

Denomination and Dissent: Benjamin Franklin Haynes and the Travails of Methodist Identity, 1885-1925

by

Andrew James Wood

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 6, 2016

Keywords: Tennessee, Prohibition, Holiness, Church of the Nazarene, Episcopacy, Newspapers

Copyright 2016 by Andrew James Wood

Approved by

Charles Israel, Chair, Associate Professor of History
Adam Jortner, Associate Professor of History
Kenneth Noe, Draughton Professor of Southern History

Abstract

This dissertation explores the themes of denomination and dissent in two related denominations, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (MECS), and the Church of the Nazarene, using the life of Benjamin Franklin Haynes. A prominent clergy leader in both denominations, Haynes rose rapidly as a favored son in the MECS before being drawn into conflict with bishops over politics, preachers' rights, and, later, holiness doctrines. Haynes and his fellow MECS clergy of the Tennessee Conference were ardent prohibition advocates who dissented from sectional and MECS norms that eschewed clergy involvement in politics and articulated exalted privileges for MECS bishops over clergy. Haynes became the editor of the conference's dissenting newspaper, the *Tennessee Methodist*, which defended clergy labor rights and reputations and employed the dissenting language and rhetoric of 'low-church' or 'Country' Methodism. 'High church' or 'Court' opponents reacted firmly, and increasingly denied even the right of dissent, which they labeled 'ensoriousness' and 'disloyalty.' Dissenters labeled their Court opponents 'critics of criticism.' These conflicts, and those over holiness advocacy, eventually resulted in Haynes's exit from the MECS. Among Nazarenes, Haynes became editor of the connectional organ, the *Herald of Holiness*. There he became the voice of the Nazarene center, supporting its episcopal offices, the general superintendents, and defending its connectionalism inherited from mainline Methodism.

This study proposes a different context for understanding the holiness schism in Methodism, highlights the vital importance of southern Methodists' polity traditions for

understanding southern Methodists' political behaviors, explores overlooked portions of the 1890s MECS crisis over polity, details in far greater depth the efforts of one of the South's most important late nineteenth century religious and political dissenters whose work symbolized, inspired, and encouraged a wide range of other dissenters, and provides a new way of understanding the early character, and later history, of the largest of the holiness denominations by establishing its intimate inheritance in terms of Methodist polity. It also provides a high-profile case of religious mobility, the movement in or out of a religious body, a generally understudied aspect of American religion.

Acknowledgments

Writing a Ph.D. dissertation in the humanities entails a staggering personal and professional investment. We authors could never have completed, or even attempted, that task without great help and provision. Family, friends, professors, colleagues, and others have counseled, coached, and encouraged me. In a few cases, our aid was mutual. But the debt owed to most of them will only be repaid by helping others. To my parents who embodied intellectual and personal virtue, and whose support was relentless, thank you. My dad's engaging mind was my textbook, my mother's joyful ethic my compass. To my admirable partner, thank you. My completed dissertation is but one of her many achievements. Thanks to her, our beloved children are already leaving their own mark. To my advisor, Charles Israel, thank you. He allowed me to opine and argue my way into better insights and rebuked me when I was not thinking for myself. He modeled curiosity, openness to new ideas, and steadfast personal grace. He demanded excellence, yet guided me without a harsh word or discouraging comment. I worked hard to meet his standards, but I never knew fear. It has not always been an easy journey, but it has been a good one. For that, I am truly thankful.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1	31
Chapter 2.....	71
Chapter 3.....	111
Chapter 4.....	161
Chapter 5.....	236
Chapter 6.....	274
Chapter 7.....	335
Chapter 8.....	395
Chapter 9.....	435
Conclusion	482
Bibliography	495

Introduction

Religious denominations have founding myths, the ideas, values, and conceptions that indicate the shape of their internal identity and sense of common ground and common cause. Those ideals become the rhetorical basis for what naturally follows a founding era, a process of negotiation and renegotiation over the precise meaning, proper enacting, and relative value of the founding ideals themselves. In other words, denominations have ‘origins’ and they have ‘histories.’ The process of working out the relationship between those original ideals and later historical developments, necessarily, invariably, and naturally involves dissent, and often a dissent specifically tied to divergent memories of denominational origins. Religious traditions, then, are living arguments both with themselves and with the world. This project will show that dissent-abundant process in two separate denominations that are related to one another by both their originating ideals and by their later histories. It will do so through the lens of the life, writings, and professional activities of Tennessean Benjamin Franklin Haynes, a prominent leader in both of these Methodist or Wesleyan denominations, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, (MECS) and the Church of the Nazarene.¹

¹ On denominationalism generally, see Robert Bruce Mullin and Russell E. Richey, eds., *Reimagining Denominationalism: Interpretive Essays* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994). For an argument for the ongoing importance of southern denominations, see Wayne Flynt, “The Persistence of Evangelical Denominationalism in the South and the Case for Denominational History: Alabama Baptists,” in *Religion in the Contemporary South: Changes, Continuities, and Contexts*, ed. Corrie E. Norman and Don S. Armentrout (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2005). Keith Harper’s introduction to his edited collection on denominational history recalls Mullin and Richey’s charge that denominational historians were to blame for the decline of denominational history among mainstream historians. First, they are too insular being written by insiders for insiders and are thus shaped by the need to tell a providential history of the denomination’s past. Secondly, they fail to place denominational stories in their various social and historical contexts. In addition, denominations have been too often understood as monolithic, united and uniform entities. Their actual histories may be more like a coalition, as with major political parties, with continual definition and redefinition of identity, leadership and mission. Keith Harper, “Introduction,” in Keith Harper, ed. *American Denominational History: Perspectives on the Past, Prospects for the Future* (Tuscaloosa: the University of Alabama Press, 2008). pp. 1-6. For an intellectual study of evangelical Protestantism in the early twentieth century, see George Marsden, *Fundamentalism in*

People such as Haynes (1851–1923), whose career revolved around denominational identity and intra-denominational dissent as a highly-visible and well-connected leader in two denominations, provide a distinctive window through which to view the theme of denomination and dissent. An MECS clergyman from 1873 until 1911, Haynes had as distinguished and influential a career within Methodism as any of the Methodist holiness “come outers” who found their way into the Church of the Nazarene. Haynes served prominent pastoral appointments throughout Middle Tennessee, most notably the prestigious McKendree Station in Nashville, and served as a presiding elder and conference secretary on the Tennessee Conference. Over a thirty-four year period, his contemporaries elected him six times to represent them at the highest Methodist quadrennial meetings, twice to MECS General Conferences, and four times to the Nazarene equivalent, the General Assembly. Haynes authored four books and served almost twenty years as an editor of leading church papers, including the *Tennessee Methodist* and its successors from 1891 through 1900. For five years it was the official organ of the Tennessee Conference. As a presiding elder and then editor, Haynes played a key role in the 1890 dispute between Bishop Robert Hargrove and Rev. David C. Kelley over prohibition and church law, the 1896 debates over holiness in Tennessee, and in the exposing of the MECS war claim scandal involving the United States Senate in 1898. For seven years he served in college presidencies at Martin Female College, Asbury College, and Olivet (Nazarene) College. From 1912 until 1922,

American Culture, 2nd edition. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). The features of Methodist denominationalism have often been overshadowed by Baptist and Presbyterian features in narratives about evangelicalism. After her review of Methodist historiography, Jennifer L. Woodruff-Tait wrote of “Future Directions.” She asks “How do modern polity controversies on social issues like homosexuality relate to earlier ones? How does Methodism relate to the rise of twentieth-century fundamentalism and evangelicalism, a development often explained from a more ‘Presbygational’ perspective?” Jennifer L. Woodruff-Tait, “‘Everything Arose Just as the Occasion Offered’: Defining Methodist Identity through the History of Methodist Polity,” in Keith Harper, ed. *American Denominational History: Perspectives on the Past, Prospects for the Future* (Tuscaloosa: the University of Alabama Press, 2008). p. 111.

he was the founding editor of the Nazarenes' central organ, the *Herald of Holiness*.²

But the full impact of Haynes's life work cannot be grasped from his resume. Having once declared that "a man should magnify his office and not the office the man," Haynes's official labors were amplified by his unrelenting concern for righteousness and justice in the church, in social and economic relationships, and in affairs of state. A person of tremendous moral courage who announced "I have never been able to believe that man was made to fear or be feared," Haynes protested injustices wherever he perceived them, acts that made his reputation with some and wrecked it with others. Personally acknowledged as a sweet-spirited and cultured man whose theological and devotional commentary was generally gracious, affirmative, and encouraging, he said of himself, "my life has been simply one of protest... my voice and pen have been kept busy in dissent." Historians writing in several fields have noted his

² True to their pietist roots, Methodists valued revival, renewal, and vital piety. They laid strong emphasis on experience of divine grace, leading to an emphasis on sanctification, the restoration of the divine image, and living a holy life. They shared with other Protestants justification by grace through faith, interpreting that experience through the lens of Arminian doctrine (God's grace is freely available for all, the death of Jesus atoned for the sins of all, human persons are enabled by God's grace to freely choose faith). Organizationally, they affirmed episcopal government (bishops provide supervision and direct efforts), itinerant ministry (clergy travel from church to church by appointment of bishop), and the connectional system (Methodist life is viewed cooperative, fraternal, and relational). Presiding Elders – today called District Superintendents – served in a middle management role, answering to the bishop but supervising the work of ten to twenty pastors. Methodism utilized a connectional system that attempts to balance oversight with freedom and encourage cooperation and conference at all levels of the church. The structure of the MECS was "based on geographical annual conferences, composed of preachers, which met yearly. Bishops, who presided at annual conferences, assigned preachers. Every four years annual conferences sent delegates to a General Conference, which established denominational policies" and elected bishops. Nancy Andersen, "Cooperation for Social Betterment: Missions and Progressives in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1894-1921.," Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1999., 18. Perhaps the best single overview of MECS characteristics is the classic primer Hilary T. Hudson, *The Methodist Armor; Or, A Popular Exposition of the Doctrines, Peculiar Usages, and Ecclesiastical Machinery of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1882). Several historians have helped craft an understanding of Methodist preachers and conferences, including Haynes and his relationship to the Tennessee Conference. Those historians include the official historiographers of the Tennessee Conference, Cullen T. Carter, John Abernathy Smith, and Von Unruh. Douglas Meeks and Dennis Dickerson, professors at Vanderbilt University, also provided invaluable insight into core features of the Methodist tradition. Books by Russ Richey, John Wigger, and Beth Barton Schweiger also shaped my understanding of nineteenth century Methodist clergy and conference relationships.

prominence as an archetypal religious and political dissenter.³

But it will be the content of his dissent, the arguments themselves, which will be explored, rather than questions of biography or personality. The debates were serious, and the issues debated of enduring importance. Therefore, this dissertation concentrates on two periods when denominational dissent proved particularly important for shaping later denominational identities. In the first period, 1885–1900, the MECS experienced a crisis of piety and order. This portion will focus on events in Middle Tennessee, where Haynes and the denominational center were located, and where aspects of the MECS story have not been explored. In the second period, 1912–1922, the relatively new Church of the Nazarene underwent considerable turmoil and change. Perhaps not surprisingly, the two eras coincide with the years when Haynes’s influence and stature in the two denominations was at its height.⁴

Histories of late nineteenth century Methodism generally focus on the holiness movement and holiness controversy. But the Methodist Episcopal Church (MEC) and Methodist Episcopal

³ Quotations from Haynes’s autobiography, B. F. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed on Methodist Seas; or, A Sketch of My Life* (Louisville, Ky: Pentecostal Publishing Company, 1921), 39-40, 257. Haynes figures prominently in several key works in these fields, including official denominational histories, studies of southern religion and politics, and studies of doctrinal views within the holiness movement. Cf. Timothy L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness, The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962), Charles A. Israel, *Before Scopes: Evangelicalism, Education and Evolution in Tennessee, 1870-1925* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004), and Joe L. Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause: Southern White Evangelicals and the Prohibition Movement* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2007). An outstanding work on the southern holiness movement that takes Haynes and others like him quite seriously is Randall J. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008). For Haynes, see particularly chapter 4, “Signs of the Second Coming.” Cf., Paul Bassett, “Culture and Concupiscence: The Changing Definition of Sanctity in the Wesleyan Holiness Movement, 1867-1920,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 28:1, 2 (Spring-Fall 1993), 59-127. Haynes had direct connections to several notable religious and political personalities of the era, including Sam Jones, Frances Willard, Rebecca Latimer Felton, Warren A. Candler, D. C. Kelley, E. M. Bounds, J. O. McClurkan, E. Stanley Jones, H. C. Morrison, and W. B. Godbey. E. Stanley Jones, the famous holiness Methodist and missionary, was an undergraduate at Asbury College during Haynes’ tenure as president.

⁴ The essential single source studies of these periods in these churches include Hunter Dickinson Farish, *The Circuit Rider Dismounts: A Social History of Southern Methodism, 1865-1900* (Richmond: Dietz Press, 1938), and Timothy Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, and Floyd Cunningham, ed., with Stan Ingersol, Harold E. Raser, and David P. Whitelaw, *Our Watchword and Song: The Centennial History of the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 2009).

Church, South (MECS), experienced wider internal dissent in this era. In the MECS, that crisis of piety and order involved--but did not equal--a crisis over the holiness revival and competing theologies of sanctification. Historians have underappreciated the fact that conflicts over political activity and disputes over church polity were also major elements. Yet political and polity crises were especially fierce in Tennessee. In the 1890s, forceful intra-denominational dissent shook “the connection,” Methodists’ affective term for their church and the system of relationships that held it together. Church-wide, these debates were simultaneous, related, and mutually-reinforcing, but can be distinguished from one another. While social and political aspects were involved, the matters debated struck to the core of MECS denominational identity and public reputation. Primary conversation partners that suggested the wider political and church polity context include Haynes himself, and historians Joe Coker, Charles Israel, Joe Creech, Kathleen Minnix, Stan Ingersol, Cullen T. Carter, and John Abernathy Smith.⁵

Two “connectional” offices, bishops and the editors of church papers, played particularly decisive roles in defining, shaping, fighting, provoking, and concentrating dissent during this crisis of piety and order in the MECS. No pastor of a single congregation, no matter how large, wealthy, or prestigious, could match the combined influence, power, and reach of Methodist episcopacy or the editor of Methodism’s “connectional” or “central organ,” the official and denomination-wide Nashville *Christian Advocate* (NCA).

Historian James Kirby has argued that the MECS conceived and practiced a distinct form of episcopacy, and the particular aspects of the approach played a large role in this crisis. The

⁵ Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause*, Israel, *Before Scopes*, Joe Creech, *Righteous Indignation: Religion and the Populist Revolution*. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006), and Kathleen Minnix, *Laughter in the Amen Corner: The Life of Evangelist Sam Jones*. (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1993), and Robert Stanley Ingersol, “The Burden of Dissent: Mary Lee Cagle and the Southern Holiness Movement,” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1989). Cullen T. Carter, *History of the Tennessee Conference*. (Nashville: 1948). John Abernathy Smith, *Cross and Flame: Two Centuries of United Methodism in Tennessee*. (Nashville: Commission on Archives and History of the Tennessee Conference, 1984).

two largest bodies of Episcopal Methodism, the MEC and MECS traditions, had an episcopacy understood as an ‘itinerant general superintendency,’ bishops who travelled and had jurisdiction throughout the connection. In the ME churches, unlike most forms of episcopacy, there were no localized potentates, no restricted jurisdictions, and no ‘diocesan episcopacy.’ But compared to the MEC, MECS bishops operated with a higher claim to power, and embraced a stronger, nearly infallible, episcopal model. They were to be *brilliant, firm, and autocratic*. That strong or high episcopal model had its origins in the firmness of founding American bishop Frances Asbury. The 1844 split with the MEC vitally shaped it. Northern Methodist preachers, inspired by abolitionism and less literal readings of scripture, had challenged the legitimacy of a bishop who held slaves by marriage, and effectively denied him the rights and privileges of both his lifetime election and due process. The charge was not a legal charge under ME law in 1844. The bishop had been assaulted, as the southerners and other episcopal conservatives saw it, because the General Conference had embraced a political faith and increasingly heretical theology.

Thus in MECS self-understanding – its original myth – the southern denomination had three core marks that distinguished it from the MEC. The MECS was a *spiritual*, not a political, church. It was to stay out of politics, a story explored in chapters 1, 2, and 3. The MECS was an *episcopal* church, not a church that could be overrun by radical or reckless preachers swayed by democratic sentiment, a story detailed in chapters 3, 4, and 5. Finally, it was a *theologically conservative* church that would remain orthodox and vigilant against heretical influences (especially from New England and Europe), and against the cacophony of heterodoxy generally, a story told in chapters 5, 6, and 7. But that trio of spiritual not political, episcopal not radical, and conservative not heretical, concentrated enormous power in the hands of the bishops themselves. The MECS ideal was a passionately evangelical and well-ordered church, its order

maintained, secured, and enforced by episcopal will. The bishops alone could protect the laity from clergy tempted to stray from these core marks. Yet in the late 1880s and 1890s, many preachers did stray, boldly and directly challenging the core denominational identity of the MECS as compared to the MEC, as a non-political, non-radical or democratic, and non-heretical or heterodox church.⁶

Kirby, writing about the “‘itinerant, general superintendency’ of episcopal Methodism,” notes that through the nearly one hundred years (1844–1939) of separate development between the post-split MEC and the MECS, different notions of episcopal prerogative existed. In the post-split northern MEC, “bishops were considered to be officers of the General Conference, serving at its pleasure.” MECS leaders saw that the northern MEC imagined a “strong” General Conference “directing an episcopacy...to be shaped in literally hundreds of ways to meet changing circumstances.” In sharp contrast, the founders of MECS identity framed it “in defense of the ‘Asburian’ ideal of episcopacy as a co-equal branch of church government” with the General Conference. Kirby tells a history of Methodist episcopacy in its “inexorable march away from ‘itinerant, general superintendency’ toward diocesan and localized episcopacy,” most notably through the 1939 merger that transformed Methodist episcopacy “more than any single act in Methodist history.” Thus, the story of mainline Methodist episcopacy in America is a story

⁶ James E. Kirby, *Episcopacy in American Methodism*. (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 2000). Because of the unique issues at stake in the 1844 split, the southern branch of Methodism would view conference, “the body of preachers” in this case, as the progressive or radical element in church life. Bishops would come to symbolize conservatism. Thus, MECS identity formed around strongly valuing unity and locating unity, not in the body of preachers symbolized in the conference and conceived of as potentially radical and schismatic, but in the bishops who protected the whole by keeping the schismatic radicalism of clergy labor in check. If Asbury himself would symbolize the high tide of episcopal power within Methodism and 1844 the high tide of conference power, the MECS would build its identity around “defending the Asburian Ark” (the church protected by episcopal authority). In such a context, with an aggressive, radical MEC conference full of abolitionist, women’s advocates, and holiness leaders, and recalling the O’Kelly schism that resulted in Republican Methodism, MECS identity would take an ironic position in the land of Jefferson and Jackson, fearing popular republican unrest from the clergy far more than it would abuses of episcopal power. Autocracy in this case did not place “the clergy” over the laity, but a clerical elite, the episcopacy, over “the clergy.”

before and after 1844, and pre- and post-1939.⁷

But before 1939, the MEC modeled a strong conference and a weak episcopacy, while in theory the MECS modeled co-equal conference and episcopacy. But many observers, including later historians such as J. Hamby Barton, noted that the southern episcopacy tended to go well beyond equality in its defense of what Kirby labels “the Asburian Ark.” Barton noted that in the South, “the episcopacy was an aristocracy providing independent leadership for the church. In the North, the republican sentiments of a great middle class church culminated in the General Conference which employed the episcopacy as the chief administrative instrument.” In practice, southern high episcopacy stood as a bulwark against fears of a reckless conference. The most common declared duty of MECS bishops was to “strengthen and protect the itinerant system.” But in their origins and functional practice, MECS bishops’ most vital role often was to protect the office of bishop itself. Kirby declares that the powers of MECS bishops were “enhanced and embellished until [they] became the most powerful in the history of episcopal Methodism.” It became so extreme that a western editor would rejoice at the news Bishop Atticus Greene Haygood was coming out west, praising the “severe wit,” of the “pointed and brusque” man who was “always ready for a tilt” and “thickest in the fight, and seldom hit.”⁸

⁷ Kirby, *Episcopacy in American Methodism*, 9-11. Elected to serve with Asbury in 1808, Bishop McKendree – well-loved in the western conferences (west of the Appalachian mountains), including Tennessee – altered Asbury’s practice in the matter of appointments. Asbury always made the appointments himself without consultation. McKendree refused to do this, and instituted the practice of meeting with the presiding elders to receive their input. The appointing power remained with the bishop – but consultation was the McKendree way, if it had not, in fact, been the “Asburian” one. McKendree also instituted the episcopal address at General Conference in 1812; when he did this, it surprised the senior Asbury, who rebuked McKendree from the floor for introducing an innovation. McKendree replied “you are our *father*, we are your sons; you never have had need of it. I am only a *brother*, and have need of it.” Asbury grinned and sat down. The episcopal address has been a feature of every General Conference since. Kirby, *Episcopacy*, 79-80.

⁸ Kirby, *Episcopacy*, 144. 164-166. Minnix, *Laughter in the Amen Corner*, 153. The *Encyclopedia of World Methodism* account of Bishop H. C. Morrison – not his contemporary, the Kentucky evangelist and Asbury College supporter, also Henry Clay Morrison – “he belonged among those awe-inspiring Southern Methodist bishops whose fiat made law in the conferences over which they presided; and who had no doubts as the rectitude of their

The widespread sense that late nineteenth century dissent in society generally, and within the MECS specifically, was becoming increasingly chaotic and impudent reinforced, strengthened, and enabled the power the MECS granted its bishops, and the autocratic actions that often went with it. Perhaps most ominously, that dissent also seemed abundantly political, radical, and heretical. The situation called for more than a defense of the MECS. It called for an offensive war to eliminate politicized, radicalized, and heterodox internal MECS dissent. The bishops and their allies in journalism and leading pulpits, as well as prominent laity, responded by calling for, and carrying out, a massive fratricide. While similar events occurred in the MEC, the southern distinctive was the extreme intensity and harshness of the crackdown against internal dissent. MEC leaders mistreated and showed occasional flashes of displeasure toward MEC dissenters sufficient to provoke an exit or change in behavior. In other words, the aims were often corrective or disciplinary. But MECS leaders relentlessly mocked, pummeled, crushed, and finally expelled MECS dissenters, ideally after their finances and their reputations were destroyed.⁹

The reasons for this greater anxiety about dissent return to sectional history. Certainly a series of political movements were threatening to the Democratic Party, the anchor of political order in the South, and the party of choice for elite leadership in the MECS. But the MECS leadership believed that MEC malice and efforts to destroy the MECS during the Civil War and Reconstruction period had never gone away. MECS leadership generally understood the Civil

convictions.” Bishop Morrison was elected in 1898. Nolan B. Harmon, ed., *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, (Nashville: United Methodist Publishing House, 1974) 1675.

⁹ For the wider and closely related dissenting movements and voices in the late nineteenth century South, see Briane K. Turley, *A Wheel Within A Wheel: Southern Methodism and the Georgia Holiness Association* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1999), Edward Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), and Christopher H. Owen, *The Sacred Flame of Love: Methodism and Society in Nineteenth-Century Georgia*. (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1998).

War to have been an offensive religious war fomented by religious radicalism so recklessly violent that it had Boston housewives writing disturbing ‘battle hymns’ featuring God at war with lines about terrible swift swords, righteous sentences, judgment seats, crushing of serpents, trampling grapes of wrath, and a fiery gospel writ in burnished rows of steel. Many MECS leaders – taking their cues from some particularly vigilant bishops – interpreted the rising energies of third-party prohibition and suffrage activity; attacks on episcopal leadership, character, and prerogative; and the rising tide of the holiness revival to be omens of a renewed MEC war against the survival and integrity of the MECS. There were good reasons for this view. Third party prohibition and woman suffrage *were* visibly led by northern MEC figures, most notably Frances Willard. The holiness movement *was* dominated by northern MEC clergy, and had been strongest in upstate New York and New England, where ties between abolitionism and holiness advocacy had been abundant. Attacks on episcopal power had been steady features of MEC internal polity debates, and when third-party prohibitionists, suffragists, woman preachers, holiness advocates, and critics and mockers of MECS bishops appeared in the mid-1880s, many MECS hardliners believed denominational survival required a swift and brutal crackdown.¹⁰

As with other denominations and organizations, MECS conflicts occurred within a system of relationships and customs. The united ministry of the MECS, combining the laity, clergy, and episcopacy, might be seen as a steep pyramid. A booming denomination of perhaps 1.2 million members in 1889, it had about 4300 active itinerant elders (clergy) organized into 42 geographical annual conferences, presided over by 10 bishops. The Tennessee Conference had

¹⁰ For MECS anxiety in this period, and its origins in MEC rivalry, see Farish, *Circuit Rider Dismounts*, Turley, *Wheel Within a Wheel*, Owen, *Sacred Flame of Love*, and Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*.

roughly 60,000 members, with perhaps 150 travelling preachers, representing a layer above that of lay preachers or local preachers, who were roughly equal in number to full-time clergy. Of that 150 ‘rank and file’ who were themselves members of an elite, perhaps some 20-25 occupied larger pulpits and presiding elder posts. They represented the top leadership of the conference. Generally above these men at the conference level were 40 to 50 individuals in positions with high visibility around the denomination – editors, college presidents, and department heads/secretaries. Divinity faculty at various schools, especially Vanderbilt, also held high place. Given the elective habits in the MECS that increasingly favored editors, educators, and department heads over pastors and presiding elders, that small group generally constituted the group from which bishops usually would come. The MECS also generally preferred to keep its college of bishops as small as possible, the smallest number that could handle the job, so as to maintain episcopal power for the sake of denominational unity.¹¹

In 1873, a twenty-two year old B. F. Haynes joined that connectional system. Information on Haynes’s early life primarily comes from his autobiography, *Tempest-Tossed on Methodist Seas*, written around 1906, published in 1914, expanded in 1920, and published again in 1921. Haynes was born in Williamson County, Tennessee on October 31, 1851 to a slaveholding family of publishers who lived in the county-seat town of Franklin. Haynes’s

¹¹ Each of the annual conferences had their own story, and those distinct histories within a sectional denomination reflect sub-regional experiences – not quite local and provincial as none of the conferences were that small, but still intimate. In the light of this pyramid, the stresses within Methodist republicanism – Methodists’ struggles with dissent and the ordering of their system – show. Given the stress on fraternity and conference – *affective* terms for Methodists – among the 4300 itinerants bound together in sticks of c. 150, the importance of agreement for Methodists was obvious. But the southern refraction of these themes viewed fraternity and conference *through the lens of episcopacy*. To view fraternity and conference as co-equal to episcopacy in some sort of dialectic was relatively dangerous for southern Methodists. The chain of order, prerogative, and authority needed to be stable and secure, and thus MECS polity placed enormous power in the hands of those at very top. It is little wonder that the social reform aspects of Methodism had often been tied to republican-styled Methodism (Free Methodists, Wesleyan Methodists and abolitionists generally were known for a “weaker” episcopacy than northern Methodism generally) or Methodists less inhibited by a professional hierarchy (most notably, Methodist women and lay preachers).

grandfather, Mark L. Andrews, was a local Methodist preacher, and thus technically a layman, not an itinerant elder/member of conference subject to episcopal appointment. With freedom to choose location and profession, Andrews, a slaveholder, served as the circuit court clerk in Franklin for thirty-four years. It was said he married and buried more people than anyone in the county. Haynes's father, Natus J. Haynes, held slaves as well. B. F. Haynes maintained that his grandfather and parents were especially kind to their slaves. A faithful attender of Methodist Sunday school, prayer meeting, and preaching services, the young Haynes recalled being inspired both by his grandfather's daily household prayers and bible-reading, and by the songs his "dear old Aunt Nancy," a household servant and "my old colored nurse," would sing as she labored. A woman with her own children to worry about, her songs, Haynes recalled, were like "prayers" that "breathed most pathetically the sorrows of slavery and the sighs of the enslaved for freedom." Despite his parents' loyalty to "the Southern Confederacy," Haynes credited Nancy for what he called his own childhood abolitionism, and for the formation of "my political and my religious views and character."¹²

B. F. Haynes was almost ten when the Civil War began. Growing poverty and Confederate defeats forced the Haynes children into various enterprises that actually provided the main family income. His newspaper suspended and losing hope of Confederate success, Natus considered selling his slaves further south, as many were doing, rather than forfeit the

¹² B. F. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed on Methodist Seas; or, A Sketch of My Life* (Louisville, Ky: Pentecostal Publishing Company, 1921), 15-18.. Writing about the 1896 Tennessee Annual Conference, Haynes wrote that he had never seen so large a gathering in his thirty-three years of association with the conference (p. 162). He joined the conference in 1873, placing that comment in 1906, while president of Asbury College. Several chapters of the book show signs of smaller sections written at a later date, and a final chapter written later recounts his life from 1905 to 1920. Older historical works reference a 1914 publishing date for the book, while copies available now date it to 1921. Sections written later were at least somewhat more positive in tone and outlook. In a flowery section of the book, a positive reference to the ocean liner *Lusitania*, launched in 1906 and sunk in 1915, for example, suggests that the section was written between those dates, before the ship became associated with tragic loss of life.

investment to emancipation. He relented only after Nancy made an impassioned plea in the presence of the entire household and the prospective buyer. On the eve of the Battle of Franklin in late November 1864, the family sent the children to the Andrews home, a mile out of town. The night after the battle, the Andrews house was “filled with wounded.” The next day, B. F. and a cousin visited the battlefield “on Carter’s farm.” The scene proved too much for his older cousin, but the thirteen-year-old Haynes lingered as the dead and wounded were removed to public buildings, churches, and private homes in town. He recalled that one day as a witness to “the horrors of war” made him “an earnest advocate of peace for all time to come.”¹³

As the war ended, E. M. (Edward McKendree) Bounds, a newly released prisoner, Confederate chaplain, and MECS preacher, came to pastor the backslidden Franklin congregation. Staying until 1868, years when Haynes was between fourteen and seventeen, Bounds’s devotion inspired Haynes, and he quickly joined the church. Bounds’s reading of old Methodist hymns, preaching, home visitation, and Tuesday night gathering of “real praying men” to pray for revival shaped Haynes’s later ministry. The revival at Franklin modeled spiritual optimism for Haynes, and exemplified the staggering rebound of MECS vitality in the two decades after war’s end. Bounds would remain Haynes’s spiritual father and mentor until Bounds’s death in 1913.

