</sup> Two Quaker brothers from Milton, New York, fought at Gettysburg. One died there. The other, John Ketcham, was made a prisoner of war and died of disease in Libby Prison, Richmond, in October 1863. The author of their story indicated that he went to war for the cause of peace.<sup>46</sup> Charles Smedley was a young Quaker from Pennsylvania who joined the 90<sup>th</sup> Pennsylvania Volunteers in the spring of 1862 at twenty-five years old. Smedley determined that it was the duty of every able man to join the army and defeat the rebellious Confederacy. As a Quaker, he realized that war was prohibited, but he was convinced that “at present I owe a higher duty to my country.”<sup>47</sup> Young Smedley had the option to announce himself as a conscientious objector and perform hospital duty, but he chose combat. He fought at Second Bull Run, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, the Wilderness, and other battles. Wounded twice at Gettysburg, Smedley earned a promotion to corporal. He was captured twice, paroled the first time but sent to the infamous Confederate prison at Andersonville the second time. He died in prison at Florence, South Carolina in November 1864.<sup>48</sup> There are examples, such as these, of Quakers joining the military, but they are few.

While scholars are confident that only a minority of Quakers eligible for military service actually served, there is equal confidence that a majority of eligible Disciples of

---

<sup>45</sup> “A Warlike Quaker,” *The New York Times*, October 15, 1862.

<http://www.nytimes.com/1862/10/15/news/a-warlike-quaker.html> (accessed March 25, 2013); “Arrival and Departure of the Seventh Regiment of Maine,” *The New York Times*, August 25, 1861.

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/91624759/13D896EB6174DDDF200/1?accountid=4117> (accessed March 25, 2013).

<sup>46</sup> A.J.H. Duganne, *The Fighting Quakers, A True Story of the War for Our Union* (New York: J.P. Robens, 1866), 93, 113.

<sup>47</sup> Charles Smedley, *A Pennsylvania Quaker in Andersonville: The Diary of Charles Smedley* (1865; repr., Glenside, PA: J. Michael Santarelli Publishing, 1995), 11.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, x, 60.

Christ served in one army or the other. With 200,000 to 350,000 members by 1860, the Disciples were “the largest group of prominent leaders in any movement or denomination outside of the traditional peace churches who professed a message of nonviolence during the Civil War.”<sup>49</sup> The reason the Disciples were not, and cannot be, classified as a peace church is because they experienced no unanimity on the war issue. They first dealt with the war issue during the Mexican War, and some Disciples opposed it and all other wars, while others fully supported it (along with most other churches). The Disciples were most numerous in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri.<sup>50</sup> In the years leading up to the Civil War, Alexander Campbell and the Disciples of Christ were determined to remain united. Campbell wrote in January of 1861 that, despite the sectional schism, “Nothing shall sever us as the followers of Christ. We have pledged ourselves to Union.”<sup>51</sup> Notice that Campbell did not say that the Disciples were committed to ‘the’ Union, but simply “Union.” He was not making a sectional reference, but was referring to the unity of the church. Despite Campbell’s optimism, the Disciples were far from united.

At first, there was a general call to unity through pacifism. The editors of the *Millennial Harbinger*, Campbell and W.K. Pendleton, worked hard to promote harmony among the Disciples of Christ and the nation. Fanning and Lipscomb initially did the same through the *Gospel Advocate*.<sup>52</sup> Campbell proposed that the Union and the

---

<sup>49</sup> Brock, *Pacifism in the United States*, 836; Tuck, “Battle Cry of Peace”, 8; *The American Christian Record*, 45-46.

<sup>50</sup> Gaustad and Schmidt, *The Religious History of America*, 155.

<sup>51</sup> Alexander Campbell, “Signs of the Times,” *Millennial Harbinger* 4 No. 1 (January 1861), 41-42.

<sup>52</sup> “Perilous Times,” *Gospel Advocate* 7 no. 6 (June 1861), 140-142.

Confederacy select men to arbitrate their disputes and come up with a compromise. As Campbell had during the Mexican War, Pendleton often reminded his readers of the immoral effects that war had on the young men who left home and on the women and children to which they returned. A man from Hebron, Virginia, wrote a letter to Campbell in July of 1861 describing the fragmentation of his local church. Campbell's advice to this one church would likely have been his advice to the entire country. He replied, "You are all to blame, and you must come together, confess your sins without mincing them, keep nothing back, confess candidly, honorably, magnanimously, and humble yourselves before the Lord and he will mercifully forgive."<sup>53</sup> More than one Disciples fellowship splintered over the sectional crisis. Even the *Harbinger* was not dogmatically committed to pacifism. Campbell and Pendleton published several pro-war articles in the interest of offering their readers arguments from each side so they could make their own informed decision. One such article drew on Scripture to prove that fighting in national wars was equivalent to obeying the civil government. Certain passages of Scripture mandate obedience to the government (i.e. "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's"), the author argued. If the government requests military service, the dutiful Christian must give it. One who is rebelling against the civil government that the Christian serves forfeits his right to be treated civilly. The Christian, in obedience to the government can, with a clear conscience, carry out whatever duty is just and enforce upon a criminal whatever penalty is just, even death.<sup>54</sup> Another argument contended that Christians were mandated to support a government that supported those who obeyed the law while punishing those

---

<sup>53</sup> Alexander Campbell, "Our National Troubles," *Millennial Harbinger* 4, No. 7 (July 1861), 413.

<sup>54</sup> P. Galley, "What is the Duty of Christians in the Present War?" *Millennial Harbinger* 4 no. 10 (October 1861), 593-596.

who did not obey the law. This government, no matter what type, was a good government and citizens should not rebel against it. Only if a government punished the good and promoted the bad could citizens rebel against it. “Though good men are not permitted to defend their religion ‘by the sword,’ nor to redress their own personal wrongs,” the author concluded, “they are permitted to bear the sword in defense of civil government.”<sup>55</sup>

Tolbert Fanning, editor of the Nashville periodical *Gospel Advocate*, urged his readers not to get involved in the sectional crisis, and expressed his views in a series of articles in 1861. In February, he blamed “unwise and cruel leaders” for the nation’s predicament, and quoted the favorite Scripture of many pacifists: “They shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.”<sup>56</sup> Fanning stressed the peaceful nature of Christ and his apostles in the New Testament. He questioned whether war in this case would result in a solution to the nation’s problems. He specifically called out Northern leaders such as William H. Seward, Horace Greeley, Henry Ward Beecher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Wendell Philips, as well as Southern church leaders, for encouraging “fanaticism” and conflict.<sup>57</sup> In July, Fanning referred to the Civil War as a “civil, unnatural, ungodly, cruel, barbarious [sic], unnecessary, meaningless, fruitless and disgraceful” war. He leveled charges of apostasy against the religious leaders who

---

<sup>55</sup> Justus M. Barnes, “Ought Christians Go to War?” *Millennial Harbinger* 4 no. 11 (November 1861), 654-655.

<sup>56</sup> Tolbert Fanning, “Duty of Christians in Reference to the Political Crisis of 1861,” *Gospel Advocate* 7 no. 2 (February 1861), 33-34; Isaiah 2:4.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 36-37.

encouraged the war.<sup>58</sup> Fanning sympathized with the Confederacy, writing that Lincoln's use of force in invading the South was "ample ground for irreconcilable dissatisfaction." He admitted that the South had the right to rebel, but maintained that Christians should not identify with North or South but with Christ. After labeling Lincoln as a sectionalist, Fanning wrote, "It is honorable religiously to even rebel against oppression, as we conscientiously believe it is for the States South to politically rebel against the assumed authority of the States North." In this article, the Nashville editor made it clear that he favored Southern secession. Financial struggles forced Fanning and co-editor David Lipscomb to discontinue the *Gospel Advocate* after 1861, so it is possible that he identified with the South to sell subscriptions. It seems more likely however, that he truly sympathized with his fellow Southerners. Nevertheless, Fanning believed that the decision to go to war was an individual one. It was neither his place nor anyone else's to force someone to join the army or to campaign for peace.<sup>59</sup> Like Campbell in 1848, Fanning was adamant that Christians should not be involved in war. Despite the peaceful desires of the Disciples leadership however, Harrell claimed that "most" of the younger Disciples fought for one side or the other.<sup>60</sup>

Perhaps the most important entity involved in the disunity of the Disciples was the American Christian Missionary Society (ACMS). Founded in 1849, the ACMS was the closest thing to a national organization the Disciples had, because all of the Disciples churches were independent. At the Society's annual meeting in Cincinnati in 1861, most

---

<sup>58</sup> Tolbert Fanning, "Wars of Heaven and Earth," *Gospel Advocate* 7 no. 7 (July 1861), 205.

<sup>59</sup> Tolbert Fanning, "Religious Aspect of the American Revolution of 1861," *Gospel Advocate* 7 no. 7 (July 1861), 210-213.

<sup>60</sup> Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 153.

who attended were Northern Unionists. These Northern sympathizers desired a public declaration in support of the Union. The pacifists, hoping to preserve church and sectional unity, did not want the ACMS to align with either side. If the organization openly supported the Union, it would do irreparable damage to the ministry in the South. Southern pacifists (some of whom had never approved of organized missionary societies) heard of the proposed 1861 resolutions and reacted in confusion, shock, and despair. Tolbert Fanning decried those Northern ministers who desired “the wholesale murder of the people South who do not choose to be governed by a sectional party North.”<sup>61</sup> Tensions simmered until the meeting in 1863. At this meeting, the ACMS overwhelmingly passed a resolution in support of the Union and the federal government of the United States. The resolution read in part,

Resolved, That we unqualifiedly declare our allegiance to said Government, and repudiate as false and slanderous any statements to the contrary.