While a student at “the Academy at Franklin,” Haynes perceived a call to preach. But imagining a hard life ahead, he instead began reading law under a local judge. He found reading Blackstone equally disheartening, and switched to journalism, the trade of his father and older

¹³ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 19-21. For the Civil War experience in Middle Tennessee, Stephen V. Ash, *Middle Tennessee Society Transformed, 1860-1870: War and Peace in the Upper South*, 2nd ed. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006), and Ash, *When the Yankees Came: Conflict and Chaos in the Occupied South, 1861-1865*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).

brother, Thomas Elliot (T. E.) Haynes. Like his father, T. E. Haynes was a pre-war Whig and reluctant Confederate turned postwar Democrat. He would later be elected to the state legislature and delegate to the 1884 National Democratic Convention. Thomas sold his share in the family paper, the *Weekly Review*, and together with B. F. began a new paper, *The Williamson Journal*. The new venture did so well that the brothers purchased the *Review*, renaming the united sheet *The Review and Journal*. After two or three years of financial success and spiritual misery for B. F., in 1873, a new pastor, James Ransom Plummer, Jr., preached a vigorous sermon on the call to ministry. Mortified, Haynes spent that night in anguished prayer. The next morning, he sold his interest in the paper and headed for Emory and Henry College in Abingdon, Virginia to study. At school, Haynes still struggled with the choice between prosperity and a life of suffering obedience. Convinced that he had reached a bargain with God to give half of his income in exchange for release from the call, he quit college after two weeks. After six months of plunging “heart and soul into journalism, politics, and business,” and prospering, Haynes applied for a license to preach, married the pastor’s daughter, Martha Louetta “Lula” Plummer, on September 25, and was admitted to the annual Conference on trial in October 1873, Bishop H. N. McTyeire, presiding.¹⁴

McTyeire sent Haynes and his new bride to Ebenezer and Liberty Circuit in Humphreys

¹⁴ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 22-26. On Bounds, see B. F. Haynes, “Death of Dr. E. M. Bounds,” *Herald of Holiness*, September 3, 1913, 1. Haynes and his immediate family were buried in Nashville in Spring Hill Cemetery (Section G, lot 744). His tombstone quotes Matthew 13.43 “Then shall the righteous shine forth like the sun in the Kingdom of their Father.” B. F.’s parents and Lula’s parents were buried in Andrews Cemetery in Franklin. Haynes’s competence in journalism was a family inheritance. An article in his father’s paper entitled “What it is to be an Editor,” reveals a deep, and humorous, familiarity with the ups and downs of the profession. *The Weekly Review*, June 2, 1866. Before the war, Natus was a partner of David E. Balch, and the paper was named *The Western Weekly Review*. The slogan “Liberty and Union, now for forever, one and inseparable,” appeared on the masthead. Cf. *The Western Weekly Review*, April 16, 1857. Haynes’s earliest attempts at preaching failed miserably, and for the first three or four years he was a manuscript preacher until being liberated from that “bondage,” Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 29. On Thomas E. Haynes and Natus J. Haynes on politics, see Weston Arthur Goodspeed, *History of Tennessee From the Earliest Time to the Present*. (Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1886), 791, 798, 804, 987.

County on the Centerville District. Haynes called this remote appointment “Big Bottom,” located where the Tennessee, Buffalo, and Duck rivers meet, southwest of Waverly. The salary of \$180 did not cover even their board, but it was the narrow prospects for his cultured wife that upset Haynes most. With only weekly mail and seven miles from the “civilizing sight and sound of a railroad train,” Haynes nearly quit the ministry, this time imagining that he could bargain with God to let him continue his journalistic business and politics while serving as a local preacher on the side. Lula proved unimpressed with his “misplaced chivalry,” and her father offered the same firm warning. Haynes ignored them, repurchased his interest in the paper, and was planning to buy a house on Main Street in Franklin when he saw that house go up in flames. He took the train back to his circuit, finally fixed in his course. The assignment embodied the humble “Post Oak Circuit,” Methodist preachers’ term for such spots, which they contrasted with exalted “High Steeple” station appointments. With no horse or buggy, Haynes did little actual pastoral work that year, but within his first two years had mastered the four year course of study.¹⁵

After a year at Big Bottom, in October 1874, Bishop Enoch Marvin appointed Haynes to Union Circuit on the Nashville District, a circuit that straddled the Davidson and Wilson county line and the Stones River. A famed war veteran, friend of Nathan Bedford Forrest, and foreign missionary, David Campbell Kelley, was Haynes’s presiding elder. Without a parsonage, the Haynes family planned to board with church families in a monthly rotation. Their first hosts took a liking to them, especially their new baby Maude, born in July 1874, and they remained in Donelson throughout. In October of 1875, the conference admitted Haynes to full connection. Bishop William M. Wightman ordained him deacon and returned him to Union, allowing him a second year in the area. Living just south and east of Nashville, Haynes briefly studied at

¹⁵ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 30-33. Haynes on his first ministry assignment, “Editorial Correspondence,” TM November 8, 1894, p. 1. For Haynes’s tribute to Lula, *Tempest-Tossed*, 31-32, 62-64.

Vanderbilt University in its first year of operation. In October 1876, Bishop John C. Keener sent Haynes to rural Montgomery Circuit in Stewart County, about sixteen miles and one hour from Clarksville. That year B. F.'s father died. Haynes recalled that Natus was a poor hardworking man of determined spirit and few words. His wife and B. F.'s mother, Elizabeth Andrews, would outlive her husband by twenty-two years. In October 1877, Bishop D. S. Doggett ordained Haynes an elder and promoted him to Springfield station. He had averaged less than \$200 a year in those first three "Post Oak" appointments. Stephens notes that even a quarter century later, "16,500 of the 19,800 white southern Methodist churches were rural. Of these rural churches, 15,000 had once-a-month preaching." Thus, advancing professionalization required that a minister serve in the financially strongest quarter of MECS churches. His ascending "Big Steeple" appointments to Springfield Station in 1877, Gallatin Station in 1881, Pulaski Station in 1885, and McKendree Station in Nashville in 1887, would see him drawing salaries many times that figure.¹⁶

Historian Beth Barton Schweiger argues that clergy increasingly viewed themselves as part of a profession. The wider cultural moods toward professionalization, "taste," and centralization influenced the church. Ministers were expected to lead respectable lives, to "dress like professional men," and educate their children well. Congregations in towns and cities prided

¹⁶ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 34, 41-46. Stephens, *Fire Spreads*, 305 n.34. Haynes reported a ridiculous pastoral incident that year that suggested just how unfit he yet was for rural pastoring. By a complicated miscommunication, the town-bred Haynes appeared at what he thought was a well-prepared new rural preaching point in an area he believed had no churches. Getting lost and running late, he was thrilled by the size of the crowd gathered. Thinking the large crowd had been waiting patiently for him, he rushed to the pulpit, thanked the apparent song leader, read a hymn, prayed, and started his message, which aimed to "flay alive Calvinism and all cognate and un-Methodist heresies." When he finished, he announced plans to erect a new Methodist church, invited the crowd to join, and stood with paper and pencil in hand for folks to come forward. The 'song leader' at long last exploded, informing Haynes that they were Baptists and that "these are my folks." Not able to think of anything else to do, Haynes announced the benediction. His pleas for forgiveness from the pastor were not well received. Later discovering that no one in that remote area had heard any announcement of Methodist plans, Haynes returned home defeated. Expecting news of a great triumph, Lula was greeted with a heavy silence. It took her two weeks of gentle queries before B. F. finally told her the story.

themselves on paying ministers a salary that enabled them to do this. But where town congregations would strive to secure finer buildings in which to worship, even rural clergy relished their ability to send their children to Vanderbilt. But “embourgeoisment,” as this process and its effects has been labeled, also provoked tensions. Schweiger notes that “rural Methodists drew on an especially rich image in their criticism of city ‘stationed’ preachers: that of the cold and weary itinerant preacher.” Indeed, “the line between station preachers and circuit preachers is almost as deeply and distinctly drawn as if they belonged to separate conferences” one Virginian lamented. The stationed ministers not only received more pay, but also more respect and regard in an increasingly ‘professional’ profession. Schweiger asserts that “this new emphasis on comfort and security represented a sharp departure from earlier assumptions about the ministry. If New South pastors lionized their itinerant and preacher-farmer forebears, they certainly did not emulate their lifestyle.”¹⁷ Kathleen Minnix has similarly noted that the professional status of clergy could be a sensitive issue. Ministers generally came from more modest families, yet still had a professional status. Minnix stated that “separated from those above him by social and economic boundaries and removed from those below him by education and profession, the minister was vulnerable to being viewed as an effete failure by both segments of society.” The assumption that ministers pandered to the wealthy was also widespread. These external social pressures, and internal pressure from laity, combined with the aggressiveness of bishops to add to preachers’ professional anxieties.¹⁸

¹⁷ Beth Barton Schweiger, *The Gospel Working Up: Progress and the Pulpit in Nineteenth Century Virginia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). 141 (“quote of Edward Portlock Wilson Diary, May 3, 1884, R-M”), 131 (quote of *Richmond Christian Advocate*, March 12, 1885), 143. Schweiger studied white and black clergy in Baptist and Methodist denominations in Virginia from 1840 to 1890.

¹⁸ Minnix, *Laughter in the Amen Corner*. 117. On ministerial education, see L. Dale Patterson, “The Ministerial Mind of American Methodism: The Course of Study for the Ministry of the MEC, the MECS, and the MPC, 1876-1920” (Ph.D. diss, Drew University, 1984). The MECS had formalized a feature of republicanism through the

The growing wealth of town and city laity helped further the embourgeoisment of the clergy. In turn, it brought changes to the episcopacy, for bishops particularly embodied the idealized and respectable type. Southern Methodists had long tended to elect strong personalities with clearly articulated views to the episcopate. Yet rather than itinerant presiding elders, the brush arbor virtuosos of an earlier period, Methodists increasingly elevated men of letters – especially college presidents, professors, and editors of church papers. On the leading edge of what would become a major twentieth century trend, men like Bishop Robert K. Hargrove were as much bureaucrats as bold interpreters of the faith. With richer and more respectable clientele to suit and impress, better educated clergy to command, and evermore politically and fiscally complex organizations to manage, southern Methodist elites’ increasingly salient concerns were for order, propriety, and efficiency.¹⁹

But what of the ‘ecclesiastical bosses’ individually? Methodists certainly debated often

extension of General Conference voting rights to male laity in 1866 (the MEC followed in 1868). But if this is viewed as an extension of full Methodist “citizenship” to Methodist lay men, it did little to strengthen the rights/voice of clergy in their relationship to bishops. Thus, the sensitivity of preachers’ common complaint that a small number of wealthy laymen could grumble to a bishop and ‘get a man moved.’ Here the burdens placed on the episcopal office in the MECS created considerable tension with the evangelical, Wesleyan, revivalistic, and pietist virtues of the MECS. For the biographical characteristics of Methodist episcopacy favored uptown respectability, cultured erudition, lordly equipoise, and a strong will, i.e., those of such birth and bearing to rule without challenge or best what challengers might come. That elective habit discouraged dissent and as readily provoked it, but in any case had little to do with the passionate, direct, pastoral, and often popular appeal of the majority of “regular” itinerant clergy these ‘better men’ governed. Better, of course, often meant better connected. MECS elite figures in this period were heavily drawn from the ranks of prewar Whigs of the Henry Clay and John Bell persuasion. Postwar, they would become determined Democrats. Perhaps not unlike monarchs who appealed to the people in order to weaken or negotiate the power of the nobility (their real rivals or counterweights), MECS bishops and their most notable supporters, were keen to defend what the southerners viewed as the traditional rights, status, and prerogatives of the Methodist general superintendency, at times, by pinching the itinerant clergy.

¹⁹ For shifts in episcopacy see Kirby, *Episcopacy in American Methodism*. R. N. Price said of Hargrove that he lacked “imagination” and often “disappointed” crowds with his preaching. Only when conditions were just right, including when he was “in a good mood,” did he preach a great sermon. He was more skilled at “business and administration than the pulpit and the platform,” R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism: From Its Origin to the Present Time*, Vol. 5 (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1913), 399. For the values and concerns of urban professionals, see Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967) and William A. Link, *The Paradox of Southern Progressivism, 1880-1930* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

the various aspects of episcopacy, especially in the year before each General Conference, when delegates had to be elected by each Annual Conference.²⁰ The MECS experienced dramatic turnover in bishops in the 1880s, even greater than that it experienced in 1866, when four new bishops had been elected. W. M. Wightman, E. M. Marvin, D. S. Doggett, and McTyeire joined with continuing prewar bishops Robert Paine, G. F. Pierce, and H. H. Kavanaugh, plus John Christian Keener, elected in 1870, to form “The Old Panel” that governed without new additions from 1870 to 1882. But deaths depleted their ranks rapidly: Marvin died in 1877, Doggett in

²⁰ General Conference/election of Delegates/election of Bishops: “A Word about Bishops,” and “General Conference,” NCA October 3, 1889 p. 8 that includes Fitzgerald’s criteria for episcopal office. See also “Notes from North Carolina,” by J. Sanford which includes proposals for changes. NCA October 31, 1889 p. 14. For instructions about sending opinions to the NCA in advance of General Conference, “Much Ink-Shedding,” NCA November 14, 1889 p.8 and “The Ethics of Debate,” December 5, 1889 p. 8 the latter beginning with “We are not of those who think that all discussion and debate are signs of evil. On the contrary, we are usually disposed to welcome these things as tokens of good. They betray the presence of life... we have no wish, as we certainly have no power, to abridge the right of debate on any subject that is of general interest to the members of our Church...but there are certain canons of discussion...” For optimism about massive revivals and “spiritual power” in southern Methodism and General Conference 1886 name change debate, charitable debate, and conservatism generally, “Another Year of Southern Methodism,” NCA October 24, 1885 p.1. For more on name change, “Remove the Word South From Our Church Name,” by J. W. Rush, and “Illinois Conference,” by Bishop J. C. Keener, NCA October 17, 1885 p. 5 and “Change of Name,” NCA October 10, 1885 and NCA June 5, 1886 p. 6. The proposal would have altered “Methodist Episcopal Church, South” to “Episcopal Methodist Church.” On elections and “termite” reform, “Our Bishops – The Sources of Supply,” by J. W. Boswell April 3, 1886 p. 13. On qualifications of bishops, “Methodist Bishops,” from St. Louis Advocate, NCA April 17, 1886 p.14. “New Bishops,” NCA May 1, 1886 p. 11 called for seven new bishops to be elected, added to the five incumbent bishops McTyeire, Keener, Granbery, Wilson, and Hargrove to make a total of twelve. On debate over *Arkansas Methodist* editor’s claim that 4 year terms are the future of Methodist episcopacy, “Two Different Statements: Which?,” By John W. Boswell of Clarksville, Ark., NCA August 28, 1886 p.4. On the meaning of episcopacy, “Bishop McTyeire’s Ordination Sermon,” NCA June 5, 1886 p. 10-11. McTyeire describes southern Methodist episcopacy as a “joint general itinerant superintendency.” On appointments and lay influence, “The Bishop’s Council” – wants laity represented. Influence should be open, not secret and unofficial – protecting connectionalism (appointment of pastors) (NCA March 2, 1889, p.14; reply March 14, 1889, p.2); another, April 11, 1889 p.5.; Another, May 30, 1889, p.17; “About Bishops” quoted from North-western Christian Advocate November 3, 1888, p.2. On episcopal addresses, “The Bishops’ Address,” NCA May 15, 1886 p. 4-5, 16. Other commentary and reports from General Conference 1886 appears in May 15, 22, 29, June 5, 12, 19 and 26 issues of the NCA. “Sketches of the New Bishops,” NCA May 29, 1886 p.13 noting the election of W. W. Duncan, C. B. Galloway, E. R. Hendrix and J. S. Key. For the ballot voting for bishop, NCA May 29, 1886 p. 17. For debates about the number to be elected, including the nomenclature “General Superintendents” in reference to Methodist bishops, NCA May 29, 1886 p. 6. On episcopal residence, NCA, June 28, 1890 p. 5. Debates over whether bishops should speak as individuals at General Conference, “Speeches of Bishops at General Conference,” by Paul Whitehead, Virginia NCA July 17, 1886 p. 13. Whitehead’s concern is to protect the bishops while maintaining the usefulness of open debate in the General Conference. A reply “Speeches of Bishops in General Conference,” by J. B. McFerrin NCA July 24, 1886 p. 4, where McFerrin approvingly quotes E. M. Bounds, then assistant editor of the St. Louis *Christian Advocate*, who argued that bishops had the inherent right to speak to the General Conference. “Speeches of Bishops in General Conference,” by Paul Whitehead NCA August 7, 1886 p. 4.

1880, Paine in 1882, and Pierce and Kavanaugh in 1884. Finally, McTyeire died young in 1889. To offset these losses and keep up with the demands of rapid growth, four new men were elected in 1882: A. W. Wilson, Linus Parker (who died in 1885), J. C. Granbery, and Hargrove. Four more were elected in 1886: W. W. Duncan, C. B. Galloway, E. R. Hendrix, and J. S. Key. Two more were elected in 1890: A. G. Haygood and O. P. Fitzgerald. This new crop, with Keener the one remaining old panelist, constituted “the New Panel.” The age turnover between 1881 and 1891 was remarkable. The six bishops of 1881, plus NCA editor Fitzgerald, averaged 68 years old, the youngest being the 52 year old Fitzgerald. The six bishops had been in office almost 22 years on *average*. By 1891, the ten bishops and new NCA editor E. E. Hoss averaged 55 years old. Three of the eleven were not yet 45 years old. The ten bishops had only 7 years’ experience on average, just a little over five minus Keener, who had 21 years by himself.²¹

From June 1890 to May 1898, the new panel was stable, save Haygood’s death in January 1896. There were ten bishops of the MECS. John Christian Keener, class of 1870; A. W. Wilson, J. C. Granberry, and R. K. Hargrove, class of 1882; W. W. Duncan, C. B. Galloway, E. R. Hendrix, and J. S. Key, class of 1886; and A. G. Haygood and O. P. Fitzgerald, class of 1890. Together with NCA editor E. E. Hoss, these eleven men held extraordinary power over MECS clergy. As a group, the bishops were very heavily drawn from editors of church papers and ‘school men.’ Keener, Galloway, and Fitzgerald were former editors – indeed Keener, Linus Parker, and Galloway were *successive* editors of the *New Orleans Christian Advocate*. College work was represented by Granbery (professor at Vanderbilt), Duncan (professor at Wofford in South Carolina), Hendrix (president at Central in Missouri), and to a lesser extent, Hargrove

²¹ John James Tigert, *The Making of Methodism: Studies in the Genesis of Institutions* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1898), 17-18.

(president at Centenary in Alabama, and Tennessee Female). Haygood was both an editor (*Wesleyan Christian Advocate* for Georgia-Florida) and a president (Emory). The two outliers of the ten were Wilson, former Baltimore Conference pastor and Missions secretary, and Key who had served only pastoral (pastor and presiding elder) appointments in the Georgia and later South Georgia Conferences.²²

Methodist bishops and Methodist editors presided over Methodist debates and often expressed their views *ex-cathedra*. Most Methodist bishops, perhaps especially southern ones, had been active in such debates before their election and their views were widely known. Contrary to what might be expected of those who hold public office today, most Methodist bishops in the late nineteenth century were usually men of strong and well known opinion who had published their views often. The tendency to elect presidents and newspaper editors that developed in mid-century made this even more likely.

They were, however, each different men. Concerned with order and propriety, Fitzgerald was not an episcopal bull like Haygood, Candler, and Hoss. His style was careful and indirect; he did not relish in satire and mockery as Haygood did and did not use all the powers available to him. Fitzgerald's understated comment about Haygood, "now and then he had a collision that a man of different constitution might have avoided," revealed both Fitzgerald's irenics and Haygood's violence. Fitzgerald usually avoided polemics and frequently published editorial blurbs that cautioned Methodists to be careful how they argued with each other. The clever and combative Haygood, on the other hand, rarely missed an opportunity to employ satire and

²² Similar trends occurred elsewhere, as recounted in an interesting case of a "dude bishop" from CME paper, a man with lots of education/degrees but with little experience, and all of it in urban appointments, NCA March 14, 1889, p. 1. The editor characterizes in interesting language the changes occurring in who was being elected bishop, i.e., younger, well-educated, urban men.

derision. Fitzgerald did not guard prerogatives of power as closely as some others did. Described by episcopal biographer Frederick Leete as “an exceptionally kindly and affectionate spirit,” Fitzgerald was grandfatherly and pastoral, and displayed a common-touch in his editorial work. He avoided sectional controversy when he could, and rarely adopted a lecturing or condescending tone. One observer praised him for his “grace and tact.” His style included frequent use of what the New York *Christian Advocate* called “spiritual witticisms.” Aged Tennessee itinerant John Matthews remembered Fitzgerald as “universally beloved” with “a heart full of the milk of human kindness.” He remembered Haygood as “a man of strong convictions [who] acted upon them.”²³

There were, in terms of style and conduct, three broad types among them. The first type, “strong men,” included Keener, Duncan, Haygood, and Hoss. The ideal “strong bishop” strengthened the episcopacy by merit and reliability, not mere talent or will to power. The former superintendent of Confederate chaplains west of the Mississippi, and most associated with New Orleans, John Christian Keener typified the strong bishop model. “Naturally of an imperious disposition,” Nolan described Keener as “almost above challenge;” he “typified the arbitrary attitude.” Price remembered him as “a strict disciplinarian and efficient presiding elder” who moved business briskly. Ever the shrewd observer, Fitzgerald – after his retirement – said of Keener “his blade was sharp and his thrust direct. He did his own thinking, and thought much. He was so sure of his own love of truth and honest purpose that he found it hard to doubt the

²³ Frederick D. Leete, *Methodist Bishops*. (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1948), 67-68, 275-276. O. P. Fitzgerald, “Bishop Atticus Greene Haygood,” *The Methodist Review*, May-June 1896, 173. “Occasional Letters” by Rev. John E. Edwards, NCA June 21, 1890 p. 4. Haygood biographer Harold Mann has an especially scathing review of Candler – “he retained to old age the limited insights of the precocious, self-assured adolescent.” That is, Candler never rose above the hasty, immature, petty, and unrestrained editorial style of c. 40 year old Haygood’s work in the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* from 1878-1882. Harold Wilson Mann. *Atticus Greene Haygood: Methodist Bishop, Editor, and Educator* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1965), 124-125, 112-115. “The New Bishops,” NCA June 14, 1890 p. 9. John Mathews, *Peeps into Life*. (Nashville: 1904). 268.

soundness of his judgment in any matter that touched closely either his head or heart.” Like G. F. Pierce before him, Keener embodied the meritocracy behind the autocracy.²⁴ Two other “strong man” personalities, Duncan and Hoss, were of somewhat different cast: although both talented and bright, they were episcopal scolds, too hot-headed to inspire broad confidence.²⁵

The second type, ‘enlightened,’ or ‘Twentieth-Century men,’ formed the largest group, including Granbery, Hargrove, Galloway, Hendrix, and Fitzgerald, although Fitzgerald retained a more common or popular touch than the others. These bishops, too, rebuked or attacked trends or persons they did not favor, but generally approached the office with (somewhat) less bravado than the “strong man” type, preferring to display superiority and mastery quietly rather than assert it boldly. Of these, Hargrove came closest to the bishop as efficient administrator model that would develop later, remaining his entire career in Nashville tending to institutions, the least

²⁴ On Keener: *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, 1318. R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism*, V. 5., 94. Price contrasted the firmer style with that of the “indulgent” style of Civil War era Bishop Kavanaugh who “governed by love rather than by authority.” 37-38. Keener once walked out of church – his family in tow – upon hearing Frances Willard was to speak. “Tennessee Conference Echoes,” NCA October 24, 1889 p. 9 including comment that “Bishop Keener was cool, clear, and kind, with a slight buzz-saw attachment now and then when needful.” Leete, *Methodist Bishops*, 106. Oscar Penn Fitzgerald, *Fifty Years: Observations, Opinions, Experiences*. (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1903), 75. See also John H. Wigger, “Where Have All the Asburys Gone?: Francis Asbury and Leadership in the Wesleyan, Holiness, and Pentecostal Traditions,” in Henry H. Knight III, ed., *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street: Wesleyan, Holiness and Pentecostal Visions of the New Creation* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010), 63-71. While Haygood has been noted by later historians as a prototypical strong bishop, by the time he took office, he was far too unstable, finally lacking in both faith and self-control, if not the combative will, to inspire confidence.

²⁵ On Duncan: Duncan’s experience was remarkably like Granbery’s: both were pastors, Confederate chaplains, elected from professorships, and without experience as presiding elders, presidents, or editors. But they were different men. Resident in Spartanburg, South Carolina, Bishop William Wallace Duncan “belonged...in the list of rather autocratic bishops,” and some conferences complained “he was a bit too irascible when sitting in the chair as presiding officer.” Harmon, *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, 729. R. N. Price said of Duncan “he was a presiding officer of the Bishop Early style. He cut and slashed. He did not hesitate to criticize the language and manner of the preachers when he thought it necessary.” His more talented elder brother, James A. Duncan, would have been elected in 1874 if there had been an election, said Price. He died before the next meeting in 1878, and delegates decided to elect his brother in 1886 from “remorse.” R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism*, V. 5., 272-275. Leete, *Methodist Bishops*, 60. Fitzgerald noted that “whoever has met Bishop Duncan in any sort of combat would discover, first, that this militant episkopos of our new century had started to fight to a finish; second, that he seemed rather to enjoy it; and third, that when the white flag of peace is floating over the battlefield of polemics, his guns are silent.” Fitzgerald, *Fifty Years*, 85. James A. Duncan was editor of the *Richmond Christian Advocate*.

active writer of the entire panel.²⁶

The third type, evangelistic shepherds, were the outliers Alpheus Waters Wilson and Joseph Staunton Key, the only two without editorial or educational assignment histories. Wilson had been missionary secretary. But of the new panel bishops, only Bishop Key could be considered a “field hand” bishop, as historian Harold Mann called Key. Mann added that Key was a “non-intellectual, politician type,” confusing 1960s bureaucratic bishops with a man who had been ‘only’ a pastor and presiding elder during his 38 years before election, all of it in Georgia (especially Macon and Columbus). Probably the least ‘political’ of the group, Key had a gentler reputation, and was the only one who had never been a college president, editor, or denominational department head. He was the only MECS bishop of the period who embraced holiness movement views.²⁷

²⁶ On Galloway: Noted as an outstanding speaker and writer, and the youngest ever elected at age 37, Mississippian Charles Betts Galloway’s discharge of his official duties “blended gentleness with firmness.” R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism*, V. 5., 441. On Hendrix: A pastor and college president in his native Missouri, only 39 at election, Methodists gave Eugene Russell Hendrix, likely the best model of the approach, the affectionate label “Prince Eugene.” Educated during the war and reconstruction years in Connecticut (Wesleyan University) and New York City (Union Seminary), and resident in Kansas City, Hendrix, and MEC bishop Earl Cranston, were remembered as “the twin prophets of Methodist Union” for their failed but poignant ecumenical efforts in 1916. Harmon, *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, 1112-1113. Leete, *Methodist Bishops*, 406-407. On Granbery: Resident in Ashland, Virginia, John Cowper Granbery served only as pastor, chaplain (University of Virginia, and various Confederate posts), and professor at Vanderbilt before his election, where students called him “Old Granny.” Price declared Granbery was an “efficient” and “excellent” presiding officer. Harmon, *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, 1030-1031. R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism*, V. 5., 501-502. Fitzgerald had weekly meetings with Granbery when the latter was at Vanderbilt, while the two were in Nashville together, i.e., 1878-1882. Granbery lost an eye in Confederate service, and later wrote the introduction to J. William Jones’s classic, *Christ in the Camp; or Religion in Lee’s army* (Richmond, Va: B. F. Johnson & Co., 1888).

²⁷ On Wilson: Resident in Baltimore, formerly pastor and missionary secretary, ‘Alph’ Wilson applied the law “mildly but firmly,” and could take criticism, including criticism about the influence of laity in appointments, criticism that blamed the bishops themselves for undermining pastors trying to enforce discipline. R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism*, V. 5., 492-494. On Key: Mann, *Haygood*, 152. Key was labeled “‘rather beneficent’ and not as forceful as some southern bishops,” Harmon, *The Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, Vol. 1, “Joseph Staunton Key,” p. 1330-1331. R. N. Price said his official administration was “polite and firm.” R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism*, V. 5., 535. For Key as president of Missouri Annual Conference, witness to “the great doctrine of Methodism,” and tenderness generally, “Our Chief Pastors,” NCA October 4, 1890, 12. Key seems to be the one among them particularly noted for a combination of modesty, piety, and kindness in his official administration. Key lived his entire episcopal life in Texas, with his college president wife, camped on top of vastly expanding Texas Methodism. Fitzgerald declared that “His orthodoxy is as straight as a gun barrel, his good sense as uniform as

Perhaps ‘inspired’ by this heavy-handed tradition of leadership, Methodists drew upon biblical, Protestant, English, and American sources to create and sustain a long dissenting history and rich dissenting vocabulary. Russell Richey’s influential discussion of the four languages of early Methodism provides a way to think of Methodism as a continuous and often cacophonous speaking of overlapping languages. The popular or evangelical language was the folk and pietist language of the great revivals, shared with other evangelicals. The Wesleyan language voiced the distinctive vocabulary of Methodism. The episcopal or Anglican language of deacons, elders, bishops came after 1784, when Methodists required their own sacramental and denominational legitimacy. The republican language, America’s political idiom drawn from Britain’s radical Whigs, came last. Richey also imagined “conference as a means of grace,” raising ordering, conferring, and governing of Methodism to a spiritual and theological act.²⁸

Two additional ways to conceive of the language of dissent in Methodism are available, both borrowed from social and political historians of eighteenth century Britain. The first comes from English historian and activist E. P. Thompson, best known for his book, *The Making of the English Working Class*. In his book of essays, *Customs in Common*, and particularly in the essay “Custom Law and Common Right,” Thompson argued that the practice of appealing to long-standing customs or customary rights was utilized by the lower orders as a means of self-defense and voicing of dissent. The disadvantaged used the language of restoration and tradition as a

sunshine in summer time in California.” Fitzgerald, *Fifty Years*, 86-87. Fitzgerald’s comments about Key’s doctrinal orthodoxy – he says were he a heresy hunter he would leave Key alone – were probably reference to Key’s acceptance of holiness movement views on sanctification. Key was quiet and careful about his position, and given the later purges of holiness advocacy, probably would not have retained place if he had not been a bishop.

²⁸ Russell E. Richey, *Early American Methodism*. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991), Xvi-xvii, 82-97, 65-81.

powerful tool for dissent.²⁹

A second source for rethinking Methodist dissent applicable to the crisis of piety and order in the MECS comes from Reed Browning's *Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Court Whigs*. Browning argued that two rhetorical camps existed within the Whig Party in early Hanoverian England, each venerating a heroic figure in Roman history. One camp, the "Court" Whigs, embraced the confident Ciceronian rhetoric of the Roman Empire, appropriate for those closest to the levers of power. The other camp, the "Country" Whigs, embraced the Catoic language of the Roman Republic, the moralistic, principled language common to groups out of power. The Whig Party included these two rhetorical approaches, the advocates of Court concentrations of power and the defenders of Country republican liberty. Browning argued that for the London-focused Court Whigs, "Cicero assumed a more relaxed posture, representing tolerance and compromise and a willingness to let leaders lead," while for the Country Whigs "Cato stood for rigor, fixed adherence to principle, and [an] abiding suspicion of authority."³⁰

In the late nineteenth century, southern Methodists similarly utilized conflicting languages I will call "Court" Methodism and "Country" Methodism. While there was overlap between these and Richey's popular/evangelical, Wesleyan, episcopal and republican languages, the lens of Court versus Country offers the ability to conceive of the narrative and rhetorical worlds of dissenting Methodists and their contented fellow Methodists. Court Methodism was culturally "uptown," optimistic, conceptually modernist, affirmed an ascension narrative, and was concerned with general progress and institutional order, especially the defense of episcopal

²⁹ E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963, 1966) and *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture* (New York: The New Press, 1993).

³⁰ Reed Browning, *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Court Whigs* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 228.

authority and prerogative. Country Methodism was culturally plainfolk, conceptually restorationist, prepared to articulate declension narratives, concerned with moral purity and political reform, and eager to defend clergy from episcopal overreaching. For the Court elites within southern Methodism, dissenting “cranks” were “disloyal,” and a threat to both progress and order in religion and society. To ‘Country’ dissenters, the elite “tyrants” were a threat to the integrity of Methodist identity and republican liberty. These languages coexisted as valid and legitimate Methodist tongues or accents in southern Methodism until the 1880s. In the 1890s, their advocates did battle, with the Court faction driving Country Methodists out of the MECS or underground. In each of the three aspects of this crisis-- politics, polity, and theology--the bishops played a vital role in clamping down on dissent in the MECS and reestablishing order. But their actions provoked a full rebellion against, and assault upon, the legitimacy of the MECS’s ruling party.

The Court has had its say in abundant testimony from Methodist historians, who have often narrated a confident story of ascent. As Nathan Hatch has noted, “modern church historians have focused on those aspects of their own heritage linked to cultural enrichment, institutional cohesion, and intellectual respectability.”³¹ Yet the MECS’s *internal* dissenters were

³¹ Nathan Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). 223. The moral transformation of society (prohibition, social concern, and women’s leadership) was fused with the plainfolk values of simplicity, moral earnestness, pietism and itinerant revivalism. These characterized the Country protest against what it viewed as the increasingly progressivist and modernist ethos of Court Methodism. Arguing that holiness adherence in the South was strongest in the southern upcountry, Randall Stephens identifies rhetorical common ground between Republicans, Populists, and holiness advocates and other religious dissenters in the same “upcountry tradition of republican dissent” that Steven Hahn identified in his book, *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Southern Upcountry, 1850-1890* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 6, 10. Stephens’ argument is very similar to the argument here with the difference that the language of ‘Court’ and ‘Country’ applies that rhetoric not to dissent from the dominant modes of southern culture and politics generally, but specifically to the case of what united *MECS intra-denominational* dissent. Stephens further notes that while most southern holiness figures had strong feelings about the domineering ways of the rich, they were themselves mostly from middling backgrounds, a description that fits well the dissenting figures – holiness and otherwise – that appear in this study. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 62-67.

not, in fact, Yankee exiles and/or fifth columnists. Nor were they allied into any organized block. But advocates of one of the threatening ‘radicalisms’ were often more likely to embrace some of the others as well. It was the common language of intra-denominational dissent that truly united the “Country” or “low church” party. B. F. Haynes came as close as any in the period to embodying the whole dissenting platform. His high stature as a prominent pastor, his placement within the prestigious and historic Tennessee Conference (where the headquarters or ‘hub’ was located, including the MECS publishing house and Vanderbilt University), and the shamelessness with which he embraced dissent made him a lightning rod for controversy and his paper the switchboard for the vocalizing, fostering, and delivery of intra-Methodist dissent. Yet Haynes was also a strong advocate for denominational institutions with a knack for organization building. His contemporaries repeatedly entrusted him with leadership of high-sensitivity posts as pastor of prestigious congregations, president of church colleges, and editor of official denominational papers.

When, in 1907 and 1908, the conflicts over the holiness movement in the MEC and MECS finally resulted in the formation of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, a national unity and union movement for regional and independent holiness adherents looking for a more orderly and denominational ethos, the new denomination inherited, in some under-acknowledged ways, the varied dissenting ethos of intra-Methodist dissent. The arch-dissenter of the MECS, B. F. Haynes, became the official voice of the Nazarene center, its founding editor and journalist, and thereby a primary articulator of its original ideals. Those origins included a complicated and, in certain specific ways, misleading appropriation of both the original myths and the jagged histories of the MEC and MECS traditions. The Nazarenes would have their own collisions with the tensions between origins and histories, as crises over the connectional offices of episcopacy

and editors upset the young denomination. Despite conservative theological views, Haynes continued his aggressive reformist social and political commentary. He engaged in denomination building, shaping the new denomination with the insights of a Methodist dissenter. The Nazarene ending chapters to this dissertation enable a challenge to narratives that assume religious traditionalism and social reform are contrary impulses, while also contending that dissent is an essential building block of denominational unity and expansion.³²

Most studies of the early Church of the Nazarene emphasize its roots in holiness doctrine and the importance of forging unity out of the merger of various regional bodies that came together to form the early denomination. This study contends that greater appreciation of the role of political and especially polity debates in the two ME churches will reveal how important those issues were in forging a new denomination not only born in the holiness revival of the late nineteenth century, but also hard forged in the crucible its *own* histories of intra-denominational dissent. This study proposes a different context for understanding the holiness schism in Methodism, highlights the vital importance of southern Methodists' polity traditions for understanding southern Methodists' political behaviors, explores overlooked portions of the 1890s MECS crisis over polity, details in far greater depth the efforts of one of the South's most important late nineteenth century religious and political dissenters whose work symbolized, inspired, and encouraged a wide range of other dissenters, and provides a new way of understanding the early character, and later history, of the largest of the holiness denominations by establishing its intimate inheritance in terms of Methodist polity. It also provides a high-profile case of religious mobility, the movement in or out of a religious body, a generally

³² The primary conversation partner on the Methodistic identity of the Church of the Nazarene is Stan Ingersol, *Past and Prospect: The Promise of Nazarene History*. (San Diego: Point Loma Press, 2014), and Ingersol, "Methodism and the Theological Identity of the Church of the Nazarene," *Methodist History*, 43:1 (October 2004): 17-32.

understudied aspect of American religion.

In terms of Haynes's timeline, each of the chapters to follow reflect the order of his own commitments and involvement. As the first chapters will show, Haynes's career was politically-oriented. In 1889, he became involved in church polity debates while he remained actively engaged in political matters. In 1895, he added holiness doctrinal advocacy while maintaining his political and polity activity. By the time he became a leader in the early Church of the Nazarene, he emphasized all three of these themes, having been shaped by the crisis that overshadowed his Methodist career and, in turn, shaped the Nazarenes with his Methodist experience. The chapters to follow reflect the order in which the crisis happened for Haynes and for the Tennessee Conference: first politics, then polity, then doctrine. These were the stages of the crisis for Haynes and for the Tennessee Conference, to which we now turn.

CHAPTER ONE

Prohibition Methodism in Tennessee

Among the strongest conferences in the denomination, the Tennessee Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was certainly the most important. Though only comprising the middle portion of the state, its urban center, Nashville, hosted the denomination-wide publishing and missions bureaucracies. Its members called Tennessee the “Old Jerusalem Conference.” Bishops and high officers resident elsewhere visited often. Its conference newspaper, the Nashville *Christian Advocate*, had become the denomination’s newspaper. The Tennesseans adopted strong temperance resolutions in 1887 and 1889, and successfully pressed the General Conference to do so in 1886 and 1890. But the prohibition resolve of clergy and laity went well beyond writing position papers or raising awareness. The most important and visible conference in the MECS fully embraced the impassioned energies of radical prohibition politics.¹

B. F. Haynes was a leader among the Tennessee Conference’s activist preachers. During Haynes’s service at Pulaski, three interrelated efforts would characterize his service: Sam Jones and revivalism, prohibition, and raising money for home and foreign missions. Encouraged by his presiding elder and fellow ardent prohibitionist, T. J. Duncan, Haynes helped lead this triple emphasis sweeping the Columbia district and the conference as a whole.²

Haynes already was an experienced preacher and political leader by the time he arrived in Pulaski in 1885 at the age of thirty-four. He also was a longtime opponent of “the liquor traffic.”

¹ Carter, *History*, 219, 237-239.

² T. J. Duncan supporting prohibition and revivals: “Columbia District, Tennessee Conference,” NCA January 3, 1885 p.5. “Columbia District, Tennessee Conference,” NCA November 20, 1886 p. 17.

In 1867 he had joined the Sons of Temperance at age sixteen. While pastor at Springfield, Tennessee from 1877 to 1881, Haynes engaged in direct political action during the “reign of the Four-Mile law,” an 1877 law forbidding the sale of alcohol within four miles of chartered rural schools. Through sermons, speeches, and circulation of literature and a petition, Haynes hoped to abolish the charter of the town in order to force saloons out of Springfield. His life was “frequently threatened” by the sort of men from whom such threats were credible. Haynes’s plan was defeated by the “treachery” of a church member, “one of my own prominent church officials,” who despite his signature on the dry petition, colluded with wet forces to annex wet voters into the city.³

At Gallatin, Tennessee, from 1881 through 1884, Haynes discovered a congregation demoralized by the lingering memory of a previous scandal, and fearful of a crushing \$3200 debt on an impressive but incomplete building. At the first stewards meeting, Haynes heard news of an “outside steward,” a “Brother H.” who collected as much as \$100 each year from local “saloon-keepers and even gamblers and other people outside of the church... who subscribed liberally to support my predecessors.” Appalled and determined to end the foul arrangement permanently, the next Sunday Haynes preached on “Gamblers and the Liquor Traffic.” Years later, when a Haynes editorial provoked complaints from northern friends that he was a Democratic partisan, he declared proudly that he had never voted Republican or Democratic, and would not “unless the editor loses his reason or his religion.” Haynes rejoiced that he had “always been an original, unreconstructed, charter member of the ex-Governor St. John’s Prohibition third party” which nominated Gov. John St. John of Kansas in the 1884 presidential election. The combination of prohibition and woman suffrage, along with the moral high ground

³ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 34-35, 46-47, 55-57. On the four-mile law, Israel, *Before Scopes*. 91-96.

that year, resulted in a massive increase in Prohibition Party votes, including the support of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) president Frances Willard, and social gospel clergyman Washington Gladden.⁴

During his pastorate at Pulaski from 1885 to 1887, he continued his public agitation for prohibition measures, including a debate on the courthouse steps with a Columbia, Tennessee lawyer whom Haynes mocked for “simply saying his piece to get the fat fee which the liquorites paid their henchmen for their work.” Haynes canvassed the state and published articles for Prohibition crusade while serving in Pulaski. As he would note later, this placed him in direct conflict with “the Democratic machinery of the State which threw all its influence and energy on the side of the open saloon and against sobriety, decency, and humanity.”⁵

Now at the forefront of MECS spiritual and political energies in the state, Haynes was drawn up the ladder from Springfield to Gallatin to Pulaski, even as his ties to prohibition radicalism deepened.⁶ The campaigns for prohibition were not mere narrow partisan politics,

⁴ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 47-49. He reported that no “tainted money” from “that class of people” as a pastoral bribe during his time at Gallatin. The debt was paid off after a six week preaching campaign using direct appeals, not entertainment or service-based fundraising methods. In 1884, Bishop McTyeire appointed an unhappy Haynes to fundraising duties for the Nashville College for Young Ladies, an untenable post Haynes quit after 4 months, finishing out the year preaching revivals. Haynes continued his efforts linking public education and prohibition in later years. In June 1887, Haynes spoke to the “White Teachers’ Institute,” delivering a “very forcible and interesting address on the importance of teaching temperance in the public schools.” *Pulaski Citizen*, June 23, 1887, p. 3. For Haynes on his partisan commitment to the Prohibition Party, “Taken to Task,” *Herald of Holiness*, November 6, 1918, p. 2. For St. John and the Prohibition Party, see Lisa M. F. Andersen, *The Politics of Prohibition: American Governance and the Prohibition Party, 1869-1933* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013). 105.

⁵ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 50-51, 57-59. Prohibition in Tennessee, at least as Haynes practiced it, was close to the religious “grassroots movement concerned with preserving purity in government and American civil liberty” Joe Creech found among North Carolina Populists. For Haynes, like Creech’s Populists, the prohibition crusade was opposed to “tyrannical boss rule” not “prompted by bourgeois drives for social control.” Creech, *Righteous Indignation*. 37.

⁶ Bishop Doggett appointed Haynes to Springfield Station in 1877, where he was returned by Bishop Kavanaugh, and twice by Bishop Paine, making him a “four year man,” a mark of distinction for clergy. The MECS at that time limited clergy to a maximum of four years in an appointment, and Bishop McTyeire sent Haynes to Gallatin Station in 1881, where he was retained by Bishops Keener and Pierce. Haynes was appointed by Bishop A. W. Wilson to

nor were they secular pursuits on the margins of religious faith. Rather, they were part of a broader religious campaign to transform individuals and society, of a piece with evangelistic and pastoral ministry. Such campaigns required leaders who could inspire broad confidence. When Haynes arrived in Pulaski, county seat of Giles County, the *Pulaski Citizen* gushed, saying that the new preacher was “finely educated, precise and faultless in expression, without effort at rhetorical brilliancy. He preaches in a conversational tone and commands his audience from beginning to end. We have it in mind to say more of him, but it may not be in good taste. We predict a great year for the church in Pulaski. He is the complete master of himself in the pulpit, as well as of his audience, and his meekness is as conspicuous [sic] as it is unpretentious. The people are universally pleased with our new preacher.”⁷

In 1886, T. J. Duncan similarly reported that the “religious enthusiasm” of the previous year not only had brought about a “purpose formed for a higher and holier life,” but also improvements in paying pastors’ salaries and raising money for missions. Pulaski station led the way in missions giving. Duncan called this giving the meeting of “the practical obligations growing out of a spiritual relation to God’s house.” At the district conference in November 1886, Haynes co-sponsored a resolution affirming the “paramount importance” of the “missionary cause” and the district’s “sincere faith in and love for” that cause, while committing the district to pay its missionary assessments in full.⁸

Pulaski Station on the Columbia District in 1885, and reappointed by Bishop Hendrix in 1886. Wilson later appointed Haynes to McKendree Station in Nashville in 1887. Carter, *History of the Tennessee Conference*, 227, 234, 236.

⁷ “The New Methodist Preacher,” *Pulaski Citizen*, October 29, 1885, p. 3.

⁸ “Columbia District Items,” *Pulaski Citizen*, January 14, 1886, p. 3. “Preachers in Council,” *Pulaski Citizen*, November 4, 1886, p. 2. For fundraising among Protestants, see James Hudnut-Beumler, *In Pursuit of the Almighty’s Dollar: A History of Money and American Protestantism*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

Duncan celebrated the liberal generosity of Giles County Methodists who overpaid their assessments for foreign missions, not including the work of the women's missionary society in Pulaski. Increased giving was just one sign of general improvement. Looking back on Giles County, Duncan noted there were "fewer drunkards and fewer men employed in making drunkards" than before and the "character of men put forth for public trust" had "greatly improved." The reputation of Giles County Methodists had not always been a good one among Tennessee Methodists, but now, Duncan asserted, Giles Methodists had given more for foreign missions than those of any other mid-state county save Nashville's Davidson county, "the one in which...the Methodist millionaires live." The annual conference in October 1887 bore out his claim; the Nashville papers reported that the Columbia district gave more for missions than any save Nashville, and led the "Old Jerusalem Conference" in the value of parsonages.⁹

Presiding elder T. J. Duncan and Pulaski pastor B. F. Haynes, along with Major T. M. N. Jones, led the local temperance and prohibition efforts through the Giles County Temperance Alliance. As Giles's delegates, they also attended the meetings of the state temperance alliance in Nashville in February of 1886 and 1887. Such men believed that prohibition was a political implication of a moral imperative that flowed from a scriptural truth. As one supporter would state simply, "God is a prohibitionist."¹⁰

In March of 1886, Duncan responded to the claim that prohibitionists' principles would require voting for a Republican if the Democrats nominated a "wet" candidate, calling that view an "absurdity." The amendment was "independent of all party candidates," Duncan stressed,

⁹ T. J. Duncan, "Giles County Methodists," *Pulaski Citizen*, November 4, 1886, p. 2. "Tennessee Conference," *Nashville Banner*, October 17, 1887, p. 4. Minutes of the Tennessee Annual Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

¹⁰ *Pulaski Citizen*, February 25, 1886, p. 3. "Giles County Temperance Alliance," *Pulaski Citizen*, January 20, 1887, p.3. *Pulaski Citizen*, February 25, 1886, p. 3.

adding that it would be “palpably and absolutely undemocratic to refuse the people the right to vote upon any question of interest to society [and] that he would not be worthy of the name of democrat who thus declared himself.” Other prohibitionists were less careful about demonstrating loyalty; one anonymously advised that prohibitionists “cannot consistently support any party that is not fully in sympathy” with their “desire to promote the best interests of our common humanity.” “If neither party will adopt prohibition out and out,” the author warned, “then its friends must run a ticket of its own.”¹¹

Other MECS clergy added their support for the prohibition cause. W. T. Bolling wrote from Colorado, “A minister has no business in politics, running for office, or stumping for a party...” but “the people of the South do not know what the liquor power is as we of the West do. It means wrecked homes, war on the Church, a continental Sabbath, crime at a premium, and lewdness a virtue. When you do find out, then the terms Democrat and Republican will be meaningless when compared to the necessity of killing this foul child of the pit, guarded by political tricksters and churchly hypocrites. The man in the Church or State who wars not against it is an enemy to Christ and a traitor to his country.” Bolling concluded that it has “put in

¹¹ T. J. Duncan, “Democrats and Prohibition,” *Pulaski Citizen*, March 25, 1886, p. 3. “Prohibition and Politics,” *Nashville Banner*, October 28, 1887, p. 2. For evidence that leading Democrats opposed prohibition, “Amen Corner v. Saloon,” by D. C. O’Howell which quotes the *Kansas City Times* “leading Democratic paper of the State,” saying ““Democracy and prohibition cannot live in the same State together,”” NCA August 27, 1887 p. 7. A report on prohibition in Texas demonstrating the methods of wet Democrats that utilized gender, race and especially sectional issues to undermine the prohibition cause, “Prohibition in Texas,” by “Theophilus Luke, M.D.” NCA August 27, 1887 p. 16. For NCA editor O. P. Fitzgerald angry about “the Whisky Trust” – NCA September 3, 1887 p. 1. A refutation of the claim that prohibition is bad for the Democratic Party, “States’ Rights and Prohibition,” by “Gilderoy,” reprinted from *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, NCA September 3, 1887 p. 2. Threats from “the Editor of a party organ,” NCA September 3, 1887 p. 8. J. J. Ventrees issued address “to the Democracy of Tennessee” threatening Methodist preachers over prohibition efforts, naming specific Methodist preachers who are trying to get into power he claims, “A Fruitless Appeal,” reprinted from *Cumberland Presbyterian*, NCA September 3, 1887 p. 17.

peril our system of civilization.”¹²

Tennessee Conference preacher A. T. Goodloe reported that the unnamed pastor of “our central Church,” likely J. D. Barbee, pastor at McKendree until 1886, had stated that “prohibition is eminently a political issue, therefore the church is barred by the very law of her ecclesiastical life from the expression of an opinion.” Goodloe complained, “I had thought prohibition was a scriptural tenet.”¹³

“The Common Enemy” was the title of a new standing section of the NCA on prohibition that appeared on February 8, 1890. It exemplified a long history of enthusiastic support for prohibition during O. P. Fitzgerald’s editorship of the central organ from 1878 to 1890. That backing included strong defense of Tennessee Conference prohibition leaders. During the campaign for statewide prohibition in the summer of 1887, a report ran in the *Advocate* that “the whiskyites exploded dynamite” in an attempt to intimidate T. J. Duncan while he was speaking for prohibition at Springfield, Tennessee. A defiant Fitzgerald declared “these people had as well understand once for all that prohibitionists cannot be intimidated – especially that one who answers to the name Thomas J. Duncan.” “The saloonists are growing violent,” observed Fitzgerald, “for force of argument they offer the argument of force.”¹⁴

¹² NCA June 27, 1889 p.4, “Colorado Letter” by W. T. Bolling, Denver, Col. A second letter, “Colorado Cullings,” by W. T. Bolling, NCA, July 18, 1889 p. 4 reveals that B. F. Haynes wrote to and visited Bolling in Colorado along with Bishop Granbery, Bolling speaks positively of Sam Small and Sam Jones. There is also complaint from Bolling that the Denver & Fort Worth Railroad provided reduced rates for presiding elders of the M.E.C. but failed to do so for those of the M.E.C., South. He also notes that bands played “Marching Through Georgia” during Fourth of July celebrations and that General Sherman was “the hero of the day out here.”

¹³ “Prohibition Prohibited,” by A. T. Goodloe, West Harpeth, Tenn. NCA October 16, 1886 p. 16. If Goodloe meant McKendree Church, located in downtown Nashville, the pastor was J. D. Barbee. For a previous controversy related to A. T. Goodloe, “A Word,” October 17, 1885 p. 5.

¹⁴ NCA February 8, 1890 p. 15. NCA June 4, 1887 p. 1. NCA June 4, 1887 p. 7. Support for Prohibition despite series of electoral defeats, NCA July 11, 1889 p.1; Optimism about advance of Prohibition, NCA July 11, 1889 p.8; “Who would have thought twenty years ago that in a single State 300,000 votes would be cast for closing the saloons? The next twenty years will bring further surprises as sure as God lives.” NCA July 11, 1889 p.8. “The

Later that same month, in the *Nashville American*, the “whisky men of Springfield” denied responsibility for the attack on Duncan. The normally sweet-spirited Fitzgerald sharply denounced their denial as “false and unmanly.” The distillers’ protested that calling their trade “nefarious” was an insult to their fathers before them. To this Fitzgerald replied angrily that “a fellow who will mount his father’s gravestone to make an anti-prohibition speech cannot delude the public into believing that he has any great reverence for the living or the dead.” Fitzgerald amused himself with the thought of the “whimper(ing)” of the “whisky devil.” He quoted the *Northern Brewer’s Association* saying they would “fight Southern fanaticism with Northern capital until the prohibition heresy is crushed.” Fitzgerald responded, “We advise them that this is a losing business. Capital don’t count in elections down South as they have been used to find elsewhere... we warn the brewers that their disbursing agents in the South can not be trusted. They will lose their capital and then have to endure the prohibition heresy in the bargain.”¹⁵

members of the whisky trust prosper in the world, and are posing as statesmen and philanthropists. And the people are thinking, and the women are praying – and changes are coming fast.” NCA November 7, 1889 p.8. Rejoicing over a prohibition victory in Denver, “Halleluiah!,” by W. T. Bolling, NCA November 21, 1889 p. 4. Similar commentary reprinted from the *Texas Advocate* stated “The liquor interest has laid its hands upon the election machinery and to a great extent dictates the results. As long as a disease is upon the surface or at the extremities of the body politic it can be carried, but when it touches the circulation it must be thrown off, or death ensues. Who doubts that the circulation has been touched in the case in question? It is now difficult in this country for any man to be elected to office without the use of whisky. Whisky buys votes, corrupts office-holders, intimidates the people, and drives good men from the primaries and the polls. It has practically disfranchised a large class of our best and most patriotic citizens,” “A Fight for Freedom,” printed under the heading “The Methodist Press,” NCA June 4, 1887 p. 2. “Tom Duncan” called a “forcible, irrepressible and indefatigable temperance lecturer,” by Bishop McTyeire, “Letter from Bishop McTyeire,” NCA July 9, 1887 p. 16. Haygood making speeches on “temperance” in Texas, NCA July 9, 1887 p. 9. McTyeire issued a warning to Methodist preachers who might go so far as to say one cannot be a Methodist and vote against prohibition while affirming his strong support for prohibition and stating that he would so vote “with pleasure and a special sense of responsibility as a citizen of Tennessee.” *Pulaski Citizen* quoted specifically defending “Methodist preachers” facing criticism for speaking for prohibition, NCA July 9, 1887 p. 9. There was at this time only one Methodist church in Pulaski. Further commentary regarding the position of the MECS on politics and the NCA on current prohibition amendment, “A Few Points Affirmed and Emphasized,” NCA August 27, 1887 p. 8.

¹⁵ NCA June 18, 1887 p. 1. Similar polemics appeared in NCA July 2, 1887 p.1 and July 9, 1887 p. 8. Fitzgerald also urged his readers that “the constitutionality of prohibition is a settled question. It is not worth while to waste powder and shot on that dead duck. Push the battle on the live issues for God, home and native land.” NCA June 18, 1887 p. 1. “The liquor men are raising money to use against prohibition. The praying women are praying to the God of mercy for its success. Let every young man vote as his mother prays.” NCA June 25, 1887 p. 8. The same issue

Fitzgerald was also opposed to “high license,” an early legislative approach to restricting alcohol by imposing licensing fees on wholesale and retail sellers of alcohol. He criticized Vice President Levi P. Morton’s involvement with liquor trade: “Methodist rule forbids us to ‘speak evil of magistrates,’ but magistrates ought to give no occasion for evil speaking.” Fitzgerald similarly lamented “the new definition of politics: a fortress behind which a giant sin may place itself and be safe. This lexicographical absurdity will be short-lived.”¹⁶

As in other eras, prohibition advocates associated the liquor trade with domestic violence, assault, murder, suicide, rape, sexual harassment, human trafficking, poverty, mental illness, child prostitution, abuse of power, bribery, extortion, and political corruption, addictions to alcohol, gambling, and drugs and the attending loss of fiscal independence, and most broadly, obviously, and ubiquitously, the physical, emotional, and financial abuse of women and children. For many evangelicals in the late nineteenth century, the whole of republican liberty was threatened by the alcohol industry. Methodist newspapers contained abundant condemnations of alcohol that focused on its dangers for society. Following similar General Conference statements in 1886, the 1889 Tennessee Conference resolved that alcohol “creates very largely the pauperism, the lunacy, and the crimes of the country, whose care or cure, or conviction and punishment, impose enormous burdens of taxation on the state.” In ways very similar to the

offers an extended refutation of the position that taxing alcohol would be more beneficial than banning it, especially highlighting “insanity, poverty and crime,” “What Does it Cost?,” NCA June 25, 1887 p. 8. “More Ammunition,” NCA June 25, 1887 p. 9 offered a review of “Onward! The March of Prohibition” by “Jos. B. West, D. D. 1887” saying “it is good ammunition for the prohibition fight now going on. Send for it, load up, and fire away at the enemy at short range. Dr. West’s method is his own – calm, philosophical, persuasive, earnest, and forceful with all the terrible facts showing the evils of the dreadful liquor traffic that threatens the ruin of our country. Read, ponder, and then vote for the right.” J. M. Wright’s correspondence with Iowa Governor Larrabee printed, “Prohibition in Iowa: Gov. Larrabee’s Testimony,” NCA July 30, 1887 p. 4.

¹⁶ NCA, March 14, 1889 p.1. For more on high license, see Coker, *Liquor*, 60-69. Condemnations of high license appear frequently in this era, often because critics believed it put the state in a position to partner with, and benefit from, the alcohol industry at the expense of the society as a whole. On Morton, NCA December 19, 1889 p. 9. NCA October 10, 1889, p. 1.

rhetoric against slavery, prohibitionists attached great importance to the malevolent functioning of alcohol in families, communities, and the body politic. The liquor trade was a systemic evil and question of personal morality that could not be divorced from the health and survival of the nation. The oft-reported brutality, felonious corruption, and murderous racial violence occurring in Nashville's saloons (some of it committed by the saloon owners themselves), seemed to confirm what prohibitionists already knew: violence, poverty, and corruption, viciousness of every type and method, drew strength from saloons and the masculine drinking culture. For dry partisans, the label 'den of iniquity' was, in no way whatsoever, hyperbole.¹⁷

Believing local institutions and traditions shaped the nation, Tennessee prohibitionists especially linked the fate of women and children to the fate of communities. Tennessee's Four-Mile Law placed the civilization's schoolroom in symbolic competition with barbarism's saloon. Prohibition appeals often referenced family concerns. Sad family stories appeared often: "excuse his heat when speaking of the liquor traffic: his once noble father died a drunkard." Fitzgerald noted that "the suicide mania rages," adding the "Cause: too much whisky and greed for money, and too little faith in God." Quiet country neighborhoods experiencing widespread drunkenness were told that "the lack of intellectual and spiritual pursuits and enterprises" were to blame. "Open the school and the church if you would close the bar-room," urged the *Advocate*.