Resolved, That we tender our sympathies to our brave and noble soldiers in the fields, who are defending us from the attempts of armed traitors to overthrow our Government, and also to those bereaved, and rendered desolate by the ravages of war.<sup>62</sup>

This document ensured that the only national Disciples of Christ organization sided with the Union. It is worth noting that the Southern Disciples had no representation at the Cincinnati meeting. The battle was between the pacifist moderates and the Unionists. The Unionists emerged victorious. Pacifist J.W. McGarvey despaired, “I have judged the American Christian Missionary Society, and have decided for myself, that it should now

---

<sup>61</sup> Tolbert Fanning, “Ministers of Peace in the World’s Conflicts,” *Gospel Advocate* 7 no. 11 (November 1861), 348; W.H. Goodloe, “The Government of Caesar,” *Gospel Advocate* 7 no. 2 (February 1861), 55.

<sup>62</sup> Quoted in Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 163.

cease to exist.”<sup>63</sup> The results of the resolution of 1863 were the further delineation of the church along sectional lines and increased opposition to the Society.

The American Christian Missionary Society resolutions shattered the myth that the Disciples maintained unity during the Civil War. Not only was there division between the Unionists and the pacifists in the North, but also the Disciples in the South heard of the resolutions and reacted in anger. Nashville editor and preacher David Lipscomb wrote after the war that the ACMS loyalty resolutions “Sent men into the Federal army; we know it sent some brethren of good intentions, but strong impulses and feelings, into the Southern army.”<sup>64</sup> As had occurred during the Mexican War, the Civil War generally divided the Disciples along sectional lines. Disciples’ evangelist Walter Scott fervently hoped that the crisis would not rend the Union in two. Therefore, he strongly supported the Union, believing that the government had to put down the rebellion. He concluded,

The government...that will not, with all its force, in defiance of all obstacles, put down anarchy and the doctrine that leads to it, ought itself to be put down, as men are more ready to follow a bad example than attend to a good precept. If this course is not pursued with personages working treason, others will imitate their insurrectionary precedent, till the infection of revolt spreading far and wide among the people, our Union will be dissolved and the United States Government perish in the whirlpool of bloody revolution.<sup>65</sup>

Scott died not long after the war began, but he was not alone in his support of the Union.

The editor of Cleveland, Ohio’s *Christian Standard*, Isaac Errett, claimed in 1863, “The

---

<sup>63</sup> Quoted in Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 164; Earl West, “Some Notes on the Activities of the Churches of Christ in the U.S. during the Civil War,” *The Restoration Quarterly* 6 (1962), 122-125.

<sup>64</sup> David Lipscomb, “I Did Wrong,” *Gospel Advocate* 8 no. 11 (March 13, 1866), 171.

<sup>65</sup> Dwight E. Stevenson, *Walter Scott, Voice of the Golden Oracle: A Biography* (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1946), 220.

sword is divinely authorized, in the hand of the civil magistrate, for the vindication of right, the suppression of wrong.”<sup>66</sup>

Errett’s brother was a major in the Union Army, and was not the only Disciple to serve. There were at least twenty-two Disciples of Christ chaplains in the Union army. Technically, chaplains were non-combatants, but some of them fought in battle.<sup>67</sup> The *Millennial Harbinger* published a piece by a Philadelphia clergyman who had graduated from West Point. He pointed out that while Christians could fight, Scripture forbid ministers to do so. Had this man not been in the ministry, he would have joined the war.<sup>68</sup> Not all Disciples held this view; at least four preachers joined the Union Army. The most well-known Disciple of this period is James A. Garfield. He had once been a pacifist, but an education at Williams College in New England led him to believe that a war, “where liberty or slavery were in the struggle” could be a just war.<sup>69</sup> Before the war, Garfield was a preacher and taught at Hiram College, where he recruited 250 students into the 42<sup>nd</sup> Ohio Regiment. After the governor of Ohio appointed him to the position of lieutenant colonel, Garfield earned a promotion to Major General after exceptional service at Chickamauga. Known as the “praying Colonel,” Garfield preached a sermon at least once during the war. The future president viewed the war’s purpose as the abolition of slavery.

---

<sup>66</sup> Brewster, *Torn Asunder*, 50.

<sup>67</sup> John W. Brinsfield, William C. Davis, Benedict Maryniak, and James I. Robertson, Jr., eds., *Faith in the Fight: Civil War Chaplains* (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2003), 129-210.

<sup>68</sup> B.J. Wallace, “Clergyman as Military Officers,” *Millennial Harbinger* 33 No. 10 (October 1862), 475-476.

<sup>69</sup> Joe D. Gray, *Unity in the Midst of Slavery and War: Churches of Christ, 1800-1870* (Winona, MS: J.C. Choate Publications, 1982), 100n1; Letter from James A. Garfield to Corydon E. Fuller, March 18, 1856. Garfield Papers, quoted in W.W. Wasson, *James A. Garfield: His Religion and Education: A Study in the Religious and Educational Thought and Activity of an American Statesman* (Nashville: Tennessee Book Company, 1952), 40.



He believed, as many did, that God used the Union as His instrument of justice upon the South for its sins, chiefly slavery.<sup>70</sup>

The Disciples' strongholds were in the West (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Missouri) and Tennessee. E.G. Sewell remembered that many Disciples in Tennessee, filled with the war spirit, volunteered in the Confederate Army. They felt obligated, if the government asked, to fight. Even some Disciples preachers were caught up in the excitement, encouraging both volunteer and draft enlistments. Sewell blamed these indiscretions on a lack of education about the New Testament's teaching on war.<sup>71</sup> Outside of Murfreesboro, Tennessee, in 1863, Garfield described the Disciples' situation in the war-torn state:

The principle church in this place is owned by the Disciples. It is a very large, fine building, and there was before the war a flourishing congregation; but the minister was a rebel and is now a chaplain in the rebel army and the church is scattered. There was a great many Disciples in this country but you would hardly know there was any such thing as religious services...<sup>72</sup>

There were at least six Disciples' chaplains in the Confederate army. The Confederate army recognized chaplains as commissioned officers, though they were without a command. Chaplain J.D. Pickett taught at Alexander Campbell's Bethany College. When the college temporarily closed in 1861, Pickett became the chaplain of the second Kentucky, the famous Orphan Brigade. James A. Garfield described Pickett as a "rabid

---

<sup>70</sup> Wasson, *James A. Garfield*, 80-86.

<sup>71</sup> E.G. Sewell, "Reminiscences of the Civil War, Again," *Gospel Advocate* 49 no. 29 (July 18, 1907), 456; E.G. Sewell, "Reminiscences of Civil War Times, No. 3," *Gospel Advocate* 49 no. 30 (July 25, 1907), 473.

<sup>72</sup> Letter from James A. Garfield to his mother, in Williams, *Letters of James A. Garfield*, 1250.

secessionist.”<sup>73</sup> Chaplain Augustus B. Fears was first a private in Company H of the 30<sup>th</sup> Georgia before his commander commissioned him to be the chaplain.<sup>74</sup>

Some Disciples had no qualms about going to war and doing the soldiers’ work. Chaplain T.W. Caskey armed himself and led his men on a charge at Bull Run. In 1861, he took part in creating Mississippi’s secession document. He was committed to the Confederate cause, but admitted after the war, “I sincerely hope I never did [kill or wound anyone]... I want no fratricidal blood on my hands.”<sup>75</sup> A friend once asked Confederate chaplain B.F. Hall about his feelings toward the Northerners: “He replied that they were no brethren of his, that the religionists on the other side of the line were all infidel, and that true religion was now only to be found in the South.”<sup>76</sup> The same chaplain boasted of a “trusty rifle, of the accuracy of his aim, and doubted not that the weapon, with which he claimed to have killed deer at two hundred yards, would be quite as effectual when a Yankee was the mark.”<sup>77</sup>

Hall was the chaplain for the Sixth Texas Cavalry, led for a time by Barton W. Stone’s son, Barton W. Stone, Jr. Ironically, Barton W. Stone, Jr. and Alexander Campbell, Jr., the sons of the famous pacifist Disciples leaders, fought for the Confederacy in the war. This revealed a rift between generations in the Civil War.

---

<sup>73</sup> Letter from James A. Garfield to Harmon Austin, June 28, 1861; James A. Garfield, *The Wild Life of the Army: Civil War Letters of James A. Garfield*, ed. Frederick D. Williams (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1964), 18.

<sup>74</sup> Brinsfield et al., *Faith in the Fight*, 59, 64.

<sup>75</sup> F.D. Srygley, *Seventy Years in Dixie: Recollections and Sayings of T.W. Caskey and Others* (1891; repr., Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1954), 153.

<sup>76</sup> Quoted in Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 155.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 156.

Campbell, Jr. was a Confederate cavalryman from Virginia.<sup>78</sup> Men elected Stone, Jr. Colonel of the Sixth Texas Cavalry in August 1861. Several of his officers were Disciples. Under the command of General Ben McCulloch, the Sixth saw action throughout the Trans-Mississippi Theater and in 1863 was absorbed into the Texas Brigade commanded by Lieutenant Colonel John S. Griffith. In the spring of 1862, Stone, Jr. resigned his commission to return to Dallas and raise another regiment.<sup>79</sup> The son of Disciples' evangelist John Allen Gano owned slaves and organized a company of Texas Rangers in June 1861. By 1863, Richard M. Gano was a Brigadier General in the Confederate Army. After the war, he became a minister.<sup>80</sup>

There were internal and external pressures on the Disciples of Christ who were laymen to take a side in the civil conflict. Patriotism spurred many men in each region to enlist. Once the initial enthusiasm petered out, Northern and Southern societies faced conscription acts. Both the Union and the Confederacy instituted military drafts. Although scholars rightly identify the drafts in the North as failures because they only added eight percent of Union soldiers, James McPherson pointed out that the existence of the draft encouraged almost a million soldiers to re-enlist.<sup>81</sup> As many as seventy-five to

---

<sup>78</sup> Webb, *In Search of Christian Unity*, 195; Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 155; Howes, "A House Divided," 30.