¹⁷ Tennessee Conference Minutes, "Supplement. – Reports Adopted. IX. – Temperance," 31 quoted in Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause*, 55. For Nashville's saloons and ties to masculine vice, murder, bribery, and corruption, see Mason K. Christensen, "The Saloon in Nashville and the Coming of Prohibition in Tennessee.", M.A. thesis., Middle Tennessee State University, 2013. Writing a history of Nashville and prohibition from the "wet" side of the debate, Christensen devotes a chapter to Sol Cohn's saloon that catered to African American clientele, and notes the concentration of upscale establishments on Cherry Street (4th Ave) between Church and Union Streets, an area known as "Men's Quarter." That area housed the headquarters for the Democratic Party, the offices for the major dailies, barbershops and other stores catering to men, and four large houses of gambling and prostitution with a wide selection of alcoholic beverages available, especially whiskeys: the Maxwell House hotel, The Climax Saloon, The Utopia Hotel, and the Southern Turf. The location of the press and political offices in such an environment signaled clearly enough that women – and male clergy – were not part of the male-only political and public culture overseen by Democrats and saloonists. Christensen, "The Saloon in Nashville," p. 9.

Fitzgerald commented that the “old-fashioned barbecue” had improved because “coffee and butter-milk have taken the place of whisky and hard-cider. We are gaining ground. The movement is slow, but sure.”¹⁸

Even revivalists voiced this political gospel. Haynes reported for the *Pulaski Citizen* when famed Georgia Methodist evangelist Sam Jones came to Pulaski in 1887. He said that 4000 heard the unconventional evangelist on the courtyard until a rainstorm drove a remnant into the courthouse to hear the remainder of Jones’ speech. Calling himself “a constitutional and concentrated prohibitionist,” Jones said he was speaking “for sobriety and for humanity, and against evil, for women and for their children.” Comparing the rich farm lands of Middle Tennessee to the “poor hills” of Georgia, Jones argued that if disadvantaged Georgians can “do without whisky,” Giles County with its “beautiful meadows...covered with Jersey cattle” could manage without the tax revenues from the sale of spirits. Appealing to the heart of a “poor widow,” Jones claimed prohibition was “more than a question of money” entailing a “question of blood, and of death and of hell...This is a battle that involves our children.”¹⁹

Striding against materialistic visions of the New South uplift, Jones meanwhile linked greed to support for the wet position. Jones averred that he would rather leave his son a “wheel barrow and shovel than the best farm in the country and whisky.” He would rather his daughter marry a modest and sober farmer than “a gifted lawyer addicted to liquor.” Jones thundered that “whisky has entrenched itself in government, in the church and in our homes” and that it

¹⁸ NCA, October 10, 1885 p. 8. NCA, August 1, 1889, p.1. NCA, July 11, 1889 p. 8. NCA September 19, 1889 p. 1. See also, comment on the personal side of Prohibition (why mothers would hate alcohol) NCA November 24, 1888, p.1; A disturbing story about a ragged boy fetching alcohol for his father, NCA January 19, 1889 p.1. Statistics given in prohibition campaign that Shelby, Davidson, Hamilton and Knox counties were 14% of Tennessee’s population but supplied 42% of the criminals incarcerated in the state’s prisons, “The Saloon Centers of Tennessee,” NCA July 16, 1887 p. 8-9. Statistics of support for prohibition from Tennessee newspapers, broken down by their party affiliation, NCA July 30, 1887 p. 8.

¹⁹ B. F. Haynes, “Sam Jones,” *Pulaski Citizen*, June 9, 1887, p. 2.

possessed “immense magnitude and power.” Jones exclaimed, “There little anti-prohibition preachers! O, my brethren!” Then Jones paused and turned to T. J. Duncan. He told the crowd that Duncan had assured him that the Columbia District Methodists were as “noble a band of christian workers” as any in the nation. Jones announced that Duncan had told him “we preachers are determined that prohibition shall carry if it leaves us without a dollar or a friend.”²⁰

Jones concluded with a litany of horrible crimes committed by intoxicated men, and claimed that in the South “twenty men have butchered their wives this year while drunk.” One man kicked his child to death in the presence of his wife, while the “only sons of a Confederate general” committed suicide together under the influence. The smaller audience gave over \$400 to the cause before parting. Appealing for those scattered by the rain to do their part, Haynes interpreted the remnant’s generosity as evidence that Giles County residents “want to save our country, our homes and our growing little boys around us from the blight of whisky.”²¹

During the 1887 campaign, Haynes again threw himself completely into the political fray. In the same issue in which Jones’s speech appeared, a listing of “Mr. Haynes’ Appointments” was printed, including political speeches to “the people on the proposed constitutional amendment” in Campbellsville, Clarksville, Fayetteville, Green Hill, Booneville, New Herman, and three different speeches in Lynchburg, a town long famous for whisky production. The month of speechmaking ended with a July 4th address at the courthouse in Pulaski.²²

The extent of the agitation over prohibition in Pulaski showed in a brief note from the same June 1887 issue of the *Pulaski Citizen* in which two pieces by Haynes had appeared. The

²⁰ B. F. Haynes, “Sam Jones,” *Pulaski Citizen*, June 9, 1887, p. 2.

²¹ B. F. Haynes, “Sam Jones,” *Pulaski Citizen*, June 9, 1887, p. 2. Coker calls Jones part of a “new style of evangelicalism” that was practical and political in orientation and willing to rethink southern shibboleths. *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause*, 97.

²² “Mr. Haynes’ Appointments,” *Pulaski Citizen*, June 9, 1887, p. 2.

editor begged “We are compelled to decline many contributions on prohibition. They come in a perfect deluge and we cannot print them all. We must beg quarter of our friends. A communication on this subject must be especially meritorious before we admit it. We are compelled to erect this proviso as a kind of dam to the torrent.” Having abundant quality material from Haynes and Duncan, the editor pleaded, “Please write on some other subject.”²³

During the same 1887 campaign Fitzgerald quipped, “If you don’t like your pastor’s speaking for prohibition, take his place in the campaign.” Fitzgerald published a “Prohibition Symposium” including articles “The Ax Laid at the Root of the Tree” by Georgian A. G. Haygood, “Prohibition Will Not Raise Taxes,” by Tennessean J. M. Wright, “Reasons for Prohibition,” by Virginian Rumsey Smithson, “The Constitutionality of Prohibition,” by Tennessean James A. Orman, “The Legality of Prohibition,” by Tennessee judge, E. H. East, and “How Prohibition Affects a City” reprinted from the *Atlanta Constitution*. Regarding the “Symposium,” Fitzgerald pressed his readers “to pass it to your neighbor,” and pledged that “The CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE proposes to do full work in this epochal contest.”²⁴ Final appeals included a sermon by W. A. Candler at McKendree and a commentary in the NCA. John N. Nichols urged the readers to vote for prohibition saying “weigh well these questions: Who will

²³ “Prohibition,” *Pulaski Citizen*, June 9, 1887, p. 2.

²⁴ NCA, June 25, 1887 p. 16. Symposium, NCA, July 23, 1887 pp. 2-4 “Our Symposium on Prohibition,” NCA July 23, 1887 p. 9. Bishop Key speaking in favor of “the ‘dry ticket’” in Georgia with Fitzgerald adding “such work well becomes a bishop... it is gratifying to know that... our chief pastors are of one mind on this great question.” NCA July 23, 1887 p. 9. Bishop Galloway and future bishop Haygood speaking for prohibition in Texas: “Bishop Galloway does not think it beneath his Episcopal dignity to give a blow for prohibition as aforesaid,” NCA August 6, 1887 p. 9. “An Address to the Friends of Prohibition in Mississippi,” by “Chas. B. Galloway, Chairman State Pro. Ex. Committee,” NCA August 20, 1887 p. 4. Assistant Editor W. A. Candler claimed “the issue is a plain one – the saloon on the one side, and the home on the other. The Whisky Devil will try to lug in all sorts of side issues and deceptions. Give no place to him.” NCA August 6, 1887 p. 8. A defense of prohibition from the charge it causes crime, “Prohibition,” by John H. Nichols, NCA August 13, 1887 p. 7. Tennessee Conference preacher James A. Orman, “General Jackson as a Prohibitionist,” NCA August 20, 1887 p. 4. Candler urged increased vigilance on the part of Tennessee Methodists in the face of prohibition’s defeat in Texas, “The Result in Texas,” NCA August 20, 1887 p. 8.

vote for God? Who will vote for the devil?”²⁵

Prohibition tied its southern supporters to a national network and made friends out of strangers and old enemies in the North. While pastor at Pulaski, the birthplace of the Ku Klux Klan, Haynes wrote to prominent Maine prohibitionist Neal Dow asking if he had changed his opinion on the issue as claimed by wet State Senator J. W. Sparks. Dow was the father of “The Maine Law” of 1851, an abolitionist mayor of Portland, a former Union General associated with Benjamin Butler’s controversial administration of New Orleans, the commander of Maine’s “Temperance Regiment,” a Union prisoner of war at Richmond’s Libby Prison, and the Prohibition Party candidate for President in 1880. Dow’s reply, printed in the *Pulaski Citizen* and *Nashville Christian Advocate* at Haynes’s request and introduction, made clear Dow’s continuing support. Dow called Maine’s law “a great success,” and outlined its positive economic and social effects on the state. That same week, the *Advocate* ran ads for a Dow pamphlet entitled, “*On with the Revolution!*”²⁶

Appealing to sources closer to home, Haynes had a prohibition editorial from the *Atlanta Constitution* published while noting that the paper’s support for the claim that “prohibition does prohibit and is a blessing to the country” carried all the more weight due to the stature of the paper and its long opposition to prohibition measures. The editorial mentioned several benefits including increased business, poor children with suitable clothing, less crime, more church

²⁵ “The Duty of a Christian Citizen,” NCA September 10, 1887 p. 3-4. “The Last Weeks of the Campaign,” NCA September 10, 1887 p. 8. Nichols, “On Which Side?,” NCA May 14, 1887 (page unclear). A measure of just how political this Methodist morality play was, a warning to voters to be careful about the wording of the ballots themselves, “Be Sure You Get It Right,” September 17, 1887 p. 9.

²⁶ “Prohibition Does Prohibit,” *Pulaski Citizen*, June 23, 1887, p. 3, “How It Works in Maine: A Correction of Honorable J. W. Sparks,” NCA, June 25, 1887 p. 13. NCA, June 25, 1887 p. 18.

attendance, and a greater commitment to public education.²⁷

After more than a month of extended speechmaking in support of the prohibition amendment, Haynes took a lengthy vacation in the West. He met his travelling companion Bishop Eugene Hendrix in Kansas City, who had likely invited Haynes to accompany him. Together they visited a series of major western cities and Methodist conferences, finally spending a week at Yellowstone Park. But Haynes did not abandon the cause of prohibition in Tennessee while he travelled with distinguished company.²⁸

In July of 1887, Haynes wrote from Olathe, Kansas, pleased by the success of prohibition measures there. Having talked to several persons while travelling through Missouri, Haynes interviewed I. O. Pickering, a prominent Olathe attorney, about the 1880 prohibition measure's effect in Kansas. A law passed while John St. John was Governor, Pickering attested to its popularity, the growth in state population, the even greater growth in wealth, including taxable wealth, all of which was achieved without raising taxes. "Business of all kinds, except tippling, has increased steadily," Pickering assured Haynes. A similar conversation occurred with Ottawa, Kansas, resident William Preshaw, who noted that while large crowds now visited the city, order was kept by a single policeman who needed to make no arrests. Special statutes prevented corruption of municipal police forces and ensured enforcement. Preshaw said, "Tell your people that prohibition does prohibit emphatically." Haynes spoke with "hackmen, porters, street car drivers, restaurant keepers, and barbers" before watching the trial of a man accused of violating the law. The "magistrate was a reclaimed drunken lawyer," he noted with pleasure. In sum, Haynes asserted that the testimony from Kansas was that "morals are better. A better

²⁷ B. F. Haynes, "Does Prohibition Prohibit," *Pulaski Citizen*, July 14, 1887, p. 3.

²⁸ "Off for a Vacation," *Pulaski Citizen*, July 14, 1887, p. 3.

observance of other laws is had, thrift prevails, and the poor are more independent.”²⁹

The following week, Haynes reported from Colorado that he had taken a detour alone to the newly settled town of Pueblo. With no church nearby, Haynes preached the first sermon in that town in the magistrate’s small office to a crowd of 25. Reporting mostly of the scenery and wildlife, including a humorous brush with “a very large mountain wolf” near Pueblo, Haynes recounted that he and his ministerial colleagues had found themselves sharing the train with an unruly and disturbed “Irishman” who in his intoxicated state mistook one of the Methodist preachers for the Pope. In his frustration, the man smashed his head several times into the wall of the train as other passengers laughed at him. As his western tour continued, Haynes kept reporting, noting the Denver Conference, praising Bishop Hendrix and commenting on New Mexico and Montana. By August, an impressed Fitzgerald, who had spent many years in California, praised Haynes for the quality of his western observations and artful pen, and announced “Our readers will be glad to hear from him again and often.” Two and a half years later, Haynes would receive votes at General Conference to replace Fitzgerald as editor of the *Advocate*.³⁰

Haynes’s travel narrative highlights his commitment to prohibition. It further shows his growing stature within the MECS and within political circles. Most clergy did not correspond with national presidential candidates on current matters of state concern. Nor did they take long vacations with bishops, or receive personal praise from the NCA editor published to the entire

²⁹ B. F. Haynes, “Prohibition in Kansas,” *Pulaski Citizen*, July 28, 1887, p. 3.

³⁰ B. F. Haynes, “In the Great West,” *Pulaski Citizen*, August 4, 1887, p. 3. Haynes’s report from Las Vegas, N. M. in the NCA laid more stress on church affairs, in particular praising the work of Bishop Hendrix who was “loved, honored, trusted and his return desired wherever he goes,” B. F. Haynes, “A Tennessee Preacher in the West,” NCA August 13, 1887 p. 7. Fitzgerald affirmed Haynes saying, “Rev. B. F. Haynes’s graphic letter from the Denver Conference showed that he had a good eye for Western life, and a heart that was responsive to the touch heroic. Our readers will be glad to hear from him again and often,” NCA August 20, 1887 p. 9. Haynes followed with “Western Letter,” by B. F. Haynes, NCA August 27, 1887 p. 7 and “Montana Conference,” NCA September 17, 1887 p. 7.

church. Now clearly a man to watch, his ascent in MECS ranks coincided nicely with the rising prohibition energies in Tennessee.

Yet when Haynes came to Pulaski in 1885, he arrived at the beginning stages of a crisis of piety and order. That crisis would unleash episcopal and editorial malice upon their former chosen one, eventually destroying his career in the MECS. In 1885, the holiness revival was intensifying in Georgia and Kentucky. But in Tennessee, it was still preachers' politics, not their theology, which provoked a polity war that set preachers' "conference rights" against episcopal prerogative. The Holiness controversy came late to Middle Tennessee, just as that issue came to a head in episcopal declarations of the mid-1890s. Tennessee's part of the crisis did not begin with sanctification advocacy. But it did begin with intense commitments to *righteousness* in church and state, a burning demand for religious and public house-cleaning that the Tennesseans repeatedly affirmed in sermons, speeches, resolutions, and newspaper articles. The political aspects of this urgent religious and political demand for righteousness challenged one of three core marks of MECS self-understanding and identity as compared to the MEC, i.e., the spirituality of the church, an ideal that required the church to remain unfettered and undistracted by affairs of state lest its spiritual mission be compromised. But the Tennesseans did not divide their demand for righteousness into such neatly alienated categories. One aspect was as vital for the temporal and eternal well-being of their sons and daughters as the other.

The role of prohibition in the MECS crisis of the 1890s has been understated by historians. The broad narratives on southern Methodism addressing this era include the excellent histories written by Hunter Farish, Nancy Andersen, and Robert Sledge. Farish describes a story of *ascent* from the low tide of MECS fortunes at the ending of the Civil War. Andersen and Sledge give considerable note to tensions between MECS progressives and conservatives *after*

the mid-1890s and into the early decades of the twentieth century, by which time prohibition *unified* southern Methodists in a way few issues could. But in the last decades of the nineteenth century, prohibition efforts represented a challenge to southern religious and political norms, most notably the concept of the “spirituality of the church.”³¹

The mythic idea that politics and religion were “separate spheres that should never overlap” had formed a core ideology of antebellum proslavery religion and politics, creating a secular pro-slavery state and a church that stayed out of planters’ business. With southern evangelicalism’s earliest social reformist and interventionist tendencies muted, elites were again free to run the state, and their private affairs, without interference from evangelical clergy or evangelical women. This redefinition of evangelical politics privatized religion by coding evangelicals, and evangelical preachers, female. Men dealt with politics in the vicious public sphere; privatized and domesticated women and preachers dealt with a virtuous religious sphere. In short, preachers were to worry about saving souls for the world to come. The real men would worry about everything else.³²

³¹ Hunter Dickinson Farish, *The Circuit Rider Dismounts: A Social History of Southern Methodism, 1865-1900* (Richmond: 1938); Nancy Keever Andersen, “Cooperation for Social Betterment: Missions and Progressives in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1894-1921” (Ph.D. Diss.: Vanderbilt University, 1999); Robert W. Sledge, *Hands on the Ark: The Struggle for Change in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1914-1939* (Commission on Archives and History of the United Methodist Church, 1975). For more recent studies of prohibition politics in the South, see Joe L. Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause: Southern White Evangelicals and the Prohibition Movement* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2007), Thomas R. Pegram, “Temperance Politics and Regional Political Culture: The Anti-Saloon League in Maryland and the South, 1907-1915,” *Journal of Southern History*, 63 (February 1997), pp. 59-64 and Ann-Marie Szymanski, “Beyond Parochialism: Southern Progressivism, Prohibition, and State-Building,” *The Journal of Southern History*, 69, No. 1 (February 2003), pp. 107-136.

³² Coker, *Liquor*, 79. For women’s invasion of planter’s honor and prerogatives among early southern Methodists, see Cynthia Lynn Lyerly, *Methodism and the Southern Mind*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998). For antebellum Methodist clergy and the distinctive space they carved in the South, see Charity R. Carney, *Ministers and Masters: Methodism, Manhood, and Honor in the Old South* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 2011). Coker, a historian of southern religion and prohibition, has noted that “for the most part, southern Methodists and Baptists in 1845 couched their arguments against interjecting the slavery issue into church matters in terms of how it violated church polity.” Coker suggests that the spirituality of the church was of Presbyterian origin and while it may have been utilized inconsistently in the antebellum period it became a core feature of Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian faith in the South after the Civil War. Coker, *Liquor*, 85-86. Historian of the Tennessee Conference John Abernathy

But the spirituality of the church concept had benefits for politicians and clergy alike. It protected the churches from molestation by the state, enabling the church to do its evangelistic work, provided that the more disruptive social and political implications of the faith remained muted. Religionists' historic fears of an autocratic state, whether confessional or anti-confessional, infringing on religious liberty and purity were thus allayed. In theory, "spirituality" finally gave clergymen undisputed authority over religion, something they had effectively lacked in much of Europe during the previous eras. On the other hand, the spirituality of the church pact kept preachers out of politics, something most politicians were eager to achieve. The long tradition of anticlericalism--the opposition to clergy or religion having too much power--in republican thought was thus maintained. That tradition ran through Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson. It reasserted itself in response to the political activities of northern church figures during Reconstruction. Even in the colonies, the Anglican establishment had operated without episcopacy, that most essential feature of Anglican polity. For the Jeffersonian tradition, and the Democratic Party, keeping preachers and 'priestcraft' truncated was necessary for both religious *and* political liberty. For many, it was as much a religious doctrine as a partisan plank, and nearly a patriotic truism, a fusion that has made American anticlericalism a particularly robust common language spoken by the areligious, the anti-religious, and the passionately religious.³³

But during the last decades of the nineteenth century, national trends running against

Smith argues that Tennessee Methodists' embrace of the spirituality doctrine after the war was due to MEC actions during the war and reconstruction period, especially the confiscation of MECS church properties. John Abernathy Smith, *Cross and Flame*, Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1984. 231.

³³ For an example of the Democratic Party's use of this tradition, see Adam Jortner, "Cholera, Christ, and Jackson: The Epidemic of 1832 and the Origins of Christian Politics in Antebellum America," *Journal of the Early Republic*, Volume 27, Number 2, Summer 2007, pp. 233-264. Anticlerical fears have been particularly strong among Baptists, whose history of mistreatment under Christian theocracies on both sides of the Atlantic have inspired their affirmation of freedom of conscience, and their distrust of episcopacy, in any form.

anticlericalism influenced the South, including widespread religious engagement in various reforms. The Protestant churches were at the peak of their power at a moment when calls for a “more perfect union” were rampant. While northern evangelicals continued their antebellum activism, many postwar southern evangelicals also embraced a social Christianity, fully embracing the process of “constructing a Christian civilization in the New South.”³⁴

Joseph Locke, focusing on Texas, argues that clergy there were engaged in a massive clerical “insurgency” that challenged the dominant southern anticlerical tradition. Far from being its captives, Locke’s clerics stormed and captured the southern public sphere. Locke mocks the captivity thesis associated with Sam Hill, and the myriad of graduate students still propping up that older thesis merely to use as a foil. The argument here is not that Tennessee MECS clergy were capturing the culture or the region’s politics, or that their fear of irrelevance led them to seek power via politics. Their insurgency had sufficient rationale on its face, if not in the region’s political shibboleths. Rather, their insurgency provoked both external opposition, a point well-noted in the literature, and intra-ecclesial opposition. The 1880s prohibition crusade challenged southern norms, and represented a form of clericalism in conflict with the region’s dominant anticlerical tradition, not to mention that it was a contest with heavily gendered overtones. But the growing tensions within the MECS – a battle *between* ‘clerics,’ in Locke’s terminology – also involved an intra-denominational fight over *which* clergy would control the political orientation and activities of the entire MECS. That struggle entailed a related fight over how much freedom rank-and file-clergy, and perhaps the laity who might look to preachers for religious leadership or support, would have to answer that question for themselves, even whether

³⁴ Israel, *Before Scopes*, 1.

or not they would retain the right to speak to the issue at all.³⁵

Methodists' millennial optimism, confidence, and enthusiasm also were major factors that encouraged political activity. So, too, were Methodists' growing sense of their own power and their responsibility for social and political reform. Fitzgerald voiced such optimism often, writing that "Methodism is organized enthusiasm." While celebrating reports of Presbyterian and Baptist growth, he added that "Christianity will take—is taking the world." Fitzgerald repeatedly affirmed his belief in an optimistic, militant church, full of millennial and eschatological confidence and urgency as reflected in his comment that "Methodism is a movement as well as a system. It is a forward movement. When it ceases to move, or moves in any other direction, it is not Methodism."³⁶

The editors of the *Advocate* wrote often concerning clergy and politics. Fitzgerald boldly stated his forward-looking approach in 1888: "A solemn apprehension and plain statement of the

³⁵ Joseph Locke, "Making the Bible Belt: Preachers, Prohibition, and the Politicization of Southern Religion, 1877-1918.", Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 2012., 5-7. Coker also demonstrates that southern prohibitionists went through a long process of achieving respectability for their transgression of the spirituality of the church. But equally clear is that those who called for this reform had already achieved respectable status for themselves. There were several reasons for this reawakening of evangelical concern for society among southern Methodists. Among the most obvious reasons were the renewed strength of the Protestant churches, the rapid urbanization of the New South that provoke and enabled greater organization, and MECS postwar competition with the MEC on southern soil. Other factors included the rise of Methodist institutions that could not avoid their role in socialization and civilization or avoid politics (e.g., Vanderbilt), and the increasing and varied cross-regional ties that re-knit the South to the national life, including ubiquitous calls for reform.

³⁶ "Methodism is Organized Enthusiasm," NCA August 7, 1886 p. 1. NCA, June 5, 1889 p.1. NCA March 9, 1889 p.1. "When the time comes that a party newspaper or a denominational religious newspaper will expose and condemn wrong-doing in their own as readily and as vigorously as in other circles, the millennium will be closer to us than it is now." NCA, March 2, 1889 p.1. See also NCA, August 29, 1889 p. 8: "The millennium will not come of itself, as some seem to think. It is not a bright, blessed something on its way to us – it is a glorious consummation, which we are to hasten by our prayer and our work. You are in your measure responsible for fixing this shining date in the calendar of humanity." Another thought from the same issue, "The Church is now engaged in a hand-to-hand fight with all anti-Christian forces, and the theorists and vague declaimers must needs take a back seat. They will not be in demand again until the millennium shall have come." "Fourth of July Sermon," NCA July 17, 1886 p. 6-7, 14 includes Fitzgerald's remarkable account of a dream he had – "My Midnight Vision" – while at sea on his way to California in July 1866: "Religion and Science walking, hand in hand, leading the way... the morning cometh." It is a very optimistic vision coming right after the Civil War. See also, "The Day of the Lord At Hand," NCA August 27, 1887 p. 1.

dangers that menace the civil and religious institutions of these United States is not pessimism. An unwavering confidence in the power of the gospel of Christ to meet all emergencies is not blind optimism. Let us avoid self-delusion and false security on the one hand, and fearfulness and faithlessness on the other.”³⁷ This balance was not always an easy one for Methodists to maintain. After 1887, the tide began to turn against political involvement.

An article entitled “Preachers as Reformers” appeared in September of 1888 that affirmed Christian ministers’ “proper place” in relation to “all moral reforms,” but warned of political entanglements. “They are naturally,” said the *Advocate*, “expected to be in the lead.” In their teaching office they are expected to be leaders “in morals as well as religious and ecclesiastical affairs.” Matters “involving the moral welfare of his people” even where “the word of God is silent” may yet require his “decision and action.” The “danger now is of going too far – requiring ministers to be partisans as well as reformers,” warned the *Advocate*. “The moment he takes the stump, or makes his pulpit the medium of partisan politics, that moment he is outside his proper sphere.”³⁸

The general principle having been stated, the editor moved to the real issue: “In no reform movement of the age can ministers do more good than in the efforts to destroy the whisky traffic.” The public supports this, “and the Church assigns him the place” because “the salvation

³⁷ NCA February 4, 1888 p. 1. On MECS optimism and militancy, see NCA January 26, 1889, p.1 “What Do Ye More Than Others” and NCA, July 4, 1889 p.1, “Our Church.” For a strong statement of optimism, NCA September 5, 1889 p. 8... “the devil will never foreclose a mortgage on this planet, for Jesus reigns and grace abounds.” Also, NCA September 12, 1889 p. 1 “this is a great age. Great faith, great plans, great energy, great gifts suit it.” For his optimism about the power of God to save the world, see NCA December 15, 1888 p. 1. Other statements of optimism concerning southern Methodism and the South generally include “Progress and Southern Methodism,” NCA March 28, 1889 p.2 by G. P. Keyes. For positive growth of MECS in Nashville relative to population growth, “A Good Record,” NCA August 15, 1889, p.8.

³⁸ NCA, September 1, 1888, p.8 “Preachers as Reformers.” It is not clear whether the assistant editor John W. Boswell or lead editor O. P. Fitzgerald wrote the article. Given that p. 8 was often reserved for the assistant editor, it seems likely Boswell penned the article. The stark language also suggest that Fitzgerald did not write the article.

of souls, as well as the general welfare of the country, is at stake.” The issue, the “danger,” is in “the methods.” ... “Right here some of our brethren are making a fatal mistake. They suppose the Church has committed itself not only to the principle of prohibition, but to a method of prohibition. This the Church has not done...” The anticlerical editor declared that “The Church has no right in her official capacity to devise methods for the State, and we very much doubt whether she is not outside her legitimate sphere when she undertakes to advise the State.”³⁹

The editor continued, stating that “The attitude” of the MECS toward the whisky traffic is one of uncompromising hostility, even to the extent of extirpation.” This “makes every minister and member a Prohibitionist,” committing “the whole body to the principle of Prohibition...” but the matter of “effecting the purpose” was “free” to “each one.” “Yet there are those who think the Church would enforce its principles through a party of its own selection, and some have gone so far as to declare this in open Conference.” These often believe the General Conference action of 1886 indorsed “party prohibition.” Rather, it changed the status of “manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage” within Methodist law from a case of “imprudent and improper conduct” to a case of “immorality.” The editor went on to quote the General Conference resolution which added “and use of” – “except for medicinal and mechanical uses.” The action also called for the church “through its press and pulpit – its individual and organized agencies to speak out in strong language and stronger action in favor of the total removal of this great evil...” and to “strive with all good citizens and by all proper and honorable means to banish the horrible evil...”⁴⁰

Yet, the editor concluded that this fell far short of changing “the record and attitude of

³⁹ *NCA*, September 1, 1888, p.8 “Preachers as Reformers.”

⁴⁰ *NCA*, September 1, 1888, p.8 “Preachers as Reformers.”