<sup>79</sup> Victor M. Rose, *Ross' Texas Brigade: Being a Narrative of Events Connected with its Service in the Late War Between the States* (1881; repr., Kennesaw, GA: Continental Book Company, 1960), 36-37; Douglas Hale, *The Third Texas Cavalry in the Civil War* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), 77, 196; Marjorie Carter Buhl, "James Webb Throckmorton," in *Ten More Texans in Gray*, ed. W.C. Nunn (Hillsboro, TX: Hill Jr. College Press, 1980), 174.

<sup>80</sup> Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 130; Douglas A. Foster and Anthony L. Dunnavant, *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2004), 223.

<sup>81</sup> McPherson and Hogue, *Ordeal by Fire*, 385-386.

eighty-five percent of white males who were eligible for the draft in the South served in the Confederate Army.<sup>82</sup> Doubtless, this included many Disciples. Their literature was rife with lamentations regarding the enlistment of church members. Peter Brock found that pacifism was “tolerated rather than adopted with any degree of enthusiasm by most church members” in Middle Tennessee.<sup>83</sup> Along with most Disciples colleges, Alexander Campbell’s Bethany College nearly emptied at the beginning of the war because the students (and some faculty) enlisted. “Almost the whole student body” of Tolbert Fanning’s Franklin College in Tennessee joined the Confederate Army when Lincoln first called for 75,000 Northern volunteers. Arkansas College in Fayetteville saw students join both armies. Union and Confederate troops occupied the college and burned it during a skirmish.<sup>84</sup> The South was severed from the North in many practical ways, as well as politically. Many Northern Disciples’ periodicals could not reach the South because the mail could not get through. This left many Southern Disciples ignorant of the pacific opinions of the leadership. Therefore, many joined the army of their section. In Texas, for example, many young men, including some who later became preachers, enlisted.<sup>85</sup> Addison Clark, an eighteen-year-old Texan, enlisted in the Confederate Army after Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers in April 1861. He was raised a pacifist, but

---

<sup>82</sup> Gary Gallagher, *The Confederate War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 28.

<sup>83</sup> Brock, *Pacifism in the United States*, 914.

<sup>84</sup> Letter from Alexander Campbell to Dr. J.W. Cox, March 21, 1864, quoted in Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, 648; Harrell, *Quest for a Christian America*, 154; West, *Search for the Ancient Order*, 325.

<sup>85</sup> Hall, *Texas Disciples*, 131.

volunteered early in the war, serving in Barton Stone, Jr.'s contingent from Dallas.<sup>86</sup> It is difficult to ascertain why some Disciples volunteered, but some did so out of a desire of military glory, in defense of slavery, or, as in Clark's case, in defense of their state when they perceived Lincoln's call for troops as a call for an invasion force. His brother Randolph Clark wrote that some recently transplanted Northerners resided in Texas when the war began. They had no ties to slavery and did not have strong opinions on state's rights, yet they fought for the Confederacy because it was their home.<sup>87</sup>

One explanation for the rupture between the Disciples and their leadership concerns the publications. Indiana Disciple Benjamin Franklin proclaimed, "I would rather, ten thousand times, be killed for refusing to fight, than to fall in battle, or to come home victorious with the blood of my brethren on my hands."<sup>88</sup> Because of his stance of non-involvement, Franklin saw a dramatic decline in subscriptions to his *American Christian Review*. Other Disciples leaders made similar passionate pacific proclamations. The most popular publication before the war was Campbell's *Millennial Harbinger*. He published it in Bethany, Virginia, but when West Virginia entered the Union in 1863, Bethany fell within the borders of the new state. Its subscribers lived in the North and the South. When the war severed the nation politically, it also cut the mail routes. Northern publications could not reach people in the South, and Southern publications could not reach people in the North. The resulting financial hardship caused even the mighty

---

<sup>86</sup> Randolph Clark, *Reminiscences: Biographical and Historical* (Wichita Falls, TX: Lee Clark, 1919), 24. Addison Clark and his brother Randolph Clark later founded AddRan College, which became Texas Christian University.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>88</sup> Brock, *Pacifism in the United States*, 839.

*Harbinger* to reduce its length from sixty to forty-eight pages in 1862.<sup>89</sup> The war forced Tolbert Fanning to suspend publication of the *Gospel Advocate*. He halted the presses in 1861 and did not renew the Nashville publication until 1866.<sup>90</sup>

Disciples from some Border States remained pacifists during the Civil War. In late 1861, fourteen Disciples preachers from Missouri, led by J.W. McGarvey, publicly declared their pacifism. The *Millennial Harbinger* published their circular in October of 1861. They stressed unity and restoration and stated, “Whatever we may think of the propriety of bearing arms in extreme emergencies, we certainly cannot, by the New Testament, which is our only rule of discipline, justify ourselves in engaging in the fraternal strife now raging in our beloved country.”<sup>91</sup> Fighting in the Civil War would be to disobey God. These Missourians were not strict pacifists, as they allowed for “extreme” circumstances in which a man could use a weapon against another man. They were opposed specifically to the Civil War, but not all wars. This illustrates further disunion among the Disciples. While many held pacifism as a strict ideology, others did not. Another influential Disciples leader in Missouri, Jacob Creath, Jr., was a strict pacifist, opposed to Christian involvement in any war; he maintained this view both during and after the war.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, 646; Hall, *Texas Disciples*, 130-131.

<sup>90</sup> Casey, *The Battle over Hermeneutics*, 206.

<sup>91</sup> J.W. McGarvey, “Circular from Preachers in Missouri,” *Millennial Harbinger* 4 No. 10 (October 1861), 583-584.

<sup>92</sup> Jacob Creath, Jr., “Christians Will Take No Part in Any War,” *Christian Pioneer* 6 no. 6 (June 1866), 170-171.

Some of the leaders of the Disciples of Middle Tennessee were pacifists. In protest of the war, Philip Fall closed his church when Confederate President Jefferson Davis called for a day of prayer. Fall refused to pledge his loyalty to the Confederacy, and gained an exemption from the loyalty oath. When the Union gained control over Tennessee, Disciples preachers David Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell, and Robert B. Trimble petitioned Unionist governor Andrew Johnson, asking that they and fellow clergy be considered conscientious objectors and exempt from military service. Johnson assured them that they would not be troubled.<sup>93</sup> Generally, however, Disciples in the Border States especially found it difficult to remain neutral. They had to deal with forces from both sides trying to recruit them. During the war, war hawks from both sides threatened to lynch Lipscomb because of his pacifist position. Southern social norms were prevalent in states like Tennessee, Virginia, Kentucky, and most of Missouri. The Honor Code of the South often dictated violence. In the Civil War, it demanded that an honorable man defend his family, his community, and his home state, all of which tied in to his personal honor.<sup>94</sup> The pacifist rejected all of these notions, which is another reason why the peaceful perspective became more unpopular the longer the war lasted. Northern preacher Isaac Errett, who was a pacifist at the beginning of the war, ended the war a firm Union supporter. Even Alexander Campbell, who would never officially take a side in the interest of unity, leaned in support of the Union, despite the fact that his wife and children

---

<sup>93</sup> David Edwin Harrell, Jr., "Disciples of Christ Pacifism in Nineteenth-Century Tennessee," in *The Stone-Campbell Movement: An International Religious Tradition*, eds. Michael W. Casey and Douglas A. Foster (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2002), 458-459.

<sup>94</sup> Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 3ff.

avored the Confederacy.<sup>95</sup> After Campbell ceded full editorial control of the *Millennial Harbinger* to W.K. Pendleton, its content seemed to favor the Union cause. For the first time in the periodical, Pendleton published Union soldiers' obituaries. Campbell had never published anything relating to the war such as battle reports or obituaries.<sup>96</sup>

During the Civil War, whatever peace testimony the Disciples of Christ could claim collapsed, while the Quakers only stumbled. Although no specific numbers exist, evidence suggests that the pacifism of the Disciples' leaders failed to influence the church members. Even some of those same pacifist leaders succumbed to the sectionalism and chose a side other than peace. The Quakers fared better than the Disciples, though Northern primary sources suggest that nearly every regional Meeting had at least a few members who compromised the peace principles. The divisive nature of civil war forced each denomination to consider their position on war and their relationship with the civil government. The post-war changes in the thinking and teaching of both the Disciples of Christ and the Quakers reveal that the war deeply affected them.

---

<sup>95</sup> Letter from James A. Garfield to Harmon Austin, June 28, 1861; Garfield, *Civil War Letters of James A. Garfield*, 18.

<sup>96</sup> Howes, "A House Divided," 39; Howes is of the opinion that Pendleton published material favorable to the Union because he was in desperate need of subscriptions to fund the newspaper. The *Harbinger* was published in Bethany, West Virginia, so during the war Pendleton had to reach a Unionist audience to sell subscriptions. The bias disappeared after the war. According to Garfield (in the same letter cited above), Pendleton voted in favor of his native Virginia's secession.



## CHAPTER IV

### POST-WAR CHANGES

After the Civil War, the doctrine of pacifism declined among the Quakers and the Disciples of Christ. The Quaker's decline was much slower, as it took until World War II for Quaker pacifism to fade. After an initial burst of rededication, Quakers grew disillusioned with the peace movement and withdrew from it, as prevalent theological trends undermined many traditional doctrines of the Friends. Among the Disciples, pacifism and neutrality had mostly been nonexistent during the Civil War, and it continued to decline afterwards. Although some leaders such as David Lipscomb continued to promote it, the sectional divide wrought by the Civil War took precedence over any single doctrine, and pacifism faded from the minds of the Disciples.