Southern Methodism toward party politics.” The MECS “could not have adopted, or indorsed even, the Prohibition party without indorsing a political creed, for the Prohibition party, besides prohibition, has ten or a dozen other ‘planks’ of a purely political and secular character, and to have adopted or indorsed it would have been to commit the Church to all the party teaches and proposes – tariff reform, woman suffrage, and all. To do such a thing – to adopt any party – would ruin any Church in the South. We are not ready for suicide.” The Church “sanctions” prohibition but “voting with the Prohibition party” said the *Advocate*, constitutes an act “we are allowed to do...only in our individual capacity.” The editor announced, “We protest against putting the Church in an attitude of opposition to any party, or in favor of any political platform.” Preachers “may take the lead in reforms, but we should not seek to change the *status* or ruin the record of the Church.” Further debates and declarations appeared throughout the late 1880s.⁴¹

Bold pronouncements on the theme appeared frequently, often going in separate directions, sometimes simultaneously. Assistant editor Warren Akin Candler declared that “When Constantine cursed the Church by patronizing it, he injected a virus into its veins that remains to this day...In the New (World), let us stand fast in the liberty wherewith we were

⁴¹ NCA, September 1, 1888, p.8 “Preachers as Reformers.” A similar thought appears in NCA, September 22, 1888 p.1. “Let her turn aside neither to the right nor to the left” from the primary religious task. For a sharp counter argument, see “The Prerogatives of the Pulpit,” NCA June 13, 1889 p. 14 by W. C. Black. Black: “there is no sphere of ethics from which the ministry is excluded,” adding that it a question becomes off limits when it becomes a partisan issue then “all the devil has to do in order to stop the Church” is to “get some political party to favor that particular evil, and thus make it a ‘question of State policy.’” “Away with such folly,” said Black adding of the “liquor traffic,” that “being immoral, the right of the pulpit to wage war upon it is unquestionable.” Black was called “a leading prohibitionist of Mississippi” and praised by the Mississippi WCTU as “The Great Heart,” NCA July 16, 1887 p. 7. Further support for preachers’ prohibition efforts, “Preachers and Prohibition,” NCA June 20, 1889 p. 4. Harsh criticism of liquor and anti-prohibition forces, NCA September 26, 1889 p. 9. An earlier statement from Fitzgerald that Prohibition should not be partisan, “but if the whisky men drag it thither we do not propose therefore to give it up,” NCA March 26, 1887 p. 1. Fitzgerald penned a programmatic essay on the topic NCA August 29, 1889 p.1. See also “The Preacher and The Present Times,” NCA August 29, 1889 p.1 and “The Church and Politics: Let Us Take Our Bearings,” NCA November 14, 1889 p.8. “The Christian Lawyer,” NCA February 2, 1889 p.1. On being non-political church: “‘broad spiritual platform upon which all honest men of every political faith may stand.’ Put the emphasis in the right place,” a partial quote of R. N. Price from *Holston Methodist*. NCA, December 15, 1888 p.1.

made free in the beginning of our national life.”⁴² Another article asserted that “The reformer who denounces general wrong-doing in the abstract, and is silent or conniving when a concrete case comes up, can be found without going far these times. With this sort of reform the world will advance backward.”⁴³

The NCA defended ministerial “super-zealousness against the current vices and evils of the times,” saying that “it were better that a preacher of righteousness should be imprudent from too much reformatory zeal than indifferent from the lack of it.” Yet they concluded, “there is a happy medium, and sanctified common sense ought to be able to find it.”⁴⁴ Another article strongly defended clerical sermonizing, noting that “they said the bold sermon of the preacher was all true, but – but what? It pinched the transgressors, and would probably make friction. The truth has been making friction from the day that Jesus exposed the scribes and pharisees until now. The only legitimate way to stop this friction is to cease opposing the truth.” On the other hand, the editor stated, “Mere denunciation of wrong is but a small part of a reformer’s work; he must be ready to plant a flower in the place of the weed he would dig up.”⁴⁵ Methodists were

⁴² NCA August 14, 1886 p. 8. On the “assassination” of a Methodist preacher in Iowa who lead the prohibition efforts there (including strong commentary as to the need for prohibition), “A Defiant Business,” NCA August 21, 1886 p. 8. Fitzgerald criticizing the British Wesleyans for losing members due to their paper talking more politics than usual, NCA August 28, 1886 p.1. On social reform and religion “Practical Religion” NCA February 16, 1889 p.1... “all acceptable and justifying works...must spring from a heart saved and sanctified by grace.” Elsewhere: “Christianity is the only agency that can deal successfully with the economic, social and ethical problems of our times,” said Fitzgerald. He repeated his objection to “all the empiricisms that divert thought and attention from the Gospel of Christ.” “Let not Israel go down into Egypt for help,” he concluded. NCA, February 23, 1889, p.1.

⁴³ NCA, September 8, 1888, p.8. Extended prohibition commentary appeared in the September 22, 1888 issue. That Methodists were optimistic about the advance: “The process of unification of the temperance forces in our country seems to be slow, but it is going on. By a course of experimenting and elimination the best method will appear, and then – union and victory!” NCA, March 9, 1889, p.8.

⁴⁴ NCA, June 13, 1889, p.8. On the same page, they say “*all* cigarette smokers, Quit!”

⁴⁵ NCA January 21, 1888 p. 8. A bolder, more controversial and complicated, and yet seemingly confused essay had appeared earlier from D. C. Kelley, “Fraternity – Another View” in the *MECS Review* January 1882 pp. 92-103. It includes a section arguing *against* the spirituality of the church doctrine in the context of slavery (p. 95) while

also preaching sermons on the theme, as evidenced from supportive reviews written by Tennessee Conference preachers T. J. Duncan, B. F. Haynes, and J. M. Wright of fellow Tennessee Methodist T. A. Kerley's sermon entitled "The Relation of Pastor and People" that defended the right of preachers to engage in prohibition activity.⁴⁶

While conservatives generally continued to embrace the spirituality of the church idea, in other words, more radical prohibition advocates in the MECS increasingly challenged the notion along moral, religious and political lines. In what they perceived as an era of great moral decline, they argued that the church should not be on the sidelines. Christian civilization could only be protected and advanced through an active Christian involvement in the affairs of the state. If the church did not reform the world, the prohibitionists were certain the world would fatally corrupt the church, and with it, the nation.⁴⁷

The spirituality of the church concept discouraged evangelical clergy and women from speaking directly to the public sins of elite men, as they had in earlier days. But evangelicals continued to read sin as stereotypically male, and no sin was more associated with masculine failings than those sins associated with drinking. With masculine sinfulness thought of as stereotypically violent and active, supported by a deep hostility to outside influence, and protected by the stressing of rights and prerogatives, sin could easily be read as entrenched addiction that could only be unmade by divine deliverance. If young women's sins were thought to be those of the wayward and misguided in need of direction and nurture, young men's sins

arguing that the MEC was too political. Kelley urges "a Christian cosmopolitan outlook..." wherein southern Methodists would "let dead issues and half-truths sleep..."

⁴⁶ Duncan's review, NCA June 6, 1889 p. 14. "'Relation of Pastor and People: A Sermon by Rev. T. A. Kerley,'" by J. M. Wright, NCA, June 27, 1889, p.7. "'Relation of Pastor and People,'" by B. F. Haynes, NCA July 4, 1889 p.20. The sermon also addressed disagreements regarding the appointment of Methodist clergy and the proper roles, duties, and rights of laity, bishops and preachers in that regard.

⁴⁷ Coker, *Liquor*, especially chapter 3.

were those of persons entrenched in open and willful rebellion, behavior that conventionally would call for discipline and restraint.

Engaging in a criticism of the male sin of drinking, then, required a redefinition of the meaning of “manliness.” As Joe Coker noted of this new evangelical perspective, “a man could lay claim to honor not by being overly concerned about how he was perceived by the public – the guiding principle of the old code of honor – but rather by following his Christian principles regardless of what others thought or said.”⁴⁸ Joe Creech affirms that “while calls for prohibition in other regions and times might have been prompted by bourgeois drives for social control, North Carolina prohibition was a grassroots movement concerned with preserving purity in government and American civil liberty.”⁴⁹

This reforming aspect drew upon a moral vision of Methodist restorationism, an appeal to the piety and practice of primitive Methodism when women and male preachers did not hesitate to embarrass men engaged in sins that had public consequences. Such restorationist reforms could conflict with both the status quo honor-prerogative approach of conservatives and the modernizing-liberalizing approach of progressives within the MECS.⁵⁰ For many wary elite Methodists, as with wary southern politicians, prohibition took southern preachers and women into politics on their own terms. It also linked them to other such “radicals” in the North, associations that were especially sensitive for southern Methodists.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Coker, *Liquor*, 190, 184-190; 194-198. For more on honor and prohibition, see Coker, 194-198; on honor and preachers, 186-188; on manliness, 32-33.

⁴⁹ Creech, *Righteous Indignation*, 37. Creech on ties between populism, holiness and prohibition, 144-145, xxix, xxiv, xxiii.

⁵⁰ For Methodists’ embrace of liturgical reform, see Jennifer Woodruff-Tait, *The Poisoned Chalice Eucharistic Grape Juice and Common-Sense Realism in Victorian Methodism*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2011.

⁵¹ Coker, *Liquor*, 3.

In October 1887, just after the Tennessee prohibition measure failed, receiving forty-five percent of the vote, the National Convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union met in Nashville. The Convention demonstrated the radicalism of the northern based organization. In WCTU norms, white women performed political tasks, and ignored shibboleths about not 'advising' the state. But the WCTU's stress on women's work for future just causes went against the past-oriented norm for southern white women's public work after the war, namely the commemoration of Confederate war dead in celebration of the Lost Cause.⁵²

In October 1887, Haynes was appointed to McKendree to replace W. A. Candler, who had filled in at McKendree while also assistant editor of the Nashville *Christian Advocate*. The new pastor personally invited Frances Willard to speak on a Sunday night that same month. While a woman speaking in church on a Sunday was controversial, such was the transgressive state of prohibition in Tennessee. A local paper reported that "several, if not, indeed, all, of the leading pulpits of the city will be occupied by lady members of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union." Leaders hoped McKendree could host the meeting, but the congregation's traditional ban on using the main "audience room" for non-regular church services prevented its use.⁵³

⁵² For southern norms concerning women's public work in the decades after the war, see Nina Silber, *Gender and the Sectional Conflict*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008). Southern women's efforts on behalf of Confederate soldiers and their widows were undertaken by the federal government for Union veterans and their families. For the woman suffrage movement in Tennessee, Marjorie Spruill Wheeler, ed., *Votes for Women! The Woman Suffrage Movement in Tennessee, The South and the Nation*. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1995), Marjorie Spruill Wheeler, *New Women of the New South: The Leaders of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the Southern States* (New York and Oxford, 1993), and Elna Green, *Southern Strategies: Southern Women and the Woman Suffrage Question* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

⁵³ "Christian Women," *Nashville Banner*, October 24, 1887, p. 4. "W. C. T. U. Convention," *Nashville Banner*, October 15, 1887, p. 5. Haynes remarked that he invited Frances Willard despite the opposition to "a woman occupying the pulpit" and the use of the church auditorium "for such a purpose" as prohibition. While holiness advocates were generally supportive of woman ordination, Haynes was no holiness advocate at this point. His later remarks concerning Willard suggest a close friendship and his admiration for the intent and scope of her efforts. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 59-61. See also Virginia A. Shadron, "Out of Our Homes: The Woman's Rights

The convention ultimately displayed how out of step the WCTU was with southern norms. It approved a committee report that recommended “special attention be paid to the work among the colored people.” Punditi Rambal, a Hindu converted to Christianity, addressed the convention. The “Rev. Anna Shaw” of Boston led the appeal and the convention raised “several hundred dollars” for Rambal’s school for “Hindoo widows” in India.⁵⁴

The convention also indicated its sentiments in symbolic ways. A white ribbon bow was worn by all the delegates representing their support for prohibition. Many delegates added “a similar bow of orange, the color of the woman suffragists.” The Rev. Anna Shaw moved among the delegates, “offering to each a bit of orange ribbon, which many, even of the southern women, accepted and wore.” One delegate announced to the convention that if WCTU President Frances Willard were elected president of the World organization, the WWCTU, she would “advocate the election of a southern woman as her successor.” A letter from the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, a northern denomination that split from the MEC in support of abolition and against episcopal overreaching, was read to the convention announcing that the Wesleyans had adopted resolutions in favor of woman suffrage.⁵⁵

There was more. Hannah Whitall Smith presented Willard with an “orange colored” jewelry case. Author of the holiness movement classic, *The Christian’s Secret of a Happy Life*,

Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1890-1918,” (M.A. Thesis: Emory University, 1976). For views opposed to equal opportunities for women, see “Woman’s Suffrage,” and “Woman’s Sphere” *NCA*, March 26, 1887 and February 25, 1910 and “Marriage and the Home,” *Methodist Quarterly Review* 9 (July 1893): 264. In contrast, W. C. Black, *Christian Womanhood* (Nashville: Publishing House of the M.E. Church, South, 1888) argued for women’s equal rights to “officiate in a public way in the service of God” (p. 46; quoted in Shadron, p. 86). In the context of this debate, Haynes’s invitation to Frances Willard placed him squarely in a more moderate camp open to and acknowledging of women’s public religious leadership, while not yet openly embracing women’s ordination.

⁵⁴ “Christians at Work,” *Nashville Banner*, November 18, 1887, p. 3.

⁵⁵ “Christians at Work,” *Nashville Banner*, November 18, 1887, p. 3.

Smith further “insisted upon a number of southern ladies coming to the platform and speaking in the Bible reading.” The *Banner* reported that Shaw was presented with a “handsome orange-colored silk handkerchief by four Tennesseans that Miss Shaw has converted to believe in woman suffrage.” Shaw preached the “annual sermon” at First Cumberland Presbyterian Church that Sunday morning. The convention adopted “planks” that endorsed “the third party movement” and woman suffrage while opposing “the barbarous cruelty of the penitentiary leasing system.” The *Banner* concluded that the national convention of the WCTU may be a “‘political convention’ but a political convention with such prayers and exhortations to spiritual life was never before seen in this city.”⁵⁶

Tennessee Conference preacher D. C. Kelley addressed the convention in his role as fraternal messenger for the State Temperance Alliance of Tennessee. Kelley affirmed that his organization was a distant second to the WCTU and noted that historians assigned labels to entire ages of time, such as the “iron age.” Kelley claimed that the present age would be distinguished for “the birth of woman’s power.” Speaking of well-meaning men, Kelley admitted “we were slow, very, very slow” to realize that women were “endowed with either courage or intellect which would enable you to do more than follow.” Connecting this change to the “doctrine” of “mutual support” developed by “John Stewart Mill, Geo. Elliott and the two Brownings,” Kelley applauded the women, saying, “your movement to procure...education for childhood upon the physiological effect of alcohol” entitled “you to the crown of true statesmanship.” The “modern statesman had learned that education must prepare the citizen for his duties,” Kelley announced, “but he stumbled like a blind Cyclops in his cave over what needed to be taught.” Kelley concluded by praising the delegates for focusing on education of the

⁵⁶ *Nashville Banner*, November 19, 1887, p. 5. Hannah Whitall Smith, *A Christian’s Secret of a Happy Life* (Boston: Willard Tract Society, 1875).

masses where men had emphasized enthusiasm. This model they had applied in their missionary and prohibition work, as well as “the crowning work of your hands – your white cross work for women.” Kelley’s address ended with “And you are right.” It was greeted “with cheers.”⁵⁷

Kelley’s praise for Willard, the WCTU, and women’s reforms was neither token praise nor a trivial endorsement. Kelley was already legendary in Tennessee Methodist circles, and an incurable progressive, the latter fact being missed by most historians of the period. He was the son of Rev. John Kelley, a longtime Tennessee Conference preacher. His mother was Margaret Lavinia Campbell Kelley, the sister of former Tennessee Governor William B. Campbell and the co-founder of the Women’s Missionary Society of the MECS with Mrs. J. W. Lambuth, an achievement that would earn them a place in Methodist lore. So lauded was Mrs. M. L. Kelley, that she received full-length biographical studies in the southern *Methodist Review*, a full length biography, and a portrait in Fitzgerald’s centennial study in 1884. In addition, D. C. Kelley’s second wife was the daughter of Gov. Campbell. His eldest daughter married beloved Tennessee Conference missionary W. R. Lambuth who was elected bishop in 1910, the year after his father in law’s death, thereby fusing the Kelley and Lambuth familial associations with Methodist missions and Methodist prominence. A graduate of Cumberland University, D. C. Kelley added

⁵⁷ “Woman’s Work,” *Nashville Banner*, November 19, 1887, p. 4., “Christians at Work,” *Nashville Banner*, November 18, 1887, p. 3. Kelley was the author of *Prohibition: the Amendment*, (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1887). Kelley wrote defending the Prohibition Party and started his own newspaper, *The Southern Independent* that was “non-partisan, non-sectarian.” NCA, March 2, 1889 p.17 “A Poor Slander.” D. C. Kelley spoke at the “Scotch-Irish Congress,” NCA May 23, 1889 p.14. A very positive report from Kelley as pastor of Gallatin “Gallatin Dedication,” by D.C. Kelley NCA June 27, 1889 p. 13. NCA December 19, 1889 p. 9. Bold statement from D. C. Kelley: “A brotherly and Christian respect has been maintained for the right motives of those who have held that church, pulpit, and preacher should be silent in the midst of the great agony of effort through which several of the States are now passing in their contest with the Whisky Devil. Now that the attack has passed beyond the enslavement and degradation of men, and makes a direct charge upon God himself, do our conservative brethren still intend to offer soothing-syrup to the church, muffle the pulpit, and muzzle the preachers?... Brethren beloved, does not the open door of Providence, which gives us a great moral issue apart from party politics, appeal to us with clear, ringing voice, saying, ‘The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth men everywhere to repent?’ The foundations are attacked – what will you do?,” “God the Author of Evil” by D. C. Kelley, NCA, July 30, 1887 p. 5.

a medical degree at age twenty before beginning his ministry as a missionary to China from 1852–1855. He rose quickly through the pastoral ranks when he returned, before four years of Confederate service, including time with General Nathan Bedford Forrest, despite Kelley’s unionist and abolitionist prewar views. Noted for his bravery and aggressiveness, Kelly rose to Colonel, serving as Forrest’s second-in-command and gaining a particular reputation for attacking Union soldiers from riverbanks. After the war, Kelley again rose quickly, pastored county-seat charges, served as presiding elder of the Lebanon and Nashville districts, president of a women’s college, helped to found Vanderbilt University, served as the first secretary of its Board of Trust, and served two separate tours as pastor of McKendree for a total of six years, the second time a 4 year term, all *before* becoming Missionary Treasurer for the denomination in 1880 at age 47. In Tennessee Methodist memory the Kelleys loom large.⁵⁸

Given to public arguments with prominent and powerful clergy, Kelley was remembered by conference historian Cullen T. Carter as “not afraid to take a stand on vital questions. He did not wet a finger and hold it up to see how the wind was blowing before he spoke....“He was,” noted Carter, “far from being a ‘me too man.’” Fitzgerald quipped that Kelley was “up with his times and a little ahead now and then.” The North Georgia leaders despised him, however: Warren Candler called him “the petted idol of the fashionable Methodists at Nashville,” while Haygood rebuked him often, once for boldly saying bishops resisted the election of more bishops in order to maintain their own power. Sam Jones biographer Kathleen Minnix declared Kelley “one of the most fascinating men in a conference rich in fascinating men.” Kelley authored or supported bold declarations in violation of southern norms on prohibition and the spirituality of the church doctrine, including one in the *Southern Review* in 1882. He lectured the Tennessee

⁵⁸ Cullen T. Carter, *Methodist Leaders in the Old Jerusalem Conference, 1812-1962*. (Nashville: The Parthenon Press, 1962). 90-91, 125-129. Recently founded Kelley’s Point Battlefield Park in Nashville is named after Kelley.

legislature on prohibition as early as 1873 on account of “the tears of wives and children,” and, in 1877, addressed African American students at Central Tennessee College, founded by the Freedmen’s Aid Society, as “brethren, friends, fellow-citizens,” and praised the labors of the northern MEC on their behalf. When Bishop R. K. Hargrove himself addressed the topic the following spring, he did so less to note black advancement and more to offer a sectional rebuke of the Society’s secretary, Rev. R. S. Rust. Hargrove’s, Fitzgerald’s, and Haygood’s statements in support of black education and/or MECS responsibility to help, came *after* Kelley’s address, itself still more radical – and less about disputing the MEC – than the others. The president of Fisk University in Nashville named Kelley a racial progressive in 1885. After Haygood took criticism for his progressive book *Our Brother in Black* (1881), Kelley came to Haygood’s defense in October 1883, and rebuked Haygood’s critics for being both intelligent and yet still narrow-minded. The “interests of the white man and the Negro,” Kelley said, “are one.” Among the most notable social and political progressives in the MECS from this era, Kelley had long been a critic of the strict application of the spirituality doctrine, pressing his fellow Methodists to prefer doing right to ‘being right.’

Kelley, who would play a central role in the crises of the 1890s, was Haygood’s equal as a racial progressive, and far more progressive than Haygood on women’s issues, an unusual combination in this period. Historians have paid comparatively little attention to Kelley, lionizing instead Haygood’s racial radicalism in his sermon “The New South” (1880) and *Our Brother in Black*. Yet Haygood’s radicalism got him elected bishop twice *after* publishing those statements, the second time in 1890 receiving a shocking two-thirds of the vote on the first ballot. Six times a General Conference delegate, Kelley’s propensity for ‘punching up’ and going against the grain ensured that despite a resume likely superior to that of *any* bishop ever

elected by the MECS – Haygood biographer Harold Mann called him “a consistently unsuccessful aspirant for the episcopacy” – he would never achieve that high office. Yet Haygood, much like his protégé and fellow loyal Democrat W. A. Candler, spent much of the later part of his career “punching down,” bullying Methodists he – and most other elite Court Methodists – did not like. Kelley spent his career defending persons and positions often particularly unpopular. At the end of his life, Kelley worked with the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. In fact, Carter may have been wrong about Kelley’s inattention to current trends. So frequently did he speak out in controversial ways, and against powerful men, one might wonder if he intentionally gave a timely voice to controversial reforming causes. Even Haynes, who shared Kelley’s concern for women’s causes and supported the Prohibition Party and the WCTU openly, found Kelley’s methods reckless. The whispers out of Georgia about Kelley as a ‘climber’ seem out of place; climbers did not punch up, especially not at bishops and men who seemed destined to become bishops.⁵⁹

As suggested by the white and orange symbolism of the WCTU gathering, the question of woman suffrage was often associated with prohibition activity, especially among third party prohibitionists. No doubt influenced by such displays of bold contravention of southern conservatism, the tide had turned against the WCTU by 1889, when new assistant editor J. W.

⁵⁹ Carter, *Methodist Leaders*, 125-129. Fitzgerald, *Dr. Summers: A Life Study* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1884), 245. Farish, *Circuit Rider Dismounts*, 349, 97, 319, 315, 187-188, 204-205, 199. Harold W. Mann, *Atticus Greene Haygood: Methodist Bishop, Editor, and Educator* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1965, 2010) 153, 151. Minnix, *Laughter in the Amen Corner*, 148. Another progressive – one with an ironic name – was J. C. C. (John C. Calhoun) Newton, pastor and later missionary from the Baltimore Conference. See Calhoun’s seventy-seven page wide-ranging assessment of various trends and the Methodist obligation to meet them, J. C. C. Newton, *The New South and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*. (Baltimore: King Brothers, 1887). Sam Jones might also be more radical than some have thought. His brief tract “Why Should a Church Member Belong to the W.C.T.U.?” includes reason 6, i.e., that the WCTU “stands for ecclesiastical emancipation of woman,” including “God’s call to women to preach the gospel.” Jones said that WCTU advocacy was “surely bringing nearer the glad day when there shall be no sex distinction in service for the King of Kings.” Sam P. Jones, “Why Should a Church Member Belong to the W.C.T.U.?” typescript, n.d., Samuel Porter Jones Papers, Woodruff Library Special Collections, Emory University.

Boswell argued for prohibition, but wanted the WCTU to drop its suffrage campaign as he thought it held back WCTU success on prohibition. His advice to the WCTU was that they should be an “anti-partisan” WCTU; with that alteration he would be fully behind their efforts. Woman suffrage and third-partyism from women taking religious authority were steps too far. The editors of the NCA urged the WCTU to forego their commentary on labor questions and especially woman suffrage.⁶⁰ Suffrage had already been too much for Fitzgerald. A sharp debate appeared between the usually easy-going Fitzgerald and the editor of the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* over woman suffrage with the implication that Fitzgerald was against suffrage and the WCA for suffrage. The WCA accused Fitzgerald of attacking the good Methodist women who wanted the vote, while Fitzgerald accused the WCA editor of dishonest criticism and “Still Toying with Woman’s Suffrage.”⁶¹

Despite his optimism about women’s lay ministries and un-conservative claim that “Methodism restored to woman the place and privilege granted her in the Church of the Apostles,” Fitzgerald opposed women’s political activity or talk of women’s ordination.⁶²

⁶⁰ “The ‘Bolt’ in the WCTU,” NCA December 12, 1889 p. 8. “A Mistake Depreciated,” NCA December 18, 1886 p. 8, possibly from W. A. Candler’s pen. It takes a sharp anti-suffrage position. For what may be a veiled criticism of the WCTU for women speaking in churches, “The Use of Scripture in the Defense of Error,” by Anson West, NCA November 20, 1886 p. 14. For “A Woman’s Answer,” that asks for the vote saying “women can vote once or twice a year without losing their purity and modesty, or becoming bad wives and mothers,” NCA January 15, 1887 p. 16.

⁶¹ “Still Toying With Woman’s Suffrage,” NCA March 19, 1887 p. 4. Fitzgerald praised for opposing suffrage as it would be a “death blow to the home,” and linking support for suffrage to those who believed it would advance Prohibition, “Woman Suffrage,” NCA March 26, 1887 p. 7. A sharp rebuke of the editor of the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate*, where the NCA editors state “we continue to declare that we are opposed to woman’s suffrage,” “Toiling With Toying,” NCA April 2, 1887 p. 8. NCA reaffirming its support for the WCTU, while repeating their hope that they would stick to temperance alone, “Yes, We Are Friendly,” NCA May 28, 1887 p. 8. Fitzgerald also commented on political parties, suggesting that the nation would be better off without them. He added later that voting a party ticket was “a shameful thing.” NCA November 17, 1888 p. 1 and NCA December 8, 1888 p.1. “Some Words After the Election” reads as a defense of the Democratic Party and a call for Democrats to remain patriotic in defeat. Fitzgerald writes as a fair, magnanimous, and charitable Democrat to an audience of Democrats. Cleveland won all the southern states but lost the election in the Electoral College. On voting party ticket, NCA January 19, 1889 p.1.

⁶² “Methodism,” NCA, November 17, 1888 p. 2. “Methodism” quoted from *Christian Guardian*, Toronto. A very optimistic statement of Methodist influence and progress. “The women of the Church were never so active in

Demanding that women choose between motherhood and the ministry, Candler's reflections on the topic included the following statement: "We know of nothing to justify the modern disposition to invest women with a sort of pious masculinity unless it is the effeminate faith of many men who seem to despair of Christianity if women are not allowed and required to do the work of both sexes in the Church." Similarly, the editors warned of women's political activities were among "Some Dangers to be Considered," where they listed three such dangers: "Salvation Armyists" (that included women's religious leadership)... "Modern evangelism" (about money greed)... And "what is called the 'woman's movement'...under the leadership of a few ambitious women, some of them are pushing their views to an extent unwarranted by the word of God."⁶³

In the early decades of the twentieth century, prohibition would provide a cause around which various camps in the MECS could rally. In the late 1880s and early 1890s, however, it threatened to split the MECS as it split the Democratic Party. In Tennessee, due in part to East Tennessee's strong white Republican vote, Democratic defeat at the hands of the Republicans was not an impossibility. Fusion politics and weakened party unity threatened Democratic control. The rise of the Farmer's Alliance fusionists was timed with the rise of the Prohibition Party to create an anxious period for Democrats. Debates over the 'Blair Bill' in the U.S. Congress also raised fears that desegregation of Tennessee schools would result. Intra-Democratic competition for black votes between New South Democrats, who sought to court African American votes through increased spending for schools, and fiscally-conservative

Christian work as now. This means much. The desert blooms at their coming." NCA March 9, 1889 p.1. "And Your Daughters Shall Prophesy," by R. N. Sledd, NCA August 13, 1887 p. 3-4. A remarkably sarcastic mocking of the pro-woman ordination position, "The Demand of the Age," by Anson West, NCA September 17, 1887 p. 4. "Christian Womanhood" reviewed November 3, 1888 p. 20; ad and review, March 14, 1889, p.20.

⁶³ [Candler] "A Mother or a Minister, Which?," NCA, January 21, 1888 p. 8. [Probably J. W. Boswell] "Some Dangers to be Considered," NCA, December 15, 1888 p. 8.

Bourbon Democrats created an opening for fusions of Republicans, Agrarians, and Black voters. In 1886, Republicans nominated Alfred Taylor with hopes of capitalizing on Democratic factionalism. Democrats nominated his brother, Robert Love Taylor, who edged out Alfred in the contest labeled ‘the War of the Roses.’ The specter of another variable, Prohibition third-party expansion, further threatened Democrats’ hold on state politics. Between 1884 and 1888 the Prohibition Party’s presidential votes in Tennessee increased fivefold. It was still a meager percentage of the Party’s national vote, and a trivial number in state gubernatorial races in 1886, and 1888, but the trend encouraged prohibitionists to explore further fusion and crossover tickets that threatened to draw off just enough votes to result in Republican victory. Such Democratic near-defeats and worrisome trends led to crackdowns by Democratic partisans. Those restrictions included the poll tax and other legislation that sought to reorder state politics by reducing the political variables and potential for fusion politics.⁶⁴

Those restrictions also targeted prohibition advocacy, especially third party and women’s advocacy. As Joe Coker noted, “during the 1890s, declaring oneself to be a prohibitionist suggested disloyalty to the Democratic Party and to white political supremacy.” A radical Yankee-born movement that linked southern Methodist preachers with the mass of southern Methodist women over and against “the Democracy” and episcopal prerogative would indeed threaten the status quo. Haygood’s support for prohibition ended abruptly in 1887. Warren Candler was also a prohibition supporter in the 1880s who later changed his position, much like Haygood, in reaction to political and gender issues. Both Haygood and Candler were known to imbibe upon occasion, the former becoming an alcoholic in the 1890s due to overuse of alcohol

⁶⁴ See Joseph H. Cartwright, *The Triumph of Jim Crow: Tennessee Race Relations in the 1880s*. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976). Roger L. Hart, *Redeemers, Bourbons, and Populists: Tennessee, 1870-1896*. (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1975). Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, 178.

for medical purposes. Candler also was a strong opponent of woman suffrage, a position that led him to oppose the WCTU. Candler would famously exclaim “Let politics alone!” even while he aggressively enforced his policy that none but Democrats would have influence at Emory College while “the Oxford Dictator” was in charge from 1888 to 1898. Candler’s family were Democratic stalwarts. Haygood affirmed in 1893 that he had always voted the Democratic ticket. Most southern Methodists backed prohibition as long as it did not challenge gender norms, racial hierarchies, or fealty to the Democratic Party.⁶⁵

Given the inadequate historical treatment of prohibition, the anti-corruption thread in prohibitionist thought has been under-appreciated, a concern that influenced religious debates as well. Court Methodists generally embraced prohibition. But their place within the cultural and ecclesiastical hierarchy naturally downplayed the more radical aspects of prohibitionist thought and when pushed they would choose order and the Democratic Party over prohibition and the threat of Republican power. In particular, the stress on anti-corruption and generally negative assessments of the direction of church, politics, economics, and society found more ready acceptance among Country Methodists on the margins of power and influence. The logic of anti-corruption whenever applied naturally focused on concentrations of power and wealth. Anti-corruption lenses applied to the late nineteenth century South focused on Democratic bossism,

⁶⁵ Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause*, 79, 251, n55. Harold W. Mann, *Atticus Greene Haygood: Methodist Bishop, Editor, and Educator* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1965), 158-160. Samuel S. Hill, Charles H. Lippy, Charles Reagan Wilson, eds., *Encyclopedia of Religion in the South*, 2nd edition. (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2005). 499-500. Coker, *Liquor*, 270-271, n. 158. Owen, *Sacred Flame of Love*, 180-184. Edward Ayers notes that “blacks enjoyed their greatest political activity and visibility of the entire New South era in the prohibition movement.” Similarly, says Ayers, “the prohibition crusade” saw the W.C.T.U. “give Southern women their first widespread opportunity to organize independently for a political cause.” Ayers notes that “Prohibition seemed the best way to end, or at least elevate, the suffering of so many Southern women.” Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, 180, 181. Charles Israel notes that the churches were taking criticism from men like John J. Vertrees who attacked the prohibition movement’s leadership as “political Methodist priests” who were in fact advancing the interests of “the Republican, the ambitious place hunter, the woman’s rights shrieker, the fanatic, and the independent.” Charles A. Israel, *Before Scopes*, 85. For Haygood and Candler’s 1892-1894 assault on the W. C. T. U. and firing of longtime professor Henry A. Scamp for prohibition advocacy, see Coker, 112-117.

their “wet” wealthy backers/bribers, and, often, “the bribable vote.” Anti-corruption lenses applied to religion, most naturally focused on elite clergy. In Methodist terms, it would most naturally focus on the episcopacy and urban station ministers and the wealthy laity who supported them and influenced their policies. In this way, a crusade for prohibition – and allied reforms like suffrage – challenged various southern “solids:” the Democratic Party (and two-party system generally), male only citizenship, the spirituality plank/doctrine, and even the rightful nearly infallible rule of ‘better men’ in the MECS. As political tensions rose in the 1890s, political and doctrinal positions that were acceptable in candidates for the episcopacy just years earlier could now disqualify one for the office. Jobs were lost, promotions prevented, and reputations ruined. It was little wonder that the Court’s demands for ‘loyalty’ resulted in Country cries of ‘tyranny.’

Tennessee Conference clergy committed themselves to the political cause of prohibition as a natural outgrowth of their religious demands for righteousness in church and state. Their political energies provoked disagreement over a core mark of MECS self-identity, the spirituality of the church. The polity implications of Methodist involvements with radical prohibition will be continued in Chapter 3. But we turn next to wider Methodist involvements in political matters other than prohibition. The legal proscription of alcohol and associated reforms were not the only political concerns worthy of MECS attention and commentary. Originating ideals about staying out of politics, no matter how often they were expressed, did not stop or even inhibit MECS political speech. The MECS was very much a politically engaged and politically interested church, and its political interest was no ‘narrow gauge’ interest focused on rare issues wherein the church had a right to speak. On the contrary, as we will see next, the late nineteenth

century MECS was overflowing with wide ranging political energy and enthusiasm, much of it of a timely and provocative nature.

CHAPTER TWO

Methodism and Civilization

The MECS possessed a prophetic tradition that extended well beyond prohibition efforts. Methodists believed they had a broad responsibility to bear truthful witness to the surrounding society and the state. They understood that hypocrisy was a serious threat to the church's witness and mission, and that in order to bear that witness effectively the church itself needed to be, and remain, free from sin if not from temptation. A worldly church, regardless of its reputation, could not successfully bear prophetic witness to a sinful world. Methodists wanted to avoid more than the appearance of hypocrisy. They believed true spiritual forces were at work. Even a church widely praised by the world, if it were not truly faithful, would still be lacking in the spiritual power and vitality necessary to fulfill its mission of bearing a truthful witness. Prophetic ministry, then, had its internal and external aspects. In order for the church to be a sanctifying force, it needed to be sanctified or holy itself. In order for the church to be a civilizing force, it needed to be a civilized church. Even in the white South of the 1880s and 1890s, Methodists embraced what they understood to be the call of God to speak truthfully about social and political matters. They aspired to be part of a righteous church ministering to a world (including both state and society) that was being transformed, remade, reformed, even sanctified, by the power of God.¹

The northern branch of Methodism and northern society generally occupied a unique

¹ "Prophetic" here refers not primarily to foretelling or predicting the future, but to moral truth-telling and criticism of sin and wrongdoing, especially truth-telling that is understood to be brave and bold. While much of the prophetic literature of Jewish and Christian Scripture does have a foretelling aspect, its central thrust is a call to righteous living in the present. For a classic statement of the emphases of this biblical tradition that informs much of American Protestantism's reforming zeal, see Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Prophets*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).

place in the southern Methodist mind in this regard. In the two decades following the end of the Civil War, sectional tensions resulting from the conflict, some particular to the Methodist experience, provided southern Methodists with both a negative and positive example, something against which to stand, and something towards which to strive. But southern Methodists' late nineteenth century engagements with politics were not driven by a comparison or foil in relation to northern Methodism, or even specifically with the "Negro question." These political engagements rather were driven and characterized by an abiding concern for civilization. On this point, it seems likely that their concern was similar to those of northern Methodists and many American Protestants generally.

Wesleyans to be sure have had a mixed and diverse record regarding political involvements. The spirituality of the church idea provided southern Methodists with a general principle, although it will be clear from what follows that they were heavily involved in public questions. So when did they get involved? On what basis did they engage, notwithstanding the spirituality of the church idea? Southern Methodists were most likely to engage in a public question when they perceived in it a threat or aid to civilization. They were "for" a public action or policy if they believed it advanced, extended, or protected civilization. They were "against" a public action or policy if they believed it advanced, extended, or encouraged barbarism.

The long history of Methodist political actions before and after this time suggests as much. Intra-Methodist notions and discourse about civilization and barbarism seem closely related to Methodist thought and practice on many social and political issues, e.g., slavery, lynching, temperance and prohibition, gambling, immigration, dancing, polygamy, war, crime and punishment, abortion, public education, civil rights, higher education, global health, etc.

Generally, civilization has often been compared to--and contrasted with barbarism. In

this, Methodists have been no exception. That is, it might be expected that if Methodists viewed an idea, action, or policy to be “barbaric,” they would also consider it to be a threat to civilization. From John Wesley’s commentaries on the American Revolution to the wartime activities of MEC Bishop Matthew Simpson, Methodists would wrestle with questions of the national and political well-being as well as that of the church.²

American Methodists also functioned with a fusion of republican and Protestant notions of civilization. Biblical warrants and a long history of biblical interpretation in Christianity obviously shaped their views. Yet these notions were largely inherited and informed by British developments, especially the history of Protestantism in Britain, both traditional and more radical English understandings of ‘liberty,’ and the political theology of the confessional state in Britain. Such views were characterized by a concern for literacy, free speech, freedom of religion, the rule of law, moral and spiritual seriousness and discipline, the need for vigilance in the face of immorality and tyranny, the fragility of free, just, and honest government, and a persistent tendency to fear religious and political decline matched with a robust hope for progress. In other words, American Methodists behaved as if human persons and human societies were both readily corruptible and readily perfectable. It could go either way and indeed *would* go one way or the other. Thus, Methodists were responsible for not just for having the right opinion of or theory about this or that issue, but also for doing something about it. For American Methodists, doctrine and ethics had to be translated into polity and action.³

² For further explorations of the American Revolution, see Jessie Shuman Larkins, “John Wesley Among the Colonies: Wesleyan Theology in the Face of the American Revolution,” *Methodist History* 45:4 (July 2007), 232-243; Dee Andrews, *The Methodists and Revolutionary America, 1760-1800* (2000) and Bucke, Emory C., ed. *History of American Methodism*. (1964) I: 145-184.

³ Fuller treatments of Methodist republicanism include A. Gregory Schneider, *The Way of the Cross Leads Home: The Domestication of American Methodism* (1993), especially chapter 2 “Republicanism and Reform,” and Russell

Such assumptions, when added to the vigorous growth of the various Methodisms by 1850, encouraged Methodists to assume the attitude of a “state church.” That is, they were primary care takers of civilization and the moral, social, and even political order. The size and access to power of the MEC and MECS that made such a stance possible, creating a corresponding sense of both responsibility and prerogative. As C. C. Goen noted, the Methodist Episcopal Church was the “most extensive national institution in Antebellum America other than the federal government.”⁴ By 1868, Ulysses S. Grant could remark that there were three great parties in the United States: The Republican Party, The Democratic Party, and The Methodist Church. Smaller Wesleyan-Methodist denominations have seemed far less confident (and assertive) about their ability to shape the course of history and national affairs. But the size, power and popular reach of the MEC and MECS in the second half of the nineteenth century are remarkable. Methodism was, quite simply, the most powerful church in America, North and South. Few churches, if any, have so consistently claimed the mantle of moral authority over the national life as have the mainline denominations of episcopal Methodism. Methodist wealth, size, geographical, and socio-economic reach, and Protestant credentials, gave it unmatched access to the American people and the American state. It is in this context that the political engagements that follow should be understood.⁵

E. Richey, *Early American Methodism* (1991), especially chapter 6 “The Four Languages of Early American Methodism.”

⁴ C. C. Goen, *Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the Civil War* (1985), 57.

⁵ The Episcopal and Presbyterian traditions probably had greater political power relative to membership than Methodism had, but their much smaller membership and far more limited socio-economic and geographical reach prevented claims to status as America’s church. Baptists, too, had great size, but lacked geographical reach and possessed a smaller urban wing and less wealth. Catholics’ status as an often unwelcome visitor in an overwhelmingly Protestant nation prevented their size and wealth from translating into the same kind of broad influence Methodism had. A Methodist running for public office would be advantaged by Methodist membership in perhaps every region of the nation. Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Congregationalists did not possess such a ubiquitous national advantage.

Editors Oscar Penn (O. P.) Fitzgerald (1829–1911, editor 1878–1890) and Elijah Embree (E.E.) Hoss (1849–1919, editor 1890–1902) spoke through the pages of the Nashville *Christian Advocate* (NCA). Both would be elected to episcopacy of the MECS directly from the editor’s desk after twelve years as editor. Nineteenth century editors exercised tremendous influence, with their editorials appearing on page one of newspapers with subscription lists in the thousands. While bishops occupied the highest posts, it seems doubtful that all the bishops combined would address as many people in as many different places on a weekly basis as did the editors of papers such as the *Advocate*. Political comments in the *Christian Advocate* ranged widely, as did less political social “observations” that included noting a yellow fever epidemic in Jacksonville, Florida, and rising opium use in the US: “brother, sister, quit!” Sectional debates did appear often, although perhaps not as frequently as might be expected. On the whole, the tone suggested that Civil War matters in particular should be left alone. Fitzgerald wrote frequently of national unity: “When a belated sectionalist in one part of the country utters a croak, he starts the whole frog-pond, North and South. And this is bad.” Fitzgerald held that sectional peace would at least partially be an indication of the maturing of the Christian churches.⁶

But sectional debates did appear in the *Advocate*. Often these consisted of defending the

⁶ NCA, September 22, 1888; NCA January 19, 1889 p. 3 and “The Opium Habit” NCA December 29, 1888 p. 8. NCA June 26, 1886 p. 8. Another possible comment from Fitzgerald is about not looking back or reviving the passions of a dark time but toward “the light of the morning,” NCA May 16, 1889 p. 1. As for engaging in sectional wrangling, “the ugly habit of repenting not of our own sins but those of our neighbors on the other side of what was once a sectional line, still shows itself here and there – especially there, we think, just now. That sort of silliness and littleness ought to be at least two decades behind us.” NCA, October 3, 1889 p. 4. Rebuke of sectional squabbling: “Your neighbor on the other side of a sectional line is liable to trip now and then as you are. Watch for his stumbling, and be ready to exaggerate it to the utmost. This is the sort of patriotism that cripples the republic; this is the sort of religion that degrades the Church. The Christians of America, Anno Domini 1887, should rise above this idiocy and wickedness,” NCA August 20, 1887 p.1.

honor or reputation of veterans or other visible war-era figures accused of some sort of wrongdoing. Discussions that compared the Old South to the New South were not uncommon. Frequently the most intense debates involved spats with editors from MEC newspapers.⁷

MECS editors shared broad and extensive social and political engagement. Commentary on race ranged widely. In many cases, writers mentioned race only as it related to some other important topic. In other cases, race was central to their concern. The tone of these writings was diverse. The subject of what whites should be doing on behalf of African Americans appeared as a consistent theme. Most often the answer was evangelistic activity, but at times other matters of a more obvious political nature were in view. D. C. Kelley, for example, appealed for women's mission work for African Americans in 1889, writing, "The old race

⁷ NCA, March 28, 1889 p.8 "An Idiotic Falsehood" states "The twaddle about an alleged remark of the late Dr. J. B. McFerrin concerning an alleged purpose on the part of the leaders of the late Southern Confederacy to have 'an established religion,' we consider too mendacious and silly to deserve notice. Dr. McFerrin never said any such thing. The absurdity of it is too patent for it to be thought of by anybody but a lunatic. The idiotic fabrication did not appear until after our old commoner was dead. This leads us to say, in dismissing it, that it is time that the ghoulishness of quoting dead men for this or that selfish or unworthy purpose ought to be stopped. The presumption is that what a good man did not openly say for himself when living no other man has the right to say for him after he is dead. The rights of a dead brother are as sacred as those of the living." J. B. McFerrin was a chaplain in "the Southern Army" during the Civil War, NCA April 4, 1889 p.20. Praise for Samuel S. "Sunset" Cox, an Ohio Democrat, NCA October 3, 1889 p. 8. Defending the "gallant Gen. McPherson who fell at Kennesaw," NCA January 8, 1887 p. 8. NCA, May 23, 1889 p.14 "Let not Virginia and North Carolina have the least semblance of a dispute concerning the relative heroism of their sons at Gettysburg. The death-roll of the troops of each State is the vindication of both." For argument that State governments should provide for Confederate Veterans with a strong appreciation for "the soldiers of the Lost Cause," as well as the "noble example of William B. Tate," see "East Tennessee Notes," by R. N. Price, Morristown, Tenn., NCA August 8, 1889, p.14. R. N. Price commented on Confederate soldiers gathering in "Holston Notes," in what was otherwise comment about the Annual Conference, NCA October 31, 1889 p. 14. "Jefferson Davis," NCA December 12, 1889 p. 8. "Bishop Keener on Jefferson Davis," NCA December 19, 1889 p. 8-9. Also A. P. McFerrin on Davis, NCA December 19, 1889 p. 9 and Atticus G Haygood's lengthy rumination on Davis, NCA January 4, 1890 p. 6. Related to "harmony in manly hearts" and a new Confederate monument at Gettysburg, NCA November 20, 1886 p. 1. Advancing moral reform versus dying sectionalism, NCA November 20, 1886 p. 8. Fitzgerald refused to continue the debate, "Let Us Have Peace," December 18, 1886 p. 8. For appeal to have chivalrous courage as "Lee, Stonewall Jackson and Sidney Johnston" in fighting gambling, NCA January 11, 1890 p.1. A review of "Christ in the Camp or Religion in Lee's Army," NCA August 20, 1887 p. 9. Fitzgerald opined "The 'New South,' so called, is producing more iron and other manufactures, and is more boastful on some lines: but is it producing nobler men and women than the 'Old South,' so called? This is the crucial question for us, A. D. 1889." NCA October 24, 1889 p. 1. W. A. Candler affirming the "New South" while praising the heroism of the old South, "Is it All New?" NCA March 26, 1887 p. 8. On "Henry Grady," NCA January 4, 1890 p.8. An example of rivalry between the MEC and MECS asserting that the MEC should serve the more needy North, likely from W. A. Candler, "A Friendly Reply," NCA November 27, 1886 p. 8.

prejudice, in a form more difficult and aggravated than it has ever been found in the history of the past, you stand face to face with to-day....We turn to you Christian women in this hour requiring penetration, insight and lofty intuition, demanding exalted courage and delicate perception of the right, to take hold in a practical way of this critical question... What you ought to do, I do not know. The desperate need I see, and, pointing you to it, leave you in the hands of Christ the Lord and of the promised Spirit.”⁸

Commentary related to race and prohibition was a frequent sub-theme. The editors at times made remarkably hostile comments, usually aimed primarily at the public sins of pro-liquor forces:. One wrote, “The Negroes, as a class, are ignorant, impressible, and easily influenced by material considerations; and the whisky rings...have no great trouble in controlling the majority of their votes.” Many prohibitionists believed that liquor forces engaged in widespread bribery of voters, especially among poor city-dwellers who voted “wet,” most often, but not exclusively, African Americans. Others reacted strongly to these charges that African Americans were not supportive of prohibition, and provided the names of African Americans and even their publications devoted to the prohibition cause. One entitled “Give the Negro His Due” charged that “here the black is more sinned against than sinning.” Sectional spats with the MEC also included racial commentary.⁹

⁸ “The Women and the Macedonian Call: Sermon Before Annual Conference of the Woman’s Missionary Society of the Tennessee Conference at Franklin, Tenn. By Dr. D. C. Kelley. Published under call of the Society,” NCA August 29, 1889 p. 3-4. See also “The Modern Deaconess Movement,” by W. C. Black, NCA October 24, 1889 p. 2. An appeal for missionary work among African Americans, January 19, 1889 p.3.

⁹ On bribery of black voters, likely from assistant editor J. W. Boswell, “What Are They Doing?” NCA August 29, 1889 p. 8. “Give the Negro His Due,” W. L. C. Hunnicutt, NCA September 18, 1886 p. 14. Colonization of “Negroes” discussed with negative assessment – They “are doing well in the South.” NCA October 10, 1889 p. 1. Fitzgerald on race and prohibition, bribery of voters, crookedness of liquor NCA August 29, 1889 p.1. See also “Some Facts: For the Consideration of Christian Patriots Everywhere,” NCA February 15, 1890 p. 1 that addressed several subjects including race, prohibition, black voting, lynching, segregation in the MEC. An appeal to black voters of Tennessee to prove their support for prohibition, noting the wholesale support of black preachers and “their chief schools – Fisk University, Tennessee Central College, and Roger Williams University,” [likely from

The editors of the *Advocate* often sharply condemned racial violence and lynching. While at times reacting defensively to northern charges of white southern misconduct, they most frequently aimed their criticisms at the lawless and uncivilized wrongdoings of whites. The context for this included their high notions of the superiority of white civilization (including black inferiority in the South) and the decisive role they believed the United States would play in future world affairs. In other words, the quality of the United States internal civilization and culture was to be critical for world affairs. Thus, America's internal virtues and vices would be particularly important.¹⁰

On lynching, Fitzgerald's views and tone were clear: "These elements make up the ordinary lynchings – brutality, stupidity, and cowardice. Leave them, therefore, to brutes, fools, and cowards." Similarly, Fitzgerald preached that "when a hundred men commit a murder as a mob, they are mistaken if they think the guilt is divided among them *pro rata*. The crime of murder rests on everyone of them." Fitzgerald believed that religious impulses would be the

Fitzgerald] "The Colored Voters' Opportunity," NCA July 9, 1887 p. 9. Fitzgerald printed and recommended a notice from J. C. Woodward of Lexington, Kentucky who began printing *The Herald*, the only paper in the U.S. published "by colored men in the interests of prohibition," "A Good Move," NCA July 30, 1887 p. 9. In response, D. C. Kelley provided the name of *The Free Lance*, an African American newspaper supportive of prohibition and published in Nashville, and said "help put *The Free Lance* in the hands of all our colored voters," "The Free Lance," NCA August 6, 1887 p. 7. For an attack on the MEC in the South, especially concerning race and charging that the white membership of the MEC in the South was "founded mainly on politics and prejudices!," see "On 'Gilbert Haven' and 'Paris Colony' Social Relations," by "I. E. S., Dalton, Ga." NCA March 12, 1887 p. 3.

¹⁰ For a defense of the South against the charge by a northern religious newspaper of wanton violence against blacks, NCA December 12, 1889 p. 9. NCA, April 4, 1889 p.1. "if there is anything in the future settled beyond a doubt it is that the Anglo-Saxon race will rule the world, or rather a race the base of which will be Anglo-Saxon." Most of these will be in "this country." Fitzgerald quotes approvingly "Dr. Strong's idea, 'As goes America, so goes the world,'" as well as "'as goes the West (Western U.S.) so goes America.'" The area west of the Mississippi, Fitzgerald predicted, the "densest and most powerful population on the globe will one day live. They will not be pure Anglo-Saxons, but their predominant strain will be Anglo-Saxon. They will be a composite race, descended from the most vigorous Caucasian stocks, developed under the free institutions of this country, and speaking the English language. No other name will fit them but '*Americans*.' They will be capable, with their brethren in the Eastern part of our country, of ruining or ruling the world. Which will they do?" The next paragraph argued that it will be rule, but "not by the force of arms but by the influence of the gospel." For apparent criticism of government policy, expenditures, and Indian war with the Sioux, NCA September 26, 1889 p.1. For white race, including Vikings and divorce, "The Divorce Question," NCA July 17, 1886 p. 1.

decisive factor in shaping solutions to “the Negro problem,” which he believed was not centrally a political issue. His article received a directly reply from Bishop Henry McNeil Turner of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Fitzgerald believed alcohol use aggravated racial tensions: “Nine times out of ten the so-called race trouble is a whisky trouble. You cannot abolish races, but you can abolish bar-rooms. Do it.”¹¹

But again the sharpest race-related comments were aimed at lynching and racial violence by whites. An extended piece from 1889 illustrates. Fitzgerald stated, “The White Caps in Indiana and Ohio are symptomatic. They indicate a disease in the body politic. The Law and Order Leagues, organized here and there and the North, are also symptomatic. All such organizations indicate a deep-seated distrust of the regular official agencies for the administration of justice.” He continued, “A notable difference between the White Caps and the Law and Order League is the secrecy of the one and the openness of the other. This is indeed a very great difference,” declared Fitzgerald. “There is no valid excuse for any secret political organization under a republican form of government, unless it is assumed that republican

¹¹ On ‘ordinary lynchings,’ NCA, September 29, 1888, p.1. On lynching as murder, NCA September 17, 1887 p. 1. “The Negro Problem,” NCA, October 6, 1888 p.1. On abolishing bar-rooms, NCA September 19, 1889, p.1. Bishop H. M. Turner replied with “A Remarkable Letter” NCA October 27, 1888 p. 4; “That Remarkable Letter” (quote from Atlanta *Constitution* as a reply to Turner, NCA November 10, 1888 p. 9; “Letter from Bishop Lane” NCA June 13, 1889 p.14; Also NCA December 19, 1888 p.1, and NCA March 28, 1889 p.1., “The Church and the Negro Question” where Fitzgerald placed the church as apolitical and non-partisan but still responsible for education and spiritual welfare adding that “these millions of Negroes are here with us. They belong to the body politic.” On reasons for the “lull in wild talk about race troubles,” NCA November 21, 1889 p. 1. On heterogeneous white North and “inherited race question to manage” in the South, NCA October 17, 1885 p.1. “The Race Problem,” NCA January 11, 1890 p.1 and “The Disregard of Human Life,” NCA January 11, 1890 p. 8. For Fitzgerald engaging in sectional polemics on the inconsistency of “the color line” problems among Northerners, rejecting “social equality” “fanatics,” and urging “the southern people” to do due duty toward African Americans despite the hampering “ravings of *doctrinaires* preaching they know not what about ‘social equality,’” NCA July 16, 1887 p.1. Strongly anti-lynching comment, “The Mississippi Horror – A Clarion Note,” (partially quoted from the *Jackson Clarion*, “A Democratic Paper,”) April 17, 1886 p.8. On “the Negro Question,” NCA July 17, 1886 p. 6-7, 11. See also “Race Troubles in the South” article and NCA January 15, 1889 p. 8 where it appears that the “Race Troubles in the South” was popular. “Naughty Detroit,” NCA December 8, 1888 p. 8 argued that race/segregation was a problem in the North also, quoting the *Michigan Christian Advocate*; See also “The Race Problem in the South” by W. M. Leftwich, *Quarterly Review* (April 1889).

government, with a free press, free speech, and an open ballot, is a failure. In fact, that is just what it all means.”¹²

Fitzgerald said that as for “forming a Law and Order League here in Nashville... we demurred, and do demur. There is with us no such emergency as would call for such a movement. If the anarchists of Chicago and the drunken and brutalized law-breakers of Cincinnati are too strong to be controlled by the officers of the law” the people there have our “regret... sympathy... and best wishes.” Fitzgerald concluded by saying “We believe that it is time to retrace our steps as a people in the direction of the old paths trod by the fathers of the Republic and rely upon the methods of political action and social reform which were born with the Government, which are in harmony with its genius, and which prevailed during the best periods of its history. Let us have open debate instead of the secret society, the watchful and steady support of all good citizens in enforcing the laws instead of secret Leagues, Ku-Klux, White Caps, or Lynchers.”¹³

¹² “Let Us Be Done With Empiricisms,” NCA, January 5, 1889, p.1. Fitzgerald continued his explanation, saying that, “The White Caps, we are aware, claim that the objects of their organization are good... The Ku-Klux in the South during the dark days of the reconstruction period made the same claim at the start, and just as truthfully. Good men went into the organization under the plea that the very existence of civilized society was imperiled, and that the machinery of the law, as then administered, was inadequate to the protection of life and property. The excesses committed in the name of this organization were the work of men who used it for the gratification of brutal instincts or personal grudges. The Ku-Klux society died a natural death when good men saw that if any necessity for such an extraordinary agency ever existed, it was no longer needed. But it has furnished ammunition for many a sectional campaign, and long after the last Ku-Klux had finished his nocturnal rounds the ghost of the dead organization was used to frighten timid and credulous voters into unquestioning party allegiance.” ... “The White Caps have sprung up elsewhere, among the very people who have scarcely recovered from their spasms of fright and horror over the atrocities, real or imaginary, of the Ku-Klux. We particularize this point, not for the petty purpose of balancing accounts in the sectional contest of crimination and recrimination, but to show that a deadly disease in the body politic has come to the surface where it has been claimed that the conditions of the most vigorous health existed, and to put thoughtful and patriotic citizens to thinking with to what we deem a very serious evil.”

¹³ “Let Us Be Done With Empiricisms,” NCA, January 5, 1889, p.1. Same page argues that “violent unnatural crimes reported” should not be in detail as they encourage similar crimes and “inflame both races.” “There is a certain class of offense the detailed publication of which is almost incendiarism.”; NCA January 12, 1889 p.1., “Mob law has received a check in this part of the world. Kill it, and rid the land of a shame and a horror.”; Another rebuke to publishers and readers of the “foul details” of criminal behavior caused by “lust and lying,” NCA July 11, 1889, p.8. Another sharp rebuke of the sensationalism among “our Southern newspapers”, NCA September 19, 1889

The editors meanwhile celebrated perceived progress, declaring “we want to record the fact that we have recently seen more candor and good-will in the discussion of sectional and race questions than ever before in our life. We congratulate every Christian patriot in this great Republic that this is so. The real difficulties of the situation are in our own stupidity and narrowness rather than in the existing facts.” Fitzgerald was often indignant: “Lynch-law is on the run in some places where the officers of the law have done their duty promptly and courageously. Let it be run out of the country, and kept out, in the name of justice and mercy.” Similarly he noted, “They have begun to regulate the ‘regulators’ in Louisiana. Let the good work go on. Ninety-nine times out of a hundred the fellow who puts on a mask and calls himself a regulator, only lacks courage to be an open murderer.” Fitzgerald wrote, “True courage is not exhibited by echoing with intensified vehemence the cry of the mob... the highest courage is calm and conservative.”¹⁴

p.1 saying “There are no more peaceable and peace-loving people than the Negroes...the anti-Semitic spirit of continental Europe nor the anti-Chinese spirit of the West find no parallel anti-African spirit in the South.”