The early nineteenth century witnessed a significant shift in American religious thought. Among Protestants, the influence of Puritan-inspired Calvinism declined, and Charles Grandison Finney led the rise of Arminian evangelicalism. The movement began with the large camp meetings at Cane Ridge in 1801. Finney and others like Lyman Beecher promoted the revivalism, emotional preaching, and dramatic conversions that spurred the Second Great Awakening by preaching in local churches at night and leading

smaller prayer meetings during the day.<sup>1</sup> The Disciples of Christ sprang from the evangelical movement. Revival preaching and vigorous proselytizing predicated their genesis and generated their dramatic growth. The evangelical influence also reached the Quakers. English Quaker Joseph John Gurney travelled the United States promoting Bible study and Sunday School programs. The latter was an interdenominational movement to educate Christians in doctrine and the Scriptures. To Conservatives (also called Wilburites), Gurney was promoting human influence. Instead of the traditional quiet meeting, waiting on the prompting of the Holy Spirit, Gurney placed the initiative on human leaders.<sup>2</sup> It was not until after the Civil War that the majority of Quakers succumbed to Finney's style of evangelicalism. Concerned about their dwindling numbers, Friends hired ministers, allowed music, and held revival meetings. Nelson's study of Indiana Quakers found only a quarter of the men who violated the peace principles during the Civil War was ever disowned or publicly apologetic.<sup>3</sup> One explanation is the desire to retain, rather than expel, members. From two different perspectives, the Quakers and the Disciples of Christ reflected the changing religious culture of the nineteenth century.

The period after the Civil War was a time of reflection for the Society of Friends. The Quakers renewed their efforts to promote peace. They worked toward that goal in two distinct ways. First, they strove to educate younger members on the traditional peace doctrine. Second, they actively promoted that doctrine outside their fellowship, seeking to

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul E. Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York 1815-1837* (1978, repr., New York: Hill and Wang, 2004), 4ff, 95.

<sup>2</sup> Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 187.

<sup>3</sup> Nelson, *Indiana Quakers*, 21.

influence the rest of Christendom and the world. Some took a broader view and saw a decline of Quakerism as the problem. United States Census records indicate that church growth had been stagnant for two decades before a decline in 1870. While some Quaker populations in the West were growing (such as Iowa), eastern strongholds were experiencing dramatic declension.<sup>4</sup> Some Friends prescribed a new evangelical movement propelled by the original zeal of Quaker founder George Fox. One author wanted to see the Friends encourage evangelical teachings of justification (the sinfulness of man and God's grace) and sanctification (the molding of man into the ideal follower of Christ).<sup>5</sup>

At the General Conference in 1866, several Yearly Meetings recommended that the Friends take measures to re-think the peace testimony. They wanted to evaluate their tactics in promoting peace, and they wanted to include other Christian denominations in a push for some form of intermediary solution between nations bent on war.<sup>6</sup> The discussion took place in Baltimore in November 1866. The committee assigned to discuss the matter came to a few resolutions. They considered a proposal to invite Congress to search for a way to mediate between nations so that they did not have to resort to war. They would reach out to other denominations to present similar petitions to Congress. They considered this motion but did not deal with it at the 1866 Meeting. One accomplishment was the recommendation that every Yearly Meeting represented appoint a Special Standing Committee on Peace. The purpose of these committees would be to

---

<sup>4</sup> United States Census of 1870, 512.

<sup>5</sup> W.S. II., "The Society of Friends—Its Future," *Friends' Review* 20 no. 31 (March 30, 1867), 481, 483.

<sup>6</sup> *Friends' Review* 19 no. 46 (July 14, 1866), 729.

“awaken more interest among our members, and give increased efficiency to our testimony against war.” The practical steps were to present their peace doctrines in schools and to produce and disseminate books and pamphlets advocating pacifism.<sup>7</sup>

Despite the setback that the Civil War presented to the cause of peace, Quaker leaders were optimistic about the future. Traditional organs of doctrine continued to espouse pacifism. They used Scriptural arguments for peace, discouraged Quakers from involvement in government, and celebrated the abolition of slavery.<sup>8</sup> The abolition movement’s success gave Quakers hope for the movement against war. Religionists and secularists alike were hoping for international peace movements to establish influence over the culture. From Europe, Samuel Janney found encouragement in the 1867 meeting of the International League of Peace in Paris. Unfortunately, in just a few years, France would be embroiled in a war against Prussia. Janney also hoped that other denominations would pick up the banner of peace, along with the Quakers. Only a broad influence could end centuries of warfare.<sup>9</sup>

D. Irish, who was active in promoting peace during the Civil War, continued to encourage practical pacifism after the war. He championed arbitration as a means to settle national and international disputes. Irish was aware that the struggle to end war would be

---

<sup>7</sup> Francis T. King, “The Peace Conference in Baltimore,” *Friends’ Review* (December 1, 1866), 216-217.

<sup>8</sup> Iowa Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of the Society of Friends of Iowa Yearly Meeting* (Chicago: Published for the Society, 1865), 30-34; Baltimore Yearly Meeting, *Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends, Held in Baltimore, for the Western Shore of Maryland, Virginia, and Adjacent Parts of Pennsylvania* (Baltimore: J.B. Rose & Co., 1866), 45, 89, 128-132; North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of the Society of Friends of North Carolina Yearly Meeting* (Greensboro: Published for the Society, 1870), 63, 69; Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, *Rules of Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Printed by Direction of the Representative Committee or Meetings for Sufferings, 1869), 24, 111-114; *Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Women Friends Minutes*, 1870, 9.

<sup>9</sup> S.M. Janney, “Peace Principles,” *Friends’ Intelligencer* 24 no. 30 (September 28, 1867), 467-469.

a lengthy one. “It is not reasonable to expect that an evil which has existed from time immemorial,” he wrote, “should be abolished in a short time.” He was encouraged by news from London that the House of Commons was discussing the installment of a program of international arbitration.<sup>10</sup> English Friends were dealing with similar issues as their brethren across the Atlantic. The *Intelligencer* published a contemplative article from the London *Friend*. The author questioned whether a majority of Quakers felt as strongly about the abolition of war as they did about the abolition of slavery. He concluded that lukewarmness and exegetical hypocrisy were to blame for the failure of Quaker peace principles.<sup>11</sup>

The peace movement proclaimed a great victory when the United States and Great Britain agreed to an arbitration treaty in January 1897. With triumphant language that condemned war as “irrational” and “inconsistent” with Christianity, Quakers reveled in this success, which turned out to be a mirage.<sup>12</sup> The treaty stipulated that, for cases in which disagreement arose between the two nations, each would appoint an “arbitrator,” and both nations would agree on an “umpire” who would mediate the conflict. A five-jury “tribunal” would decide certain cases involving large amounts of money. Each party selected two jurors and agreed on one umpire. A six-member tribunal consisting of three members from each nation would adjudicate territorial disputes. The decision of any of

---

<sup>10</sup> D. Irish, “War,” *Friends’ Intelligencer* 28 no. 32 (October 7, 1871), 505-506.

<sup>11</sup> “War and Modern Quakerism,” *Friends’ Intelligencer* 28 no. 35 (October 28, 1871), 550-551.

<sup>12</sup> “Peace and Arbitration,” *Friends’ Intelligencer and Journal* 54 no. 9 (February 27, 1897), 139-140.

the tribunals would be considered final, as appeals were not allowed.<sup>13</sup> The two nations renewed the treaty in 1907 and maintained it into the 1920s. In 1914, the guns of August obliterated hopes of a universal peace or arbitration system. Those hopes were lifted again with United States President Woodrow Wilson's proposed League of Nations. This amounted to nothing, but World War II provided the impetus for a more successful version, the United Nations.

By the twentieth century, pacifism was no longer a primary tenant of the Society of Friends. For Midwestern Friends, pacifism was "superfluous" by the 1930s. Traditional Quakerism had been declining for a long time since the turn of the century. In most areas, Quakers were not distinct from other Protestant denominations.<sup>14</sup> One author observed, "With the end of the Civil War, almost all Quakers in the United States began to change noticeably—to take on the protective coloration of American culture."<sup>15</sup> A case study of the largest and most influential Quaker Meeting in the late nineteenth and twentieth century, the Indiana Yearly Meeting, showed that Quakers lost their passion for peace principles as they "have been almost totally absorbed into the larger culture of the United States."<sup>16</sup> The post-war period saw a decline in many of the disciplines that made the Quakers unique. In conformity to popular evangelicalism, they stopped dressing in

---

<sup>13</sup> Richard Olney and Julian Pauncefote, "Text of the Arbitration between the United States and Great Britain," *Advocate of Peace* 59 no. 2 (February 1897), 37-39.

<sup>14</sup> Cecil B. Currey, "The Devolution of Quaker Pacifism: A Kansas Case Study, 1860-1955," *Kansas History* 6 (Summer 1983), 123, 125.

<sup>15</sup> Damon D. Hickey, *Sojourners No More: The Quakers in the New South, 1865-1920* (Greensboro, NC: North Carolina Friends Historical Society and North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1997), xii.

<sup>16</sup> Thomas D. Hamm, Margaret Marconi, Gretchen Kleinhen Salinas, and Benjamin Whitman, "The Decline of Quaker Pacifism in the Twentieth Century: Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends as a Case Study," *Indiana Magazine of History* 96 no. 1 (March 2000), 47.

plain clothing and using plain language. They introduced music and preaching to meetings. In their excitement to add new members, traditional teachings, such as pacifism, were de-emphasized. New Quakers did not have a predilection to pacifism, so it died out. The Quakers opposed the Spanish-American War and World War I, but the younger generation did not receive the peace message as often or with listening ears.<sup>17</sup> Younger Friends in places like North Carolina seemed unaware that their sect was absolutely opposed to war. As a result, many fought. Unlike in the Civil War, they did not disown those who went to war in North Carolina because the elders blamed themselves for not educating the next generation on the traditional principles of peace.<sup>18</sup> Officially, the Quakers still maintain pacifist doctrine. Practically, Quaker pacifism is no more. It took until World War II for the doctrine to lose influence, but adherence to Quaker peace principles began to steadily decline after the Civil War.

Alexander Campbell's death in 1866 only served to further the disunion between the Northern Disciples and the Southern Disciples. Campbell was the last remaining link to the Stone-Campbell unification of 1831. The combination of Campbell's death and the Civil War destabilized the Disciples of Christ. This is not to say that there were no attempts at reconciliation. The editors of the *Millennial Harbinger* constantly promoted aid programs for the South. Many in the church were genuinely concerned with the needs of their Southern brethren. David Lipscomb worked tirelessly to raise money to aid destitute Southerners. Others were excited about the new mission field of four million

---

<sup>17</sup> "War Not the Antidote for War," *The Friend: A Religious and Literary Journal* 78 no. 39 (April 8, 1905), 305.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 45-48; Hickey, *Sojourners No More*, 107.

freedmen.<sup>19</sup> Although the *Millennial Harbinger* stopped printing in 1870 due to a lack of funding, one of the last issues showed that a commitment to pacifism remained. A January 1870 article encouraged ministers to eschew military topics and instead “devote their time and thought to preaching ‘Peace on earth; good-will to men.’”<sup>20</sup>

The discord between sections manifested itself through the publications. Before the war, the *Millennial Harbinger* was the dominant publication of the Disciples. Christians North and South subscribed to the publication. After the war, sectional publications replaced the universal acceptance of the *Millennial Harbinger*. Northern Unionists subscribed to Errett’s *Christian Standard*. Pacifists read Franklin’s *American Christian Review*. Southern sympathizers perused Lipscomb’s *Gospel Advocate*. The Southern churches were understandably upset that the Northern Disciples with the American Christian Missionary Society had passed the Loyalty Resolutions in 1863. That distrust remained for decades. Isaac Errett’s *Christian Standard* (published in Cleveland, Ohio) and David Lipscomb’s *Gospel Advocate* (published in Nashville, Tennessee) promoted further disunity by maintaining arguments through their publications.<sup>21</sup> Errett revealed the rift with backhanded offers of help, such as,

If men in the South will in good faith accept the issues of a war which themselves initiated, and cease to glory in a rebellion whose fruits have been so terrible, and obey the word of God in submitting to the lawful authorities of the land, we will go to any reasonable length in respecting

---

<sup>19</sup> Jesse Curtis Pope, “The Restoration Ideal in American Religious Thought” (PhD. Diss. The Florida State University, 1990), 259; W.K. Pendleton, “Our Cause in the South,” *Millennial Harbinger* 37 No. 7 (July 1866), 325-377; W.K. Pendleton, “Aid for the Suffering Brethren in the South,” *Millennial Harbinger* 37 No. 11 (November 1866), 525-526; Benjamin Thomas, “A Great Missionary Field.—Four Millions of People Craving the Bible,” *Millennial Harbinger* 36 No. 5 (May 1865), 234-235.

<sup>20</sup> Francis A. Walker, “Is It a Gospel of Peace?” *Millennial Harbinger* 41 No. 1 (January 1870), 34.

<sup>21</sup> Isaac Errett, “The Gospel Advocate,” *Christian Standard* 2 no. 7 (February 16, 1867), 52.



their prejudices, sympathizing with their sufferings, and repairing their desolations.

The *Standard* editor continued to defend the ACMS Loyalty Resolutions of 1863.<sup>22</sup> Meanwhile, Lipscomb, his co-editor E.G. Sewell and other Disciples in Tennessee held a special disdain for missionary societies, specifically the ACMS in Cincinnati. In 1871, the ACMS began its “divisive work” in Tennessee, leading to congregational splits among the Disciples of Christ.<sup>23</sup> Because of the discord brought by the war, some Disciples of Christ churches split, while others simply disbanded. The government officials taking the 1870 Census were aware that there was a division between “Christians” and “Disciples of Christ.” They were unable then to determine with certainty how many belonged to each sect, so they counted them together, but, as early as 1870, it was clear even to outsiders that there was division within the Disciples’ movement.<sup>24</sup> In 1906, this division became official. The Census Bureau issued a special report on religious bodies and made a distinct separation between Disciples of Christ and Churches of Christ. The Churches of Christ were strongest in the South, while the Disciples of Christ were strongest in the North Central and Midwestern regions.<sup>25</sup>

David Lipscomb was an important figure among the Disciples in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Lipscomb lived through the Civil War as a young preacher in middle Tennessee, and his experiences influenced his later writing. Although

---

<sup>22</sup> Isaac Errett, “The Letter from Georgia,” *Christian Standard* 1 no. 11 (June 16, 1866), 84.

<sup>23</sup> E.G. Sewell, “Reminiscences of Civil War Times, No. 5,” *Gospel Advocate* 49 no. 32 (August 8, 1907), 500; David Lipscomb, “I Did Wrong,” *Gospel Advocate* 8 no. 11 (March 1866), 170-171.

<sup>24</sup> United States Census of 1870, 505.

<sup>25</sup> Department of Commerce and Labor: Bureau of the Census, *Special Reports, Religious Bodies: 1906, Part II Separate Denominations: History, Description, and Statistics* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1910), 236, 240, 243.

he was a pacifist like Campbell and Pendleton, Lipscomb embraced a more conservative perspective on the Christian's relation to government. He defined these thoughts in his *Civil Government*, which was originally a series of articles in the *Gospel Advocate* in 1866 and 1867. This publication was the dominant Southern church journal after the Civil War.<sup>26</sup> Although Alexander Campbell discouraged the graduates of his college from making politics their career, he encouraged Christians to vote.<sup>27</sup> Lipscomb echoed Stone, believing that Christians should take no part in human government, including voting. He found voting for a war or for a candidate who leads a nation into war to be the same as fighting the war yourself. Lipscomb wrote, "A man who votes to bring about a war, or that votes for that which logically and necessarily brings about war is responsible for that war and for all the necessary and usual attendants and results of that war."<sup>28</sup> Campbell thought that God ordained civil governments to do his will.<sup>29</sup> Lipscomb saw civil government as a sort of punishment that God burdened man with because he had disobeyed God and could not abide under God's government. Human government was a consequence of man's rebellion against God. The Christian must pay his taxes ("Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's," Mark 12:17) and obey the laws of a human government ("Let every person be subject to the governing authorities," Romans 13:1) but no more. Lipscomb thought that Christians who were

---

<sup>26</sup> Mark Alan Elrod, "The Churches of Christ and the "War Question": The Influence of Church Journals" (PhD. diss. Vanderbilt University, 1995), 11.

<sup>27</sup> Alexander Campbell, "Baccalaureate Address," *Millennial Harbinger* 2 No. 8 (August 1859), 432; Campbell, "Christian Politics," *Millennial Harbinger* 7 No. 3 (March 1857), 174; Craig M. Watts, "Campbell's Pacifism and Relations with the State," *Encounter* 66 No. 2 (Spring 2005), 128.

<sup>28</sup> David Lipscomb, *Civil Government: Its Origin, Mission, and Destiny, and the Christian's Relation To It* (1889; repr. Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1957), iv.

<sup>29</sup> Alexander Campbell, *Popular Lectures and Addresses* (Philadelphia: James Challen & Son, 1863), 313.

involved in civil government polluted the church. Tolbert Fanning summed up this perspective when he wrote, “Christ was not of the world neither were his disciples, and the Christians in the nineteenth century should not be instruments in the hands of the devil to carry out his purposes.”<sup>30</sup>

The Civil War forced some of the Disciples of Christ to realize the importance of unity on the war issue. Some who had been involved in the war regretted it. Former Confederate chaplain B.F. Hall concluded, “The war was a mistake and a failure.”<sup>31</sup> Moses E. Lard lamented the comparative neglect that the issue of war received before and during the Civil War. He attempted to rectify this problem by writing an article that he hoped would compare to Campbell’s 1848 article on war. Lard based his lengthy argument on seven passages of Scripture that he thought clearly excluded Christians from warfare. He methodically dismantled certain arguments in favor of Christians going to war and concluded repeatedly, “Christians can not go to war; for they can not become men of violence.” Replies to the article differed on some points of argument, but agreed with Lard’s overall principle that war was wrong.<sup>32</sup> It is certain that *Lard’s Quarterly* did not have the influence that Campbell’s *Millennial Harbinger* had, especially considering Lard only printed the Kentucky periodical for six years, but it is likely that some Disciples shared his perspective.

---

<sup>30</sup> Lipscomb, *Civil Government*, 10, 132, 133, 155.

<sup>31</sup> Srygley, *Seventy Years in Dixie*, 153.

<sup>32</sup> Moses E. Lard, “Should Christians Go to War?” *Lard’s Quarterly* 3 no. 3 (April 1866), 225-244; John Shackelford, “Reply to the Question—Should Christians Go to War?” *Lard’s Quarterly* 3 no. 4 (October 1866), 355-361.