¹⁴ On sectional and racial progress, NCA January 12, 1889 p. 8. On indignation over lynching, NCA February 16, 1889 p.1. On regulating the regulators, NCA December 12, 1889 p. 8., On true courage, NCA January 28, 1888 p. 1. For even sharper anti-lynching comments, see NCA March 28, 1889 p.1. Further anti-lynching comments, NCA February 2, 1889 p.8; Also, NCA March 9, 1889 p.1 A “smaller and meaner class of politicians seek to aggravate the racial difficulties that are inevitable from a situation without parallel in history, but let Christian men of all sections and all shades of color be just, patient, and prayerful. We are on trial. Let us see to it that that which God puts before us as our grand opportunity shall not through our blindness and waywardness be our shame and disaster.” Another criticism, NCA April 11, 1889 p.1. affirms the reward issued by Governor Gordon of Georgia for the capture of a gang of White Caps – “That is the word: they are a cowardly ‘gang,’ and should be stamped out everywhere, even in Indiana and Ohio, their birthplace.” On carrying of firearms, Fitzgerald asks why one man carries and another does not: “Because one has a sneaking passion for strife and blood in his heart, and other has not” NCA April 11, 1889 p.1.; Another comment, NCA April 11, 1889, p.8. For comments linking violence against the “Southern Negro” who “does not want to move, and could not do so if he would,” “stop demagoguery all around and let the Golden Rule and common sense prevail,” and “secret political societies are wholly out of place in a free republic,” NCA June 27, 1889 p.8. For criticism of dueling and claim that “race troubles” are tied to “drunkenness,” NCA September 5, 1889 p. 8 and September 19, 1889 p.1 where Fitzgerald claims “nine times out of ten the so-called race trouble is a whisky trouble. You cannot abolish races, but you can abolish bar-rooms. Do it.” Race violence and drunkenness, “The ‘Carrolton Affair,’” NCA April 24, 1886 p. 8. For defense of the South against those who claim southerners favor dueling, NCA September 12, 1889 p. 9. For Fitzgerald’s views on dueling, NCA September 19, 1889 p. 1 namely “two more simpletons in Georgia have gotten their names in the newspapers as intended duelists.” Again on dueling and political, legal responses favored, NCA September 26, 1889 p. 1. Again on White Caps “and the white rowdies in the South,” NCA November 14, 1889 p.1. “The citizen who encourages

Fitzgerald's successor, E. E. Hoss made similar statements, including a full-throated protest from 1892. Hoss declared himself "squarely against mob law," which he "denounce[d]...in Ohio or Tennessee or Texas." The "burning of a negro man at Texarkana as a penalty for an unnamable offense, fills us with horror," Hoss announced, before questioning "What are we coming to? Are our courts good for nothing? Is law useless? Are we drifting back to barbarism?" Hoss cried "In the name of civilization, the name of humanity, in the name of God, we protest against such things." Hoss said, "The rule of the mob is anarchy." It was the lynching, not the "unnamable offense," that filled Hoss "with horror," and had him fearful of a drift into "barbarism" and "anarchy."¹⁵

B. F. Haynes, as editor of the *Tennessee Methodist*, a new paper for the Tennessee Conference begun in 1891, operated in this context. He also condemned lynching in March

lynch law weakens the defenses of his own home and takes the ABC lesson in anarchy," NCA November 21, 1889 p. 8. For a defense of the South against the charge of wanton violence ("calumny") against blacks by a northern religious newspaper that said "a 'wire-grass Georgian would just as soon shoot a Negro as a deer,'" NCA December 12, 1889 p. 9. For evidence of positive Fitzgerald on race ("the good Fitzgerald") NCA December 18, 1886 p. 4. "The 'good citizen' who winks at lynching, and goes into spasms of fright or indignation when lawlessness breaks out around him in other forms, needs better sense or a stronger will," NCA January 4, 1890 p.1. "Prof. Scomp, of Emory College, insists that assisted immigration is the true solution to the Negro question. May be so. But until all hands are ready, let us do what we can to give the Negroes among us the gospel of Jesus Christ; so that if they stay here they will be fellow Christians, and if they go they will carry that gospel with them," NCA January 18, 1890 p.8. For a rebuke of the idea of forced Black emigration to Africa, "Why Peoples Move," by Atticus G. Haygood, NCA February 15, 1890 p. 5. Other commentary from the editors, "Negro Colonization," NCA February 22, 1890 p. 8. Strong anti-lynching and anti-mob violence commentary that ties mob violence to the lingering "satanic" effects of war, NCA February 22, 1890 p.1. It is however clear that Fitzgerald was opposed to whites and blacks attending school together – repeated griping about "the Asbury Park incident" in New York, "the Chattanooga University," and "the Glenn Bill" in Georgia appears. NCA August 13, 1887 p.1. Replying to northern critics, "Critics with Beams in Their Eyes," NCA August 27, 1887 p. 8. "The Upshot of The Glenn Bill," NCA September 3, 1887 p. 8. Sharp criticism of lynching: "'Judge Lynch' is a fool," NCA August 20, 1887 p. 1.

¹⁵ NCA, March 2, 1892, p.1. Hoss's full statement: "It is not necessary for us to say that we are squarely against mob law. Our position on that subject is already well known. We denounce it in Ohio or Tennessee or Texas. The recent burning of a negro man at Texarkana as a penalty for an unnamable offense, fills us with horror. What are we coming to? Are our courts good for nothing? Is law useless? Are we drifting back to barbarism? Awful as is the crime of which the negro in this case was guilty, there was no excuse for the action of the mob. In a perfectly lawful way, he could have been speedily tried and swiftly executed. In the name of civilization, the name of humanity, in the name of God, we protest against such things. Our former utterances on this subject have lost us some subscribers. We should not change our course by a hair's breadth if 10,000 names were dropped to-morrow. The rule of the mob is anarchy."

1892. In a full length front page article entitled “Means Remedial and Preventative of a Great and Growing Evil,” Haynes went even further than Fitzgerald or Hoss when he declared that “every member of a mob is a murderer” and called for “searching and swift and summary vindication of the majesty of law, and the rights of even the guiltiest under the law in every case of lynch law by the detection and trial and punishment of the lynchers.”¹⁶

All three editors – Fitzgerald, Hoss, and Haynes – spoke through papers authorized as General Conference or Annual Conference organs. Together, their social and political engagement was broad, extensive, and shared. Their frequent condemnations of lynching appeared on page one of their papers, on the editorial page, not in small font and toward the back with the obituaries, event announcements, and advertisements. Their condemnations went out to thousands of homes in the white South in the late 1880s and 1890s, many of which were in counties where these atrocities were occurring. They appeared from Fitzgerald’s pen as late as the spring of 1890; that May in St. Louis, the General Conference with lay and clergy delegates from throughout the South, elected him bishop. Haynes was Tennessee Conference secretary at the time he was making these statements, while Hoss would be reelected editor in 1894 and 1898 before being finally elected to the episcopacy in 1902.¹⁷

¹⁶ “Means Remedial and Preventative of a Great and Growing Evil,” *Tennessee Methodist*, March 17, 1892, p. 1.

¹⁷ My findings confirm Hunter Farish, *Circuit Rider Dismounts*, 226-229, and run contra Connor Kenaston, who argues that anti-lynching commentary was linked to evangelistic and missionary concerns, not concerns over the decay of American civilization. Kenaston, who does not cite Hoss, Farish, or the NCA, argues that Fitzgerald became more sympathetic toward African Americans in the 1890s due to pressure from northern and MEC critics. It seems more likely that northern criticism of white southerners on race generally *increased* white sectional and racial animosity. Kenaston sees little anti-lynching or pro-uplift commentary from whites in the MECS before 1900, perhaps because his sources do not include the MECS newspapers from that era, especially the late 1880s and early 1890s. Hoss’s comments about losing subscribers might be bluster. His predecessor ran such commentary frequently, had a booming subscription record, and was elected bishop in 1890. Atticus Greene Haygood, whose works Kenaston cites heavily, was elected bishop *twice* after making pro-uplift and anti-lynching comments. Haynes’s *Tennessee Methodist* ran a symposium on lynching in 1893. Connor S. Kenaston, “Methodists and Lynching: Racial Violence and The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1880–1930,” *Methodist Review* 7 (2015): 21–43. Kenaston’s essay is one of several studies of lynching and religion in the South that have appeared recently.

Fitzgerald's views on racial violence were related to his views on political violence and political organizations generally. In 1888 he wrote that "The secret methods of political action born under Old-World despotisms are as much out of place in this free Republic as would be the use of the knout as a remedy for political heresy. As good American citizens, we want none of them." Fitzgerald also took aim at entertainment violence, as compared to political violence. About cock-fighting, he declared "this vice, which combines brutality and silliness in about an equal degree, had had its day except among the lowest slums of our large cities." He also set himself against boxing, commenting on "John Sullivan" and "Slugging" in Mississippi, and praised Gov. Lowry for standing against the practice.¹⁸

Fitzgerald also wrote about "Election Reforms," proposing several reforms, the repudiation of political deceit in campaigns, the election of Presidents and Vice-Presidents for six year terms and a corresponding lengthening of office terms generally. He pronounced, "the ballot-box ought to be the palladium of our liberties... but under the system now prevalent it threatens to become the instrument of their overthrow." Other political commentary flowed on tariffs, Presidential pensions, the host city for the World's Fair, Brazil's revolution, Mormons,

On the whole, they do not deal directly with the types of evidence utilized here: statements that went out in official denomination-wide and region-wide papers on a weekly basis, from members of the very elite of a southern evangelical denomination. What is missing from Fitzgerald's writing about lynching is reference to gender or sexuality. Also missing is extended or frequent commentary about Jesus's bloody death on the cross, Jewish rejection of Jesus, the curse of Ham, or most of the other Christian teachings or practices that are frequently mentioned by historians of lynching and religion as causative factors of lynching in the South. Each of the Nashville-based editors were consistent about extra-legal violence: it was barbaric, unpatriotic, felonious, and unchristian. The question is not why did elite MECS clergy remain silent on or support lynching, but did their official condemnations have any effect, and if not, why not? For classic works on this topic, see William Fitzbugh Brundage, *Under Sentence of Death: Lynching in the South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Joel R. Williamson, *The Crucible of Race: Black White Relations in the American South since Emancipation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, *Revolt Against Chivalry: Jessie Daniel Ames and the Women's Campaign Against Lynching* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979).

¹⁸ On secrecy in a free republic, NCA February 16, 1889, p.1. On entertainment violence, NCA January 12, 1889 p. 1.; NCA August 15, 1889 p.1 and September 12, 1889 p.8. More political commentary including communism, socialism, and anarchism in "The Sure Remedy for National Evils," NCA October 17, 1889 p. 1.

Utah, South Dakota, and Nevada statehood, and even the Monroe Doctrine.¹⁹

Comments about Catholics and Catholicism appeared upon occasion, usually related to worries about forms of government and Catholicism's axiomatic hostility to free government and political freedom of religion. Methodist anti-Catholicism was widespread and most often about Catholicism's perceived religious and political threat to American religious and civic virtues and institutions.²⁰ Comments about public and private education appeared, though more often related to higher education.²¹ Discussions about missionary activity both inside and beyond the United

¹⁹ NCA, November 3, 1888, p.1. "Election Reforms." For evidence of the importance of politics to leading MECS preachers, "Patriotism" quoted from *St. Louis Christian Advocate* and written by "Dr. J. O. Andrew" argued that "Patriotism must underlie all greatness of character" on the premise that if a man does not love those closest to him, he cannot love those furthest from him or even love God. NCA November 17, 1888 p.2. On one of several references on the topic in 1888 of "that blessed tariff," see NCA October 13, 1888 p.1. On pensions, see NCA April 4, 1889, p.1. Urging "Washington City" for the World's Fair site, NCA November 21, 1889 p. 1. On Brazil's preference for republicanism over monarchy, NCA December 5, 1889 p. 1 and 8. For Statehood and Mormons/LDS church see NCA December 1, 1888 p.1, a sharp comment against Utah statehood due to polygamy, and NCA December 1, 1888 p.8, a comment on South Dakota statehood with a sharp note on Nevada "not as did Nevada, by the back-door of an illegal procedure." For more on Southern religious groups on Mormons and polygamy that includes a number of Methodist newspaper sources (both white and black), Patrick Q. Mason, "Opposition to Polygamy in the Postbellum South," *Journal of Southern History*, August 2010, Vol. LXXVI, No.3, 541-578. On the Monroe Doctrine, NCA February 2, 1889 p.8. Opposition to the Spoils system and criticism of President Benjamin Harrison on Sabbath issues, NCA July 25, 1889 p.1.

²⁰ On Catholicism generally, aggressive political activity and aims in the US and assumption of papal control, see NCA, January 19, 1889 p. 1, NCA March 9, 1889 p.9 and especially NCA, October 31, 1889 p.7 and NCA November 14, 1889 p.8 the latter saying "the kingdom which is not of his world is not dependent upon the 'triple alliances' of civil rulers, nor upon the patronage of the State in any form." Also "Anti-Christ, And Roman Catholicism," by W. M. Prottsman, NCA December 12, 1889 p. 3. On public education in the North and Catholics, NCA June 6, 1889 p.1.

²¹ On public and denominational Christian education colleges – "A Vital Question Now Before Us" NCA March 9, 1889 p.1. More on "Church Schools vs. State Schools," NCA June 20, 1889 p. 14 by J. H. Sherrard, Valley Center, Cal. On "Vanderbilt University – Its Critics," NCA June 27, 1889, p. 8; includes defense of replacing McTyeire with another Bishop on the Board of Trust (compares this practice to similar ones as Presbyterian Princeton and "The Episcopal University at Sewanee)." "The assumption, indirectly made, that a university under the control of the Methodist Church must of necessity be narrow and illiberal," is "unfounded in fact. The genius of true Methodism is liberal." Another defense reprinted from Nashville Daily American of June 23, 1889 by J. T. McGill, NCA July 4, 1889 p.14.; Support for public school educator's (National Educational Association) convention in Nashville, NCA July 18, 1889 p. 8, and NCA July 25, 1889, p. 9, the latter noting with approval that "there was one class of citizens who gained nothing by the visit of the teachers – the saloon-keepers." Further commentary on Convention, including strong defense of Christian higher education against "the small politician's" charge of "sectarian education," NCA August 1, 1889 p.1. W. A. Candler, Emory College, and J. H. Harrison of McTyeire Institute attended National Educational Convention, Candler spoke , NCA July 25, 1889 p. 9; Founding of Scaritt (Mission Training School) in Kansas City, NCA October 31, 1889 p. 8. Religious colleges superior to state universities for irreligious rich men's sons, "A Vicious and Oppressive Policy," NCA June 4, 1887 p.1. Discussions of ministry and ministerial

States were frequent.²²

The editors also wrote and published commentary about immigration, Chinese Americans, Native Americans, convict labor, and prison reform.²³ One item distinguished between types of immigration: “If we here in the South will maintain religion, education and good roads, the sort of immigration we want will come fast enough. The other sort will follow the affinities that attract it where there is much beer and whisky, and but little Sunday rest or devotion.”²⁴ Indicating the range of Fitzgerald’s political awareness, he worried in 1889 about rising anti-Semitism in Germany, which he called both “silly” and “satanic.”²⁵

The editors declared that “Anarchism is not indigenous to this country, but the loaferism

theological education also appeared, including pay and Vanderbilt University that assumes general progress: “A Two-Sided Question,” NCA July 11, 1889 p.8; For more on ministerial/theological education, NCA October 17, 1885 p.1.

²² “Foreign missions – we say. Foreign to what? Foreign to nothing that is Christ-like.” NCA, November 24, 1888, p.1. On Africa and politics: “As we have more persons of African blood among us than any other nation, while European nations are carving up and dividing Africa, should we not have a hand in the matter? Providence points that way now.” NCA February 16, 1889 p.1. Positive comment about missions to Africa, NCA September 22, 1888 p.1 and October 6, 1888 p. 8; several comments on Africa December 19, 1889 p.1; The Bishops on Missions NCA May 30, 1889 p.3; “A Corean (sic) Student of Methodist Divinity,” NCA November 10, 1888 p.8; On the West and missions and the advancing MECS, “Our Western Work” NCA January 26, 1889 p.8; On China and Missions, NCA February 2, 1889 and September 19, 1889 p.8; For an overview of MECS missions, Robert Sledge, *Five Dollars and Myself: The History of Missions in the MECS, 1845-1939* (New York: General Board of Global Ministries, 2005).

²³ “Immigration, the Moral Side” NCA Sept 15, 1888 p. 8. Anti-immigration comments from a South Carolina man, “In the Sunny South,” NCA May 30, 1889 p. 3. A full statement anticipating foreign immigration to the South and urging Prohibition including a broad outline of good and bad forms of assimilation and the character of the South to be maintained from W. A. Candler, “Getting Ready for Their Coming,” NCA March 19, 1887 p. 8. Warm support, appealing to the mercy of Jesus, for the immigration of Europe’s “paupers,” NCA July 30, 1887 p. 8. Criticism of the government’s treatment of Choctaw Indians, NCA March 19, 1887 p. 1. Quote from *South-Western Advocate* was negative, urging an end to immigration, NCA November 3, 1888 p. 2. On convict labor and sentencing, NCA January 26, 1889 p.1 and p. 8. On Prisons, NCA March 28, 1889 p.1; Several items, NCA July 4, 1889 p.1; NCA November 28, 1889, p.9. On ending the imprisonment of children, NCA December 19, 1889 p. 8.

²⁴ NCA March 21, 1889 p.1.

²⁵ On Jews and anti-Semitism among the “upper classes” in Germany, NCA, August 22, 1889 p. 13. He went on to ask, “are we doing our duty toward them [Jews] in this Christian republic, where all good men and women belong to the upper class?” On missions to Jews, NCA February 2, 1889, p.1 and “The Gospel: The Power of God to Save the Jews,” NCA October 16, 1886 p.1, and “The Promised Day of Israel,” NCA April 9, 1887 p.1. On Judaism, tithe, money and selfishness in lean years, NCA September 5, 1889 p. 1.

and drunkenness on which this poisonous fungus fixes itself is.” Fitzgerald reported that anarchists were starting Sunday schools in Chicago “for the purpose of propagating their diabolical theories...” “which is Satan’s doing... Let us outwork him, and save the Republic!” Republicanism and Christianity were intimately related: “Christianity is the vital breath of republicanism.”²⁶

Fitzgerald took aim at “Common Enemies,” naming “orators and editors who exaggerate the misdoings and shortcomings of any other section,” who were “lawless fellows...who perpetrate outrages against law and order... and place a weapon in the hands of her” [The South’s] “enemies by their evil doings,” and “the common enemy that aggravates all the evils that threaten the peace and prosperity of our country...drunkenness. It is emphatically *the* common enemy.”²⁷ ““Prohibition does not prohibit’ is an anarchist’s cry, a cry of defiance to law” said Fitzgerald.²⁸

A remarkable Fourth of July Address called “Shooting at the Eagle” by Fitzgerald showed the range of his political interests. Its topic was American civilization, including social, political, and religious aspects. He praised efforts to enact prohibition, called for greater attention to the Sabbath, decried atheism, sectionalism, secret oath-bound societies, woman suffrage, and anarchists (for the one who uses bombs: “silence him with a rope”). He also blamed the founders of the republic for “our late war,” and declared the constitution of 1789 a

²⁶ NCA, January 19, 1889, p.3. NCA, January 26, 1889 p.4. NCA October 3, 1889 p. 8.; On the advance of republicanism and the weakness of European nobility and monarchy, NCA August 8, 1889 p.1.

²⁷ “Common Enemies,” NCA October 3, 1889 p. 1. Of drunkenness, “It is the leader of mobs, the corrupter of the ballot, the inspirer of lust and murder.” Fitzgerald references a “brutal assault” upon blacks that took place on a railway car in Georgia.

²⁸ NCA September 10, 1887 p.1.

living document.²⁹

Consistent antiwar and antiviolence commentary was a shared feature of the editorials of Fitzgerald, Hoss, and Haynes. Southern Methodist responses to war should be understood in two overlapping contexts. First, the South generally had a more intimate experience of war, given most of America's bloodiest war in terms of American losses was fought largely in that region. Secondly, the South is often thought to be a militaristic, pro-war region, one devoted to, and marred by, widespread personal violence.

Methodists had commonly supported an ongoing war with all of its passions and, often, personal and familial complications. But the late nineteenth century provides an interesting transitional moment in American Methodist thought. Most southern Methodists writing in the 1880s and 1890s had seen the Civil War up close. Most writing for publication in the various MECS newspapers in this era were men, and many of them had been in uniform in what was the highest mobilization by percentage and age range in American history. A war of that scale fought on familiar ground was not readily forgotten. But these editors did not embrace a triumphalist version of the progress of American civilization by means of American military power.

In 1888, the editors of the Nashville *Christian Advocate*, the central and most important newspaper of the MECS, declared that "international arbitration is the next great step in the forward march of humanity" adding that "the vocation of the soldier among the civilized States

²⁹ "Shooting at the Eagle: Dr. O. P. Fitzgerald's Fourth of July Oration (At Montevalle)," NCA July 18, 1889, pp. 2-4. See also "The Editor's Fourth of July Meditation," NCA July 10, 1886 p.1 and July 17, 1886 p.6-7, 14. For a more positive assessment of the American political past and a more negative one about its present, "Government," by W. C. McCoy, *Alabama Christian Advocate*, NCA January 4, 1890 p. 2-3 where McCoy states "We need an Andrew Jackson...[to] drive out the miserable rabble who now disgrace the seats once filled by Washington, Clay and Webster." Even more remarkably, "Come Back, Andrew Jackson!," NCA January 18, 1890 p.1 and more on Andrew Jackson, p. 8. Also, "The Present Outlook for Republican Government," NCA March 1, 1890 p.1.

is passing away.”³⁰ In 1889 they avowed, “The law of retaliation long ago ceased to control real Christians. The time hastens when it will cease to control parties, nations, and races. True Christianity will bring this to pass.”³¹ They continued, stating that “The masses of mankind will not submit to the silliness and barbarism of war much longer. The burden of the expense of it and the hazard of life fall upon the rank and file, and they will not stand it much longer. The Geneva arbitration marked the first step toward the new era. What will be the next?”³²

The editors stated in October 1889 that “despotism and war ought to be buried in the same grave, and the world will be ready for the funeral sooner than some think.”³³ They editorialized that “The men who flippantly talk of religious wars and race wars in this republic are enemies to all religions and all races. Reason, persuasion and patience will solve every problem before us. The only real problem is whether we, as a people, are rational enough to patiently rely on moral agencies to accomplish moral results.”³⁴

The editors of the *Advocate* cried, “the gospel of Christ will compel disarmament sooner or later. That is the only hope of the world.”³⁵ Concluding a discussion of European militarism, the editors urged substituting “Arbitration, God’s method for settling difficulties, for War, which is Satan’s own.”³⁶ The editors affirmed statements from the British government that “The Security of Modern Civilization” cannot rest on “brute force,” and declared that “the final civilization of the world which will abide, must be that which John saw, ‘the holy city, the new

³⁰ NCA December 8, 1888 p.8, NCA December 15, 1888, p.1.

³¹ NCA March 21, 1889, p.1.

³² NCA June 13, 1889, p. 8.

³³ NCA October 3, 1889, p.1, and p. 9

³⁴ NCA October 10, 1889, p. 8.

³⁵ NCA December 11, 1886 p.1

³⁶ NCA February 8, 1890, p.1.

Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven.”³⁷ Reviewing the rise of arbitration, they said “We hail such movements as the first rays which proclaim the dawn of the day when the nations of the earth shall learn war no more. May they shine unto that perfect day. War is the sum of all villainies, and ought never to arise between civilized states. It is a custom entailed from a semi-barbarous age, when rulers were wicked and the people ignorant... The time of that ignorance has passed. The people are no longer servants. Princes must settle their feuds... as other men do.”³⁸ Fitzgerald concluded in 1890 that national increases in lynching and mob violence were lingering “satanic” effects of war.³⁹

If the South is often thought to be a militaristic region, these Methodists wondered aloud about the wisdom of the Spanish American War. While many southern Methodists would later support American involvement in the Great War, they also supported the League of Nations.⁴⁰ President William McKinley, an Ohio Methodist, had reservations about leading his country to war against Spain. MECS Editor and later Bishop E. E. Hoss warned of war against Spain including the tax burdens he felt would invariably accompany an expansion of the US military.

Hoss wrote passionately in 1898 of his opposition to “‘yellow’ journals” and their “satanic” methods, pleading that “we have not yet recovered from the vast demoralization of our last war. Another one at the present time would stimulate everything in our civilization that needs repression. In spite of the fanatical jingoism that cries aloud for an instant declaration of hostilities, we plead for an honorable peace. As a citizen and as a minister of the gospel, we

³⁷ “The Security of Modern Civilization,” NCA January 29, 1887, p. 8.

³⁸ NCA September 17, 1887, p.1.

³⁹ NCA February 22, 1890, p.1.

⁴⁰ Robert Watson Sledge, *Hands on the Ark*, 1975, pp. 172-175. Kenneth MacKenzie’s study of Methodism during the Spanish American War focused on the MEC. Kenneth M. MacKenzie, *The Robe and the Sword: The Methodist Church and the Rise of American Imperialism* (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1961).

enter our solemn protest against the taking of any step that is likely to bring on the horrors of military strife.” Two weeks later, Hoss wrote, “we exhort the people to be quiet. Let Christians everywhere pray the Lord to avert the horrors of war.”⁴¹

A staunch sectionalist and often bitterly partisan Democrat, Hoss’s commitment to peace led him to praise Republican President McKinley’s patience on March 17 and April 14 against his “cowardly” and “fire eating” critics. Hoss expressed his hopes for peace even after the war came. “The readers of this ADVOCATE do not need to be told that we are a man of peace,” Hoss began. “Having seen the horrors of war as they were exhibited in a border state during the unhappy period of 1861–1865, we are profoundly averse to the shedding of human blood if it can possibly be avoided.” Hoss continued, “When General Sherman said ‘war is hell,’ he spoke only the naked truth. It turns loose all the worse passions of men, and is accompanied by ten thousand evils of the most appalling character. The vast expenditure of money which it involves is the least thing that can be said against it. There is not a sin or vice which it fails to breed.” Hoss declared, “That it furnishes the opportunity for the display of certain magnanimous virtues, is unquestionably true; but it is equally true that there is occasion for the development of these same virtues in the pursuits of peace. Heroism may find as appropriate a theatre for action in civil life as on the field of battle.”⁴²

Hoss praised McKinley’s magnanimity and warned of possible postwar lengthy entanglements and lingering troubles. Hoss declared, “The pulpits of our country can do their best service in the present emergency, not by screaming out sentiments of hate and contempt for

⁴¹ “The Prospect of War,” NCA March 17, 1898 p.1. “The Suffering Cubans,” NCA March 31, 1898 p. 8.

⁴² “The Prospect of War,” NCA March 17, 1898 p.1, “The President’s Message,” NCA April 14, 1898 p. 8.; “The War With Spain,” NCA April 28, 1898 p. 1.

our enemies, but by teaching, with unwonted vigor, the lessons of Christian morality.

Malevolent passions are never justifiable. Not to stimulate them, but to restrain them, is the business of Christian ministers. Though we have drawn the sword against Spain, we must still deport ourselves, not as savages, but as believers in the gospel of the Prince of Peace.”⁴³ Just weeks later, the May 1898 General Conference elected him to the episcopacy.

Methodist reflections on politics and civilization in this period also considered the rapid urbanization in the United States, including southern urbanization. Methodists noted the growth of cities New Orleans, Atlanta, and Nashville, among others, in frequent articles with titles like “Methodism in the Cities” and “Methodism and the Masses.”⁴⁴ In 1888, one by the latter name from Fitzgerald functioned as a major address in defense of Methodism. Fitzgerald argued that there was no gulf between Methodism and the masses, citing the 600,000 members added “since the war.” Speaking of the Christian churches generally, he declared “there is no organization that holds so warm a place in the hearts of the laboring masses.”⁴⁵ Yet, “when the cities are growing so rapidly through mammon-worship and immigration,” said Fitzgerald, “the member from the

⁴³ “The War With Spain,” NCA April 28, 1898 p. 1. See also p. 2 of April 28, 1898 for war reporting and other commentary at the beginning of military mobilization through the American South.

⁴⁴ NCA, “Methodism in the Cities,” October 27, 1888, p. 1.

⁴⁵ NCA, October 20, 1888, p.1. “Methodism and the Masses.” NCA March 9, 1889 p.1. “The Methodists are making a mighty effort to relieve the bodily miseries and save the souls of the poor of London. And they feel the thrill of new life, for God is with them of a truth. It is a veritable *renaissance*. Let American Methodists and other Christians take a hint here” (emphasis in the original). Similarly in reference to urban mission generally: “The evangelization of New Zealand is an accomplished fact. Let us take courage, and renew our efforts in behalf of New York, Chicago, New Orleans and Nashville.” NCA March 14, 1889, p.1. Similar appeals for urban evangelism in “Methodism and the Masses,” NCA August 20, 1887 p.1. For bragging about Methodism’s growth in Nashville and defense of preachers against criticism from the Nashville *American*, “A Good Record,” NCA November 7, 1889 p.8. Concerning southern cities, rioting and immigration, “Evangelize the Cities,” NCA October 30, 1886 p. 8. “A Tale of Four Cities,” (London, Chicago, Boston, Baltimore) NCA December 4, 1886 p. 1 reveals Fitzgerald to be open to immigration as a Christian duty but worried about the need for reaching the urban masses who were coming mostly from “the discontented and debased populations of foreign cities.”

country' is our main reliance to save the land from untold wrongs."⁴⁶

Fitzgerald often wrote of ministry to the poor, saying "it reaches down into the depths of human degradation, and grasps the lost sinner, and lifts him up into life and liberty. This is Christianity – the Christianity that crosses continents and seas to seek and save the lost; that kindles the light of hope in the convict's camp, in stockade, or mine; that finds its way to the hospital and the prison where the sick are dying, and the sinful are perishing; that goes to the rough and out-of-the-way places of earth, where the least-favored of our brothers and sisters are fighting their hard battle, unseen, unpitied, unhelped."⁴⁷

Methodist responses to urbanization included more clearly political commentary in the form of labor-management relations and related calls for political enforcement of sabbatarian laws. Methodists discussed labor unrest and strike activity with some frequency, generally supporting labor efforts so long as they were peaceful and law-abiding.⁴⁸ Methodists also aimed

⁴⁶ NCA January 28, 1888 p. 1. Methodist responses to urbanization came in several forms. Those related to evangelization efforts generally pressed Methodists to do more mission work in the cities. Where Baptists had been more strongly rural and Presbyterians more strongly urban, Methodism had been unique in possessing large urban and rural memberships, such that rural v. urban tensions were a persistent feature of Methodist life. Yet the United States was still a rural nation, and the cities were viewed with some suspicion, perhaps especially their supposed role in fomenting spiritual and moral declension, a view with a long history in Western thought.

⁴⁷ "A Layman's Remark," NCA August 1, 1889 p.1. On the obligation to the poor, see NCA January 19, 1889 p.8. NCA, April 11, 1889 p.1 "Methodism and Organized Charities" states that "Pauperism has been almost unknown in (Methodism's) own circle...Methodism and pauperism do not co-exist," for Methodism "lifts up communities, families, and individuals into a condition of sobriety, industry, thrift, and self-support." For a strong appeal for direct ministries with urban "least" – "it is not machinery, but the mind of Jesus, which we need" – "Not Machinery, But The Mind of Christ," NCA July 25, 1889, p.1; also NCA November 21, 1889 p. 1. Fitzgerald took a different approach to poverty saying "Nine out of ten of the healthy men, young or old, who whine about their poverty, owe it to their own lack of self-denial. This is aimed at the nine. If you are the tenth, don't take it to heart." NCA October 24, 1889 p.1. Another comment "I was sick and in prison and ye – did not come near me, but wrote essays and made talks as to what others ought to do. So the Master will say to some who will read this, unless they change their conduct very soon," NCA October 31, 1889 p.1. Very similar views appealing to the "washing of the disciples' feet," reprinted from the *Wesleyan Advocate*, "The Strong Must Help the Weak," NCA September 10, 1887 p. 2.