Most of the Disciples of Christ leaders reverted to pacifism after the Civil War. Those who had been pacifists during the war remained pacifists. Some of the Northern editors who had supported the ACMS Loyalty Resolutions and the Union opposed the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. David Lipscomb, who maintained a pacifist perspective throughout his life, perceived that view as hypocrisy.<sup>33</sup> In 1876, Lipscomb's *Gospel Advocate* published an article denouncing the "armed peace" diplomacy of the United States and lamented the tremendous build-up of military infrastructure in the last twenty years. To Lipscomb, the Civil War was the poor man's fight but it was the politician's war. Lipscomb placed responsibility for the Civil War on "politicians, demagogues, and ambitious adventurers who make their gains off of the misfortunes of their fellow man." Common citizens were mere puppets in the hands of the ruling few.<sup>34</sup> However, there is no evidence that local congregations heeded the leadership's pacifism any more than they did during the Civil War. After the Civil War, the Disciples were never known as a peace church.

---

<sup>33</sup> David Lipscomb, "What is War?" *Gospel Advocate* 12 no. 9 (September 1870), 892-893. Lipscomb opposed the Spanish-American War in 1898 (David Lipscomb, "War and Christianity," *Gospel Advocate* 40 no. 20 (May 19, 1898), 317).

<sup>34</sup> Elihu Burritt and David Lipscomb, "America and War," *Gospel Advocate* 18 no. 7 (February 17, 1876), 165-166.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

A comparative study of two groups that espoused pacifism before the Civil War gives insight to the socio-cultural influence of the war. It was so divisive that it made professed pacifists fight their co-religionists over regional differences. Analysis of the similarities and differences between the Quakers and the Disciples of Christ leads to a better understanding of their responses to the Civil War. Before the Civil War, the Disciples of Christ and the Quakers used similar arguments against war. Both churches used Scripture to their advantage, pulling out every passage that they could to make a moral argument that war was wrong. They cited the destructive symptoms of war in history, emphasizing the financial cost, the copious amounts of money spent by governments for relatively little gain. They emphasized the social cost, in broken cities, ruined farmland, and destitute people. Wars did not just affect armies and governments, but civilians. They emphasized the spiritual cost, the corrosive influence that army camps had on soldiers, who brought those influences home when the war ended. If they could make a convincing enough argument, people of that church would be pacifists. These people, in turn, could influence members of other Christian churches. The Disciples and

the Quakers tried to tie pacifism with the Christian religion. Ideally, this would lead to a majority of pacifist Christians. But the corrosiveness of civil war proved too much. Still, there was a noticeable difference in the number of Disciples who fought compared to the number of Quakers who fought. Differences in tradition, emphasis on religious education, geography, organization, and theological views on politics caused the Quakers and Disciples of Christ to react differently to the Civil War.

Within a decade of the early Quaker's declaration of peace, pragmatic though it may have been, Quakers acquired a reputation as pacifists. By the nineteenth century, the Friends had made a profound cultural impact. Jennifer Connerley points out that "Fighting Quakers" were a cultural phenomenon, because the peace testimony of the sect was so well known that any of them who did fight gained notoriety. The Quakers held more cultural significance than numerical significance in nineteenth century America. Society often looked at Quakerism and war as a contradiction. Cartoons in popular magazines like *Harper's Weekly* often portrayed Quakers in the context of their odd traditional habits or compromising their pacifist principles in some way. Often, dummy cannons were referred to as "Quaker guns." These were usually logs cut and painted to look like cannons from a distance. Confederate troops used them to fool Northern armies during the Peninsular campaign of 1861, as well as Manassas in 1862.<sup>1</sup> It is possible that some Quakers maintained traditional pacifism because society expected them to. Social pressure, from within Quaker society and without, may have provided extra encouragement for some Friends to stay out of the war.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jennifer Connerley, "Fighting Quakers: A Jet Black Whiteness," *Pennsylvania History* 73 no. 4 (Autumn 2006), 378-384, 389-390; "Rebels Captured by Colored Troops," *New Orleans Tribune* (August 23, 1864), 2; "An 'Affair' Between A Whaling Captain And A Military Officer," *Colored Tennessean* (October 7, 1865), 1.

The Disciples of Christ had no such reputation. The ideas that sparked the movement were little more than fifty years old. As a distinct denomination, it was only about thirty years old by the time of the Civil War. It had been less than fifteen years since Disciples' leadership took anything resembling a doctrinal stance of pacifism (Alexander Campbell's "Address on War"). Even then, not every influential leader in the church was a pacifist. The Disciples were tied together by one idea—Christian unity. Beyond this, they agreed on very little. The issue of war was a secondary one, so it only came up when wars occurred. Much of the leadership seems to have assumed that their hearers would come to a position of pacifism by studying the Scriptures. What they expected could not withstand the intense passions aroused by the Civil War.

Education, in tandem with age, was important in determining whether a young Quaker or Disciple considered enlisting. In general, Civil War soldiers on both sides were young and poorly educated. Most soldiers were in their late teens to mid-twenties. Illiteracy was rampant.<sup>2</sup> When it comes to religious pacifism in the Civil War, the story is one of failure. The Disciples could not even educate their own members to pacifism. The Quakers did, much better than others, but still blamed a lack of education for the few Quakers that did go to war. Tennessee Disciples preacher E.G. Sewell considered the lack of awareness of pacifist doctrine to be the primary reason that many young Disciples went to war. He wrote that many of the Disciples in his state had never studied the

---

<sup>2</sup> Bell I. Wiley, *The Common Soldier of the Civil War* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975), 73, 75.

Scriptural views on war and peace. This was likely the case among other congregations as well.<sup>3</sup>

In 1860, the Quakers were, by far, more numerous in the North than they were in the South or the Border States. There were more Quakers in New Jersey than in all the Confederate states combined. This was the result of emigration to the North because of slavery in the South. Pennsylvania, New York, Indiana, and Ohio held the highest number of Quaker churches in the nation. Those states happened to be among the most populous states in the Union, so these numbers are not a surprise.<sup>4</sup> Emigration throughout the antebellum period and during the war reduced the number of Quakers in the South. The Quaker presence in the Confederate states was small, and unlike the Northern Quakers, there are no records of Southern Quakers joining the Confederate Army. This was assuredly due to the sect's anti-slavery views, along with, but in a lesser sense, their pacifist views. For these reasons, they avoided the sectional conflict between members that plagued the Disciples.

The majority of Disciples' churches were also in the North, but they had more of a presence in the South and in the Border States than the Quakers. Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, and Missouri held the highest number of Disciples churches in 1860. This shows the strength of the Disciples in the Border States. They also had a significant presence in Tennessee and Virginia.<sup>5</sup> The importance of the Disciples in the Border States is not that there was a majority (there was not), but that they had a significant

---

<sup>3</sup> E.G. Sewell, "Reminiscences of the Civil War Again," *Gospel Advocate* 49 no. 29 (July 18, 1907), 456.

<sup>4</sup> United States Census of 1860, 498.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*



presence in the Confederacy. The Disciples were so loosely operated, with so little oversight, that they were especially vulnerable to sectional division. This also reveals the cultural divide between North and South. Bertram Wyatt-Brown has extensively documented the honor society of the antebellum South. While it received little mention in Disciples' periodicals, Wyatt-Brown's work acknowledges that honor was valued very highly in the South. This must have attributed to many Southern Disciples' decision to fight for the Confederacy. Conversely, the Quakers were uniform in their beliefs, so although there were some Friends in the Confederate states, they held all the same principles as the Northern Quakers and therefore did not split.

This brings up another important difference: church organization. The Quakers did not have singular heads of their Meetings and they did not indulge in titles. Despite this, they managed to maintain a systematic structure. Local Meetings were absorbed into regional Meetings, which were absorbed into state Meetings that were absorbed into a national General Conference. At every level, within each branch of Quakerism, there were uniform doctrines and practices. Every Meeting, at the very least, held each member accountable to ten queries. These questions addressed all the major points of Quaker doctrine, including the traditional dress and customs, meeting attendance, war, and slavery. A Quaker from New York answered to the same queries as a Quaker from North Carolina. The same belief system and a social system that set the Quakers apart from the rest of society connected them to one another.

The Disciples of Christ lacked any kind of national organization, except for the American Christian Missionary Society, whose influence was limited, especially in the South. They had only a few doctrines that a majority of church members agreed to. Aside

from the issue of Christian unity and the promotion of the Scriptures, there was no mandated theology or practice to be a Disciple. Because of the relative youth of the movement, they had no tradition to hold them together and no unique common practices. Churches were scattered throughout the country, seemingly held together only by the force of Alexander Campbell's will. His death in 1866 left the movement without a strong singular leader, and though there were plenty of regional leaders to maintain the church, over time the lack of uniformity led to larger schisms in doctrine. The lack of organization among the Disciples eventually led to the officially recognized split in 1906.

Along with sectional ties, political involvement swayed men toward Union or Confederate. Because the majority of Christian denominations declared a political allegiance and showed an interest in politics, they got involved in political quarrels. The Quakers and Disciples held, in many cases, opposing views on Christian participation in civil government. Political involvement reflected the willingness of their members to abandon pacifism. The Quaker's position was one of political abstinence, thus they were largely disinterested in politics because they were disassociated. Some of the Disciples accepted political involvement while others, who were primarily in the South, encouraged non-involvement.

During the Quietist period of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Quakers withdrew from politics, though they had held power in some of the colonies. In their Books of Discipline, they discouraged any involvement in the political arena. Part of the Quaker discipline was obedience to the civil government "except those by which our allegiance to God is interfered with." They defended liberty of conscience as a natural right. Therefore, they advised all members of the Society to refrain from any office of

civil government “the duties of which are inconsistent with our religious principles, or in the exercise of which they may be, or apprehend themselves to be under the necessity of exacting from others any compliances against which they are conscientiously scrupulous.” Quakers were admonished to abstain from voting or promoting anyone for political office.<sup>6</sup>

The Disciples of Christ, unsurprisingly, were split on the issue of political involvement. W.K. Pendleton, who edited the *Millennial Harbinger* with Alexander Campbell, attended the University of Virginia as a young man (from 1836-1840) and looked forward to a bright future in politics. He was an active member of the Whig Party and ran for Congress in 1855. After the Whigs collapsed, Pendleton supported the Constitutional Unionist candidates John Bell and Edward Everett in the election of 1860 and shifted his allegiances to the Democrats thereafter. In 1872, when West Virginia’s constitutional convention met, the state Democrats and Republicans nominated Pendleton to represent them.<sup>7</sup> On behalf of his neighbors from western Virginia, Alexander Campbell was one of ninety-six delegates to go to the Virginia Constitutional Convention in late 1829 and early 1830 and was actively involved in representing the needs of his region.<sup>8</sup> Barton W. Stone and his acolytes, including Tolbert Fanning, believed that Christians should not be involved in civil government. David Lipscomb, a student of Fanning, encouraged widespread political abstinence among the Disciples after the war. With the Quakers, compromise of any doctrine, including not being involved in politics

---

<sup>6</sup> Baltimore Yearly Meeting, *Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends*, 44-45. Similar reproof was given by the Indiana Yearly Meeting, Iowa Yearly Meeting, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, and Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.

<sup>7</sup> West, *Search for the Ancient Order*, 94.

<sup>8</sup> West, *Trials of the Ancient Order*, 42.

or war, could get a person excommunicated from the church. With the Disciples, pacifism was more of a suggestion than a mandate. The Disciples readily left most theological and political issues up to the individual. While some did not, many of the Disciples did have a political affiliation that led them to be involved in political conflicts, such as war.

Ultimately, there were five reasons the Quakers maintained their pacifist doctrine during the Civil War and the Disciples of Christ did not. First, the Society of Friends had established two hundred years before the war a commitment to peace. The Disciples established such a commitment less than two decades before the war and it was not all encompassing. Second, and connected with tradition, education influenced young men in each sect to join the war or to stay out of it. The Quakers had a reputation as pacifists and, for the most part, educated their youth according to those principles. The Disciples did not focus on pacifism nearly as much as they did other topics, so many did not know that their religious beliefs should affect their sectional or political affiliation. Third, while the Quakers were predominantly located in the North, many of the Disciples of Christ lived in the North and the Border States. There were more Disciples than Quakers in the Confederate states. This led to a conflict within the movement beyond whether or not to get involved in the war, but they had to decide which side to support. Socio-cultural mores and traditions prevailed. Fourth, the rigidity of the Quaker's organization allowed them to remain united during and after the war, while the dearth of uniformity among the Disciples led to a permanent split. Finally, the Quakers required their members to stay out of politics. This was another important difference between the Quakers and Disciples of Christ. The Civil War humbled both the Quakers and the Disciples of Christ, but only the Quakers were able to limit its influence.

## REFERENCES

### Primary Sources

#### Periodicals

*The Advocate of Peace*, 1894-1920

*The Christian Baptist*, 1823-1829

*The Christian Messenger*, 1826-1845

*The Christian Pioneer*, 1861-1870. Microfilm.

*The Christian Standard*, 1866-present. Microfilm.

*Colored Tennessean*, 1865-1866

*The Evangelist*, 1832-1835

*The Friend: A Religious and Literary Journal*, 1827-1906

*The Friends' Intelligencer*, 1838-1955

*The Friends' Review*, 1847-1894

*The Gospel Advocate*, 1855-1861, 1866-present. Microfilm.

*Harper's Weekly*, 1857-1916

*Lard's Quarterly*, 1863-1868

*The Millennial Harbinger*, 1830-1870

*New Orleans Daily Creole*, 1856-1857

*New Orleans Tribune*, 1864-1870

*The New York Times*, 1851-present

*The Non-Slaveholder*, 1846-1854

*The North Star*, 1838-1851

#### Government Documents

*Statistics of the United States...in 1860; Compiled from the Original Returns and being the Final Exhibit of the Eighth Census.* 1866. Reprint, New York: Norman Ross Publishing Inc., 1990.

*The Statistics of the Population of the United States...Compiled from the Original Returns of the Ninth Census.* 1872. Reprint, New York: Norman Ross Publishing Inc., 1990.

Department of the Interior, Census Office. *Report on the Statistics of Churches in the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890.* 1894. Reprint, New York: Norman Ross Publishing Inc., 1990.

Department of Commerce and Labor: Bureau of the Census. *Special Reports, Religious Bodies: 1906, Part II Separate Denominations: History, Description, and Statistics.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1910.

#### Published Records and Minutes of Quaker Groups and Organizations

Minutes of the New England Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1847-1865.

Minutes of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting, 1861-1864. Microfilm.

Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Women Friends, 1860-1870.

Minutes of the Western Yearly Meeting (Indiana), 1861-1865.

Baltimore Yearly Meeting. *Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends, Held in Baltimore, for the Western Shore of Maryland, Virginia, and Adjacent Parts of Pennsylvania.* Baltimore: J.B. Rose & Co., 1866.

Indiana Yearly Meeting. *The Discipline of the Society of Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting, Revised by the Meeting Held at White Water, in the Year 1854.* Cincinnati: A. Pugh, 1854.

Iowa Yearly Meeting. *The Discipline of the Society of Friends of Iowa Yearly Meeting.* Chicago: Published for the Society, 1865.

North Carolina Yearly Meeting. *The Discipline of the Society of Friends of North Carolina Yearly Meeting*. Greensboro: Published for the Society, 1870.

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. *Rules of Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends Held in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Printed by Direction of the Representative Committee or Meetings for Sufferings, 1869.

Religious Society of Friends of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting. *Memorial at a Meeting for Sufferings*. Greensboro, NC: Unknown, 1864. Microfilm.

Religious Society of Friends of the Virginia Half-Yearly Meeting. *Memorial to the Legislature of Virginia*. Richmond: G.W. Gary, 1863. Microfilm.

### Books

*The American Christian Record: Containing the History, Confession of Faith, and Statistics of each Religious Denomination in the United States and Europe; A List of All Clergymen with their Post Office Address, Etc., Etc., Etc.* New York: W.R.C. Clark & Meeker, 1860. *Sabin Americana*. Gale, Cengage Learning. Oklahoma State University Library.  
<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY106757670&srchtp=a&ste=14> (accessed October 25, 2012).

Baird, Robert. *State and Prospects of Religion in America; Being a Report Made at the Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, in Paris, August 25<sup>th</sup>*, 1855. London: Edward Suter, Aylott and Co., and Hatchard and Son, 1855. *Sabin Americana*. Gale, Cengage Learning. Oklahoma State University Library.  
<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY101183190&srchtp=a&ste=14> (accessed March 25, 2013).

Belcher, Joseph. *The Religious Denominations in the United States: Their History, Doctrine, Government, and Statistics*. Philadelphia: J.E. Potter, 1854. *Sabin Americana*. Gale, Cengage Learning. Oklahoma State University Library.  
<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY101212826&srchtp=a&ste=14> (accessed March 25, 2013).

Campbell, Alexander. *Popular Lectures and Addresses*. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son, 1863.

----- . *The Christian System*, fourth ed. 1866. Reprint, New York: Arno Press & the New York Times, 1969.

- Cartland, Fernando G. Introduction by Benjamin F. Trueblood. *Southern Heroes or The Friends in War Time*. 1895. Reprint, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1972.
- Clark, Randolph. *Reminiscences: Biographical and Historical*. Wichita Falls, TX: Lee Clark, 1919. *HathiTrust Digital Library*.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/yale.39002008697865>
- Duganne, A. J. H. *The Fighting Quakers, A True Story of the War for Our Union*. New York: J. P. Robens, 1866.
- Dymond, Jonathan. *An Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity, and an Examination of the Philosophical Reasoning by Which it is Defended, with Observations on Some of the Causes of War and on Some of Its Effects*. Philadelphia: I. Ashmead & Co., 1834.
- Fee, John G. *Non-Fellowship with Slaveholders: The Duty of Christians*. New York: John A. Gray, 1855.
- Foster, Ethan. *The Conscript Quakers, Being a Narrative of the Distress and Relief of Four Young Men from the Draft for the War in 1863*. 1883. Reprint, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1972.
- Fox, George, et al. *A Declaration from the Harmless & Innocent People of God, called Quakers, against all plotters and fighters in the world for the removing of the ground of jealousy and suspicion from both magistrates and people in the kingdom concerning wars and fightings, and also something in answer to that clause of the King's late proclamation, which mentions the Quakers, to clear them from the Plot and Fighting, which therein is mentioned, and for the clearing of their innocence*. London: unknown, 1660. *Early English Books*.  
[http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full\\_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=BYID&ID=12131663&FILE=../session/1361302629\\_7698&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var\\_spell.cfg&ECCO=undefined&DISPLAY=AUTHOR&HIGHLIGHT\\_KEYWORD=default](http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=BYID&ID=12131663&FILE=../session/1361302629_7698&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&ECCO=undefined&DISPLAY=AUTHOR&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=default) (accessed February 19, 2013)
- , *The Journal*. Edited by Nigel Smith. 1694. Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1998.
- Garfield, James A. *The Wild Life of the Army: Civil War Letters of James A. Garfield*. Edited by Frederick D. Williams. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1964.
- Goss, Charles C. *Statistical History of the First Century of American Methodism: With a Summary of the Origin and Present Operations of Other Denominations*. New



York: Carlton & Porter, 1866. Hathi Trust Digital Library.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/dul1.ark:/13960/t8ff49s7f> (accessed March 4, 2013).

Hayward, John. *The Book of Religions, Comprising the Views, Creeds, Sentiments, or Opinions, of all the Principal Religious Sects in the World, Particularly of All Christian Denominations in Europe and America; To Which are Added Church and Missionary Statistics, Together with Biographical Sketches*. Boston: Sanborn, Carter, Bazin and Company, 1857. *Sabin Americana*. Gale, Cengage Learning. Oklahoma State University Library.  
<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY111656454&srchtp=a&ste=14> (accessed March 7, 2013).

Lipscomb, David. *Civil Government: Its Origin, Mission, and Destiny, and the Christian's Relation To It*. 1889. Reprint, Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1957.

Pillsbury, Parker. *The Church as It Is, Or, the Forlorn Hope of Slavery*. Boston: A. Forbes, 1847.

Pringle, Cyrus. *The Civil War Diary of Cyrus Pringle*. Foreword by Henry J. Cadbury. Lebanon, PA: Sowers Printing Company, 1962.

Richardson, Robert. *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell Embracing a View of the Origin, Progress and Principles of the Religious Reformation which he Advocated*. Cincinnati: R.W. Carroll & Co., Publishers, 1872.

Rose, Victor M. *Ross' Texas Brigade: Being a Narrative of Events Connected with its Service in the Late War Between the States*. 1881. Reprint, Kennesaw, GA: Continental Book Company, 1960.

Shannon, James. *The Philosophy of Slavery, as Identified with the Philosophy of Human Happiness; an Essay*. Frankfort, KY: A.G. Hodges & Co., 1849.

----- *An Address Delivered before the Pro-Slavery Convention of the State of Missouri...on Domestic Slavery*. St. Louis: Printed at the Republican Book and Job Office, 1855.

Smedley, Charles. *A Pennsylvania Quaker in Andersonville: The Diary of Charles Smedley*. Foreword by James Durkin. 1865. Reprint, Glenside, PA: J. Michael Santarelli Publishing, 1995.

Srygley, F.D. *Seventy Years in Dixie: Recollections and Sayings of T.W. Caskey and Others*. 1891. Reprint, Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1954.

Stone, Barton W., and John Rogers. *The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone*. 1847. Reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1972.

## Secondary Sources

### Books

Barbour, Hugh, and J. William Frost. *The Quakers*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Barney, William L. *Battleground for the Union: The Era of the Civil War and Reconstruction, 1848-1877*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1990.

Brewster, Ben. *Torn Asunder: The Civil War and the 1906 Division of the Disciples*. Joplin, MO: College Press Publishing Company, 2006.

Brinsfield, John W., William C. Davis, Benedict Maryniak, and James I. Robertson, Jr., eds. *Faith in the Fight: Civil War Chaplains*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2003.

Brinton, Howard. *Friends for 300 Years: The History and Beliefs of the Society of Friends since George Fox Started the Quaker Movement*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.

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

-----, *The Quaker Peace Testimony, 1660-1914*. New York: Syracuse University Press, Inc., 1990.

Buhl, Marjorie Carter. "James Webb Throckmorton." In *Ten More Texans in Gray*, edited by W.C. Nunn, 169-186. Hillsboro, TX: Hill Jr. College Press, 1980.

Carwardine, Richard J. *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Casey, Michael W. *The Battle over Hermeneutics in the Stone-Campbell Movement, 1800-1870*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998.

-----, and Douglas A. Foster, eds. *The Stone-Campbell Movement: An International Religious Tradition*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2002.

Conkin, Paul Keith. *Cane Ridge, America's Pentecost*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.

- Crothers, A. Glenn. *Quakers Living in the Lion's Mouth: The Society of Friends in Northern Virginia, 1730-1865*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012.
- Davis, David Brion. *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- DeGroot, A.T. *Disciple Thought: A History*. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University, 1965.
- Foster, Douglas A., and Anthony L. Dunnivant, eds. *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2004.
- Gallagher, Gary. *The Confederate War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Garrison, Winfred Ernest, and Alfred T. DeGroot. *The Disciples of Christ: A History*. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1948.
- Gaustad, Edwin S., and Leigh E. Schmidt. *The Religious History of America*, rev. ed. New York: HarperCollins, 2004.
- Goen, C.C. *Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the American Civil War*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Gray, Joe D. *Unity in the Midst of Slavery and War: Churches of Christ, 1800-1870*. Winona, MS: J.C. Choate Publications, 1982.
- Hale, Douglas. *The Third Texas Cavalry in the Civil War*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.
- Hall, Colby D. *Texas Disciples*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1953.
- Hamm, Thomas D. *The Quakers in America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.
- Harrell, David Edwin. *Quest for a Christian America: The Disciples of Christ and American Society to 1866*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003.
- Hickey, Damon D. *Sojourners No More: The Quakers in the New South, 1865-1920*. Greensboro: North Carolina Friends Historical Society and North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1997.
- Hill, Samuel S., and Charles H. Lippy, eds. *Encyclopedia of Religion in the South*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2005.

- Hughes, Richard T. *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996.
- Ingle, H. Larry. *First Among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Johnson, Paul E. *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837*. 1978. Reprint, New York: Hill and Wang, 2004.
- Jordan, Ryan P. *Slavery and the Meetinghouse: The Quakers and the Abolitionist Dilemma, 1820-1865*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- Leach, Jack Franklin. *Conscription in the United States: Historical Background*. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle Publishing Company, 1952.
- McPherson, James M, and James K. Hogue. *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- Merriman, John. *A History of Modern Europe: From the Renaissance to the Age of Napoleon* Vol. 1, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010.
- Murch, James DeForest. *Christians Only: A History of the Restoration Movement*. Cincinnati, OH: Standard Pub., 1962.
- Nelson, Jacquelyn S. *Indiana Quakers Confront the Civil War*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1991.
- Noll, Mark A. *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992.
- , *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Paludan, Phillip Shaw. *A People's Contest: The Union and Civil War, 1861-1865*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996.
- Rable, George C. *God's Almost Chosen Peoples: A Religious History of the American Civil War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Schlissel, Lillian, ed. *Conscience in America: A Documentary History of Conscientious Objection in America, 1757-1967*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1968.
- Shannon, Fred Albert. *The Organization and Administration of the Union Army, 1861-1865* vol. 1. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1928.

- . *The Organization and Administration of the Union Army, 1861-1865*, vol. 2. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1928.
- Singletary, Otis A. *The Mexican War*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Smith, Timothy L. *Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Stevenson, Dwight E. *Walter Scott, Voice of the Golden Oracle: A Biography*. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1946.
- Stout, Harry S. *Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the American Civil War*. New York: Viking Penguin, 2006.
- Wasson, W.W. *James A. Garfield: His Religion and Education: A Study in the Religious and Educational Thought and Activity of an American Statesman*. Nashville: Tennessee Book Company, 1952.
- Webb, Henry E. *In Search of Christian Unity: A History of the Restoration Movement*, rev. ed. Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2003.
- Weeks, Stephen B. *Southern Quakers and Slavery*. 1896. Reprint, New York: Bergman Publishers, 1968.
- West, Earl Irvin. *The Search for the Ancient Order: A History of the Restoration Movement, 1849-1906* vol. 1 (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1957).
- . *The Trials of the Ancient Order, 1844-1865* (Germantown, TN: Religious Book Service, 1993).
- Wiley, Bell I. *The Common Soldier of the Civil War*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.
- Wills, Gary. *Head and Heart: American Christianities*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2007.
- Wright, Edward Needles. *Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War*. 1931. Reprint, New York: A.S. Barnes & Company, Inc., 1961.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

## Articles

- Burke, James L., and Donald E. Bensch. "Mount Pleasant and the Early Quakers of Ohio." *Ohio History* 83 no. 4 (December 1974): 220-255.
- Connerley, Jennifer. "Fighting Quakers: A Jet Black Whiteness." *Pennsylvania History* 73 no. 4 (Autumn 2006): 373-411.
- Currey, Cecil B. "The Devolution of Quaker Pacifism: A Kansas Case Study, 1860-1955." *Kansas History* 6 (Summer 1983): 120-133.
- Hamm, Thomas D., Margaret Marconi, Gretchen Kleinhenn Salinas, and Benjamin Whitman. "The Decline of Quaker Pacifism in the Twentieth Century: Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends as a Case Study." *Indiana Magazine of History* 96 no. 1 (March 2000): 45-71.
- Watts, Craig M. "Campbell's Pacifism and Relations with the State." *Encounter* 66 No. 2 (Spring 2005): 107-128.
- West, Earl Irvin. "Some Notes on the Activities of the Churches of Christ in the U.S. during the Civil War." *The Restoration Quarterly* 6 (1962): 122-125.

#### Unpublished Material

- Elrod, Mark Alan. "The Churches of Christ and the "War Question": The Influence of Church Journals." PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 1995.
- Howes, Nathan David. "A House Divided: The Millennial Harbinger and the American Civil War." MA thesis, Pepperdine University, 2006.
- Pope, Jesse Curtis. "The Restoration Ideal in American Religious Thought." PhD diss., The Florida State University, 1990.
- Tuck, Darin A. "The Battle Cry for Peace: The Leadership of the Disciples of Christ Movement during the American Civil War, 1861-1865." MA thesis, Kansas State University, 2010.

VITA

Andrew Benjamin Smith

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: AMERICAN PACIFISM: THE QUAKERS, THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST,  
AND THE CIVIL WAR

Major Field: American History

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Master of Arts in History at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 2013.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in History at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 2011.

Experience:

Teaching Assistant, 2011 – 2013, Oklahoma State University

Professional Memberships:

Phi Alpha Theta