⁴⁸ Commentary on labor strikes, NCA September 12, 1889 p.1. Commentary about London strike and efforts by Salvation Army and Socialist leader John Burns to prohibit alcohol and violence, "An Object Lesson," NCA October 3, 1889 p. 8. Positive comment on Powderly and the Knights of Labor, NCA October 17, 1889 p. 1. For labor-management/capital relations and arbitration, "The Industrial Troubles – The Remedy," NCA April 3, 1886 p.1 and p.8 the latter calling for capital to show "brain and heart," labor to show they are "law abiding." "The Labor

at corporations and the very wealthy, adding criticisms of corporations generally, railroads specifically, and occasional complaints about the wealthy.⁴⁹ For example, Fitzgerald criticized “the insipid crowd called ‘society’” and its influence in Georgia government.⁵⁰ Fitzgerald decried corporate corruption of state legislatures and supported calls for a constitutional amendment to allow direct election of Senators by the people “who are too numerous to be purchased.”⁵¹

Many Methodists believed that Sabbath enforcement would be especially beneficial to the working classes. Some argued that insanity among the working classes was linked to a lack of Sabbath rest, while others suggested that a day of rest might cool industrial tensions. Some singled out lotteries as well as an abuse of the working poor.⁵² Haynes called for an end to Christian families taking a Sunday paper in an article entitled “A Dangerous Guest,” noting that

Problem,” reprinted from Wesleyan Christian Advocate, NCA April 24, 1886 p. 14. Fitzgerald criticized labor leader Henry George, NCA December 25, 1886 p.1.

⁴⁹ Criticism of corporations and railroads, “The Corporation Conscience,” NCA July 18, 1889 p. 8; On the danger of concentration of wealth from Fitzgerald, NCA October 31, 1889 p.1.; A reply to the Atlanta *Constitution’s* reply to the original article, “The Congestion of Wealth,” NCA November 21, 1889 p. 8. It includes sharp comments about war and the concentration of wealth including the various means by which it has been concentrated. For more commentary about public life and the greed of corporations, “Corruption in Public Life,” NCA March 1, 1890 p. 8. On corporate ethics: “the New Testament code applies to corporations as fully as it does to individuals,” NCA July 23, 1887 p.1.

⁵⁰ NCA July 25, 1889 p.1.

⁵¹ NCA, January 1, 1887 p.1.

⁵² NCA January 19, 1889, p.8. “A distinguished specialist in the treatment of the insane affirms that the prevalence of insanity is caused by the lack of Sunday rest among certain classes. Whoso collides with a law of God will be wrecked in the encounter.” ; Several comments on labor and sabbatarianism that were supportive of both, NCA November 3, 1888 p. 8. The Sabbath and the Knights of Labor, NCA February 2, 1889 p.3; “Methodism and the Working Classes” article commented on, NCA February 2, 1889 p. 8. Repeated support for Anthony Comstock and sabbatarianism laws, NCA May 2, 1889, p.9; The lottery was called “an abomination.” NCA March 9, 1889 p.8; similar sentiment in “The Octopus” NCA March 21, 1889 p.2 (quoted from New Orleans Christian Advocate); NCA, April 11, 1889 p.8. Support for Beverly Carradine’s sermon against the Louisiana Lottery from Joshua H. Harrison, NCA May 2, 1889, p.17. Criticism of Louisiana lottery as “one of the worst products of the darkest period of Reconstruction,” NCA September 26, 1889 p. 8. On Gambling and Lotter(ies), NCA November 28, 1889 p. 1. Angry secular daily paper spelled “the name of a race-horse with a capital initial letter, but (used) no capital letter in speaking of the Holy Spirit,” NCA November 28, 1889 p. 8.

on that day when children have the most time to read they are given reading material that tells tales of murders, suicides, divorces, adultery, rapes, train wrecks, etc. all with “salacious” and “disgusting” detail. No such story teller would be invited into a good home in person on the Sabbath, Haynes noted, but is ironically paid to do so weekly in the form of the Sunday paper.⁵³

The topic of the church and wealth elicited some of the sharpest commentary in the *Advocate*. The editors took aim at the personal habits of Methodist Christians, wondering aloud if financial habits and practices were not as good a test of faith as any other. The theme was simple – greed and true spiritual vigor were natural, if too often unrecognized, enemies.⁵⁴

Fitzgerald commented on the dangers of wealth, saying “the fact that a large and rapid increase in wealth so often proves hurtful to piety is a sad reflection on human nature” and “the number of men who maintain their spirituality after a sudden increase in riches is so small that your belief that you would prove an exception is a self-delusion rather than of wisdom.”⁵⁵ Fitzgerald urged women wearing expensive clothes not to do so. Fitzgerald noted a Catholic bishop wearing a ring that he was told symbolized “sacerdotal authority;” he added that he had seen “gold rings flashing on the fingers of Methodist preachers in the pulpit” and asked wryly “what do *they*

⁵³ NCA, February 2, 1889 p.3 “A Dangerous Guest” by B.F. Haynes. Haynes as pastor, NCA March 2, 1889 p.1. “When we saw at the McKendree 11 o’clock daily prayer-meeting the layman with the largest business interests of any man in the Church, we had this thought: If all the rest of the men who might have gotten there by straining a point had been present, pastor Haynes’s face would have brightened and some of the absentees would have gotten a needed blessing.” A positive reply to Haynes’s article urging rapid tract publication – “let us have it by all means” – and that it be “sown broadcast,” NCA March 14, 1889 p.13 “A Dangerous Guest” by E. Dunbar.

⁵⁴ A sharp criticism distinguishing between charity and the economic relations between rich and poor: “There are a great many in the Church, as well as out of it, who will ride a poor man bare-backed with a spur on each foot, in order to accumulate a little surplus for deeds of charity,” “The Law of Usury,” by J. M. Dunn, NCA August 6, 1887 p. 13. “Who Can Wake Up The Rich?,” by J. H. Riggins, NCA August 13, 1887 p. 17, called for a “pentecostal Spirit” of “prayer and self-denial” and wondered if rich man or woman would give up “a tour of Europe” or an investment opportunity.

⁵⁵ NCA January 26, 1889 p.1.; For arguments that the New South must funnel its new wealth into “the intellectual and religious institutions of the South... the religious and moral forces” or fall into “effeminacy, luxury, licentiousness, and death,” see “Increase of Wealth,” reprinted from *Wesleyan Christian Advocate*, NCA June 4, 1887 p. 2.

signify?”⁵⁶ Fitzgerald routinely criticized “mammonism,” including its manifestations in “booms.”⁵⁷

Methodists also addressed the means of raising money in the churches. Many decried “worldly” methods that did not utilize direct appeals.⁵⁸ “The more self-denial and the less of worldly expedients to get money you put into your new church,” urged Fitzgerald, “the more you will please the Head of the Church. Self denying love is the best cement for Zion’s walls.”⁵⁹ Other comments included a quip on genuine spirituality as the oil for Methodist machinery, and a comment about the adequacy of present Methodist ‘machinery’ and the lack of need for any “fifth wheels, but more sanctified common sense and driving power.”⁶⁰ While optimistic about the signs of the future, Fitzgerald charged that “mere ecclesiasticisms” of our own making have caused the Church to halt “in its march.”⁶¹ Fitzgerald urged that a congregation functioning as

⁵⁶ On women’s clothing, NCA September 5, 1889 p.1; On ministers wearing rings, NCA September 12, 1889 p.1.

⁵⁷ For Fitzgerald on “mammonism,” see “Concerning Booms,” NCA March 5, 1887 p. 1, “Further Concerning Booms,” NCA April 30, 1887 p.1 and complaints about urban “mammon-worship,” NCA January 28, 1888 p. 1. On Oklahoma “boom” and land rush as “chasing the phantom of wealth,” NCA May 9, 1889, p.1.

⁵⁸ NCA October 6, 1888 p.8. “The sexton for revenue...is getting ready to begin his winter stupidities. The saints will suffer, and the sinners will stay away,” in NCA, November 3, 1888, p.1 and NCA May 28, 1887 p. 8. See also “Our Rich Men,” NCA May 16, 1889 p.1; and Fitzgerald’s “Christianity and Money,” NCA October 10, 1889 p.1. Positive response, “Christianity and Money,” by J. H. Stockton of Thomson, Ga., NCA October 31, 1889 p.7.

⁵⁹ NCA, June 6, 1889 p.1. A similar comment, June 6, 1889 p.1 about the decline effectiveness of using shame in collecting money as opposed to “an enlightened Christian conscience.” On money raising, “The Collections” NCA May 23, 1889 p.9; “The Money Power of the Church” NCA December 1, 1888 p. 3 by Joshua H. Harrison McKenzie, Tenn. See also “The Temporal and the Spiritual” NCA February 23, 1889 p.1, mostly about money and spiritualizing the administration of the church. Also, NCA, April 4, 1889 p. 9, where several items appeared related to the hunger for wealth, including commentary on “the end justifies the means” and “There is no sin in possessing riches” and “Men gamble in ‘futures’ and by sharp practices control the price of almost all the necessities of life; and thought the practice is demoralizing and hurtful, the whole thing is regarded by many as legitimate.”

⁶⁰ NCA October 27, 1888 p.8; NCA, May 16, 1889, p.1.

⁶¹ NCA, October 13, 1888 p. 1. “The Full Reservoir.” For a more optimistic view especially related to aggressive missionary posture of the church see NCA January 12, 1889 p. 1 “The Vanderbilt Missionary Brotherhood a Good Sign;” For criticism of wealth, NCA February 16, 1889 p.1 “if we do not give in proportion as we get, we will be corrupted by covetousness and enfeebled by luxury.”

“a mere social club” would lack effectiveness “until they are vitalized by the transforming, sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost.”⁶²

Haynes, like Fitzgerald and Hoss, shared a strong concern for the spiritual integrity of Methodists, especially where spiritual integrity clashed with new urban indulgences. For sixteen years, Haynes was an important and loyal rising star on the Tennessee Conference. In 1887, Haynes was appointed to the most prestigious pulpit in Tennessee Methodism and among the most important in the MECS, Nashville’s thirteen-hundred member McKendree Station Church. Haynes followed Warren Candler, who filled in at McKendree in 1886 and 1887, taking over for J. D. Barbee who had been elected book agent, while Candler was assistant editor of the Nashville *Christian Advocate* from 1886–1888.

While Candler was calling for Methodists to stick to their stand against worldly amusements, Haynes echoed a different sort of moral theme. Haynes, like Candler, was opposed to “the theatre and all forms of worldliness.”⁶³ The subtle difference between Candler’s McKendree moralizing and Haynes’s two years later was not primarily one of style. Candler criticized a manifestation of moral and spiritual drift, a diagnosis Haynes affirmed. But Haynes identified what he believed was the internal source of that drift and its deep effects on the health and vitality of the Methodist Church. Candler’s language had been aimed at those outside the Methodist fold those who were corrupting Methodists by their example. Haynes aimed at sins, personal or systemic, by exposing the failures of his fellow Methodists to deal with temptations in their own lives. On most matters, but especially in matters of money and wealth, Haynes was

⁶² NCA March 2, 1889 p.1. “A Working Church.”

⁶³ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 51-52. The movement to resist moral decay and embrace older values of spiritual purity, and an awareness that wealth brought its own temptations, found more adherents than did the second-blessing theory of Christian perfection.

a vigorous *internal* critic. The world's sins were no surprise. But Haynes's commentary suggests that he was attentive to external critiques of religion, and recognized their importance. Further, he held that the church's spiritual and moral integrity was essential to its duty reform the world. Without a *uniform and credible spiritual and moral witness*, the church's deeply cherished and desired practices, e.g., to evangelize with divine power and bear a just and effective social and political witness, would be frustrated and diminished.

Haynes's time as McKendree pastor from 1887 to 1889 displayed these concerns. In addition to inviting prohibition and suffrage leader Frances Willard to speak on a Sunday night just as he arrived at the church, Haynes determined that "avarice was the crying and crowning sin" of that congregation and began preaching accordingly. Opposition in his first year was "confined to the circles of the wealthy," coming to a head when eleven of the "over forty" members of the congregational board met secretly and, by a majority vote, decided they did not want Haynes back for a second year. Having been informed of this action by Judge Whitworth, Haynes invited the bishop for the next annual conference, Bishop John Christian Keener, to preach at the congregation. By error, his presence was not announced, and when the bishop saw the "packed" house with persons standing in the back and along the walls, he told Haynes's critics that "it would be a grave mistake to remove any young man who draws this number of people in a great downtown city church."⁶⁴

In his second year, several notable achievements occurred. He recalled seeing the best revival the congregation had seen in twenty years. Considerable money was raised. Total collections in his second year "reached the unprecedented sum of about thirty-six thousand dollars," he recalled. So great was the financial report that it received editorial notice in the

⁶⁴ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 36-38. Likely Judge James Whitworth.

denomination-wide *Quarterly Review*, a scholarly journal for clergy and teachers. Editor W. P. Harrison rejoiced that the great downtown church had come to grips with “the right use of temporal wealth,” such that Harrison exclaimed it “a prophecy of a gracious dispensation, the exchange of earthly for the true riches, which clothes the Church with power from on high.” McKendree had given \$6431.94 for domestic and foreign missions, the highest total in the MECS that year, a figure that did not include \$583.51 given in “relief of the poor.” Between the two ME denominations, only Garden Street MEC in Philadelphia had given more, and only \$83.09 more at that. Only ten churches in the MEC had even exceeded \$3000, and in many of those cases the pastoral salary outpaced the missionary giving. McKendree had allotted almost twice Haynes’s \$3300 salary.⁶⁵ Haynes also began the “Nashville City Mission” that bore the name “Haynes Chapel,” organized 2 or 3 Sunday schools “in the neglected factory districts,” and was planning for the construction of church buildings in those areas. But Harrison’s editorial notice of “a gracious dispensation” came in January 1890, three months after Bishop Keener removed Haynes from the pastorate of the church because of complaints from wealthy laity. Those complaints were in response to blistering sermons against greed and moneyed influence in the church like Haynes’s notable “Achanism in the Church” sermon preached at McKendree in July 1889.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ W. P. Harrison, “McKendree Church, Nashville,” *Quarterly Review of the MECS*, January 1890: 429-431. McKendree gave \$7700 toward education that year. Harrison carefully detailed the ten MEC churches: St. Paul’s, Washington Square, and Madison Avenue churches in New York; Summerfield in Brooklyn; Grace, Garden Street, and Arch Street in Philadelphia; Grace Church in Wilmington, DE; Grand Avenue in Kansas City, and Newburg, New York’s Trinity Church.

⁶⁶ NCA, May 23, 1889, p. 17 “McKendree Church, Nashville” by S. W. Barbee, Anacoda, M.T. “McKendree Church, Nashville,” by B. F. Haynes, *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, April 10, 1889, p. 8. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 38. On Haynes’s activities while pastor of McKendree, see “A Good Example,” NCA December 29, 1888 p. 9, “McKendree Church Revival,” March 28, 1889 p. 8 and “Nashville City Mission” by Wm. M. Johnston, Pastor, NCA July 11, 1889, p. 5. For a call for “a revival of old-time Connectionalism – the practical manifestation of oneness” that will produce Church growth in the cities and praised for McKendree under Haynes’s leadership, “Methodism in the Cities,” NCA November 7, 1889 p.1. Here Fitzgerald states that “If Satan can hold the cities, he

B. F. Haynes was not a poor man. In January 1887, the *Pulaski Citizen* reported that Haynes had made “some very fortunate investments in Nashville real estate.”⁶⁷ His placement at McKendree fit his social status and standing as well as that of his and his wife’s families. Having come from a comfortable family, and married “up” the social ladder, Haynes’s career was tied to the growing urbanization of the New South and its town and city churches. Appointment to McKendree was a marker that a Tennessee Conference preacher had arrived, and that he had prospects for higher office. Yet, the “Achanism in the Church” sermon indicated that whatever his social standing, his religious teaching included sharp criticism of the money-oriented spirit of his age. His message was not, then, an exiled cry from the wilderness or envious rant. Rather, Haynes echoed John Wesley’s severe, vigilant, and enduringly unfashionable surmises on “the dangers of riches,” which in turn reflected older biblical and Christian notions of human susceptibility on this point. Haynes’s words show that at least some Methodists were influenced by Wesley’s social ethics, and sought to reground Methodist identity in Methodism’s founding era, often warmly labeled ‘primitive Methodism.’⁶⁸

Haynes had his old friend, former pastor and mentor, Rev. E. M. Bounds, then editor of the *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, print the fifth and final part of Haynes’s sermon on “the curse of covetousness.” Bounds introduced it to his readers as a “fearless and wholesome” treatment of the subject. Beginning with the story of Achan in Joshua Chapter 7, Haynes told his wealthy

will have the nation in his iron grip” and suggests that if Methodism has failed to reach cities in the past it was “owing more to a lack of genuine Methodist zeal and true Methodist methods...” that is, “Methodism...of the heroic, aggressive, connectional type.”

⁶⁷ *Pulaski Citizen*, January 20, 1887, p. 3.

⁶⁸ For McKendree’s ties to Nashville’s merchant class and wealthiest citizens, see Doyle, *New Men, New Cities, New South*. For John Wesley and Methodism on money, wealth and class, see M. Douglas Meeks, ed., *The Portion of the Poor: Good News to the Poor in the Wesleyan Tradition*. (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1995), especially the Introduction and Chapters 3 and 4, as well as Kenneth J. Collins, “The Soteriological Orientation of John Wesley’s Ministry to the Poor,” *Asbury Theological Journal*, 50:1, Spring 1995, 75-91.

congregation that the history of the Christian religion indicated that the sin of covetousness, greed in effect, was “one of the severest gravity,” evidenced by “the history of the church in all ages,” and the fact that “Prophets, Apostles, and Christ himself dwelt upon it.” Moreover, it was “by far, the one of which the church is in greatest danger.”⁶⁹

Stating his thesis simply, “This is THE sin of the church to-day.” Speaking of the church’s relation to the wider society, Haynes argued that “The race for money is rife and ruinous in as well as out of the church, and puny and palsied will be the work of the church in trying to save society and the nation from threatened engulfment in sensuality and anarchy, until she can present herself in the conflict untainted by the foul and fatal virus.”⁷⁰

Comparing the Israelites to the modern church, Haynes argued that if “she could not stand before Ai, with an undiscovered Achan in her bosom, much less can she to-day stand before the Anakim of the most colossal and brutal and remorseless greed in the most congenial clime for their work the world ever saw, with hordes of Achans in her bosom, whose sin is open and known, and who join affinity with the Anakim without, and sometimes out-herod Herod.”⁷¹

Taking direct aim at the dominant forces of the age, Haynes continued, “the giant corporations of the day, grown fat and ferocious on the flesh of the innumerable small fish they have ravenously consumed, whose bones they have flung to the wayside” count many church members among their friends and allies. In fact, church members frequently acted as the “executors” and “the agencies for conceiving” what he labeled “the plundering schemes of these

⁶⁹ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5. Bounds was already familiar with Haynes’s work at McKendree, evidenced by a report that appeared in the NCA July 25, 1889 p. 9: “Dr. E. M. Bounds” preached at McKendree: “his sermon was characteristic – sound, strong, and fervent.”

⁷⁰ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

⁷¹ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

modern monsters.” Church people were the “paid agents for corrupting the legislatures, the judges and the juries of the country for the successful consummation of their designs of oppression and greed.” “Among the vast army of millionaires,” Haynes averred, “how very many churchmen you find, and yet how many such fortunes do you suppose have been acquired without sin.” Haynes did not mince words with his wealthy hearers. “I do not believe that one in ten thousand such has ever been, unless it has been inherited.”⁷²

Haynes’s criticism of corporate sin continued, noting that “The great trusts and combines which fasten the iron screw of remorseless greed on nearly all the necessities of life, and to augment an already plethoric purse unrighteously and cruelly swallow smaller concerns or drive them out of business in loss or bankruptcy, and then draw enormous profits on the cornered necessities of life, grinding down to deeper and more hopeless poverty the poor – these can most always boast of church members as profit-sharers and often as presidents and officers. The underpaid laborers and overworked and Sunday worked laborers not unfrequently in their denied Sabbath rest and eighteen hour work and inadequate pay, are rendering tribute to wealthy church men.”⁷³

Noting that “God’s method” was to “destroy the covetous idolater,” Haynes asked “are we trying to beget a conscience within the church on this question? Are we crying out that

⁷² B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

⁷³ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5. Haynes’s criticism of industrial capitalism runs counter to the standard portrait of evangelical or mainline clergy among labor historians. However, his internal criticism of southern Methodists’ apathy concerning the plight of labor supports the standard view that Methodist preachers were especially noted for their support of management. Indicating the disconnect between religious and labor historians, the classic study of southern religion and southern labor, Liston Pope’s *Millhands and Preachers: A Study of Gastonia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), has no rival. Utilizing sociological theory, Pope argued that financial dependence on Mill revenues bound the churches to management and caused them to abandon labor. Pope was himself a graduate of Duke Divinity School and his work has the flavor of an intra-ministerial jeremiad. In that sense, Haynes and Pope could both be viewed as internal critics of religion.

corporations not only have souls, but that each has as many souls as it has stockholders, and that each is guilty of the sin of all!....What a fearful and neglected truth,” said Haynes, “and yet that is the word of God.” Instead of rebuking these sinners, Haynes argued that “we coax and cajole them in their lives of supreme greed and selfishness, and when they die we preach them to heaven.” By seeking their ill-gotten money by “our low and unworthy appeals to their pride or appetite or passion, we debauch the whole plane of Christian liberality,” said Haynes. The “only true basis” for financial appeal “lies in Christ’s sacrifice for us.” “Church fairs, raffles, suppers and donkey parties” were the work of “good women,” but offended Haynes’s sense of justice. The husbands of these women could give what the church needed annually and even then “perhaps not discharge fully his obligation to God as to his money.” Instead of appealing to vanity and raising money through entertainment, Haynes called on “earnest and good” women to engage in “earnest prayer to God to open your husband’s hearts and pockets.” “Fewer signs of God’s presence and power” among most of America’s churches, indicated the church’s weakness before the sin of covetousness. “The church is lean and lifeless, spiritually poor and prayerless” Haynes averred adding that “we are neglecting our own children by prayerless homes, and our boys are drifting from us.”⁷⁴

It was not only the souls of Methodists that concerned Haynes. He identified the moral failure on the question of money as the key to Methodists’ spiritual and financial weakness for the cause of missions at home. Haynes told his wealthy urban congregation that the urban “masses” were growing faster than “our efforts to save them,” even as “they are growing poorer in purse and more resentful of their wrongs and suspicious of the churches – and justly so.”

⁷⁴ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5. For an example of women’s generosity, see Ruth Crocker, *Mrs. Russell Sage: Women’s Activism and Philanthropy in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era America*. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).

Sounding an ominous note of divine judgment, Haynes envisioned that “their piteous cries go up to the Lord of Sabaoth, and the Lord’s church too often and in too many quarters does not champion the cause of the oppressed by her own self-imposed fetters of subserviency to the money power.”⁷⁵

“As America goes, the world will go,” Haynes said, “and the great west is soon to hold way over America. To control the West is to control the situation.” In an age of tremendous membership growth, Haynes warned his fellow southern Methodists, saying “We are neglecting the frontiers of our civilization and of our church.” Reminding his hearers that the western states were swarmed by saloons, gambling halls, and race tracks, Sabbath-breaking and Spiritualism, he claimed that Catholicism through “munificent outlay of men and means” was “amassing colossal wealth” in the West. Meanwhile, Methodists were “gingerly dole[ing] out meagre means for a few scattered faithful sentinels to starve on.” Echoing the religious competition with Catholicism that characterized Protestant activists of his day, and adding a commonplace but dubious quotation of apocalyptic anti-Catholic statements supposedly from Abraham Lincoln, Haynes thought such stinginess suggested that Protestants had been lulled into complacency, not recognizing the importance of the west as “the strategic decisive battlefield for the final text of free government and free religion.”⁷⁶

“Where is the Protestant church which sees this and acts accordingly?” Haynes asked, “why and where this criminal apathy and indifference to these great issues as well as this decline of piety and devotion in our homes?” If Methodists would “fall on our faces before God” as

⁷⁵ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

⁷⁶ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

Joshua had, God would reveal “Achans here and there, influential church members, and sometimes influential preachers in high places, and say to us, ‘Israel hath sinned.’”⁷⁷

Haynes lamented Methodists’ decline by mocking the very markers of MECS advance, saying “Until we cease canonizing covetousness by putting higher premium on bullion than brain, and on pence than in piety and prayer, by lauding in our sermons the God-given (?) money-making power; by selling out the high places of the church for the influence and money of rich men, God will not come back in the power with which he honored and blessed our labors in the days of our greater poverty and simplicity.”⁷⁸

Even Methodist connectionalism itself was under the influence of the world’s lust for money. The church must be “purged of this sin...from the Bishops and General Conference all the way down the line.” Haynes called for “less emphasis” on “money as an end sought, and far more attention to that unspiritual state in the church, out of which comes the low state of conscience on the question, and most of our difficulty in raising funds.” Annual conferences should focus on “revivals, family religion, child-training and all the distinctively spiritual phases and progress of church work.”⁷⁹

Aiming directly at the bishops’ administration of the church, Haynes argued that “winning souls and elevating the spiritual tone of his people” should be the “test of ministerial standing and prospects” not “the financial standard.” Going to the marrow of bishops’ influence on the preachers Haynes asserted that a preacher “must not as a result of his experience at annual conferences, be allowed to go forth feeling his commission to be somewhat that of an

⁷⁷ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

⁷⁸ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

⁷⁹ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

ecclesiastical constable” whose raising of the apportioned funds “will be the chief matter examined into and will possibly grade his position in the esteem of his brethren, his reputation as a pastor, and his clerical value in the mind of the appointing power.” Such a feeling would result in “numerous and grave”...temptations.” Haynes claimed that until a change in emphasis was effected, a “general lowering” of individual preachers’ “conscience in the true and lofty nature of ministerial work and responsibility” would result.⁸⁰

“Would that there were less business, *business*, BUSINESS crowded into our annual conferences,” and more “devotion and worship” Haynes lamented, adding, “How unlike Wesley’s conferences!” He continued “How little conferring we do – mutual, earnest interchange of ideas, plans, methods of soul-winning, training, preaching, church discipline and such like. How little time for worship and prayer.” He asked, “do we go from them with the glow of a new and fresh baptism of love and power, stranger and better and happier men to our charge?” With so many faithful servants in attendance, “what a precious spiritual season of grace ought these annual assemblings to be.”⁸¹

Haynes ended his sermon with an appeal to restore primitive Methodism, noting that “Wesley wisely warned us against the day when we should allow rich men to become necessary to us.” Better to truncate her institutions than to allow them “to place us in a condition of mammon rule in the church.” Always a strong supporter of missions, Haynes affirmed the “great interests for which we raise funds” adding that his objection was to “the wrong education” the church was receiving from its leaders. Calling for a truly Christian view of stewardship he

⁸⁰ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

⁸¹ B. F. Haynes, “Achanism in the Church,” *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

accused the church's leadership of "stimulating her from without, instead of from within." "Genuine enduring scriptural progress," would only come through "cheerful and loving voluntary offerings growing out of the giver's relation to a crucified Lord," which in turn would provide the moneys needed while "the givers themselves would be saved."⁸²

Reminding Nashville's wealthiest Methodists that Jesus had "commended the widow and her mite," Haynes argued that the church was "almost putting a premium on avarice, by elevating it to high places and crowning it with authority, and sometimes allowing it to dictate the appointment of pastors to our churches." The gifts of rich men were "lauded and noised abroad, while many of the smaller gifts of the poor, though really greatly larger in proportion than the others, are received without note or comment." "The beginning of obsequious servitude to money is a perilous thing," he warned, adding that "if we make it our master in one thing, we will soon be its servants in all things." The church which "panders" to money will soon "surrender" to it.⁸³

Haynes's conclusion highlighted his sharp rebuke of "money power," the crisis in Methodist identity he thought it entailed, and the wholesale spiritual reform Methodists must undertake to be rid of this timely and timeless social, and ultimately political, sin.

The church has no higher mission to-day than to war against the mammonism of the age and of the church. She must purge herself first of the sin or she can never stand successfully before the Mammonism without. The time has come for judgment to begin at the house of God, for the cry to go forth on the battlefield of the church 'to your tents, O Israel' and we must hie us back to the camp and there prostrate before God, in humble confession and solemn and searching self-examination discover our guilt, and then by repentance and restitution, and faith and prayer, be purged of our iniquity. Nothing short of just such a reformation will redeem and reinvest Methodism with its divine and saving power in this world, in that measure she once enjoyed. Our crown if not gone, is fast going. Our origin was in a reformation of experimental spiritual religion and practical

⁸² B. F. Haynes, "Achanism in the Church," *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

⁸³ B. F. Haynes, "Achanism in the Church," *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

piety. It was our genius and our glory to present to a lost world a type of deadness to the world and its charms, and of Christ-like unselfishness and devotion to saving souls. Our purity was our power. To-day our gold is our guilt.⁸⁴

Haynes's sermon, an appeal to recover a usable Methodist past, was all the more important given the new threats he perceived. Yet an explicit appeal to the rural origins of a lost political, moral and spiritual purity is missing from Haynes's critique of the ravages of wealth. If he associated moral decay with new wealth, he did not associate moral virtue with small town America. For Haynes, the simplicity of "primitive Methodism" was not due to mythological simple virtues of rural life but with the moral virtues of poverty and reliance on divine power instead of material power. Haynes's critique of wealth and his positing of an abusive ruling class of new men, constituted a Wesleyan critique of the New South and the Gilded Age generally. But it was also, Haynes recalled, "the first public criticism I ever made of the Bishops of the Church," and he "confidently expected to pay the penalty for the sermon," which would be his removal from the pastorate at McKendree.⁸⁵

Bishop Keener had sustained Haynes in 1888 when wealthy laity complained of his preaching, declaring it "would be a grave mistake" to move such a successful pastor. Keener had good reasons to let Haynes stay for a third year: a packed house, revivals, and record receipts obviously among them. Keener also could have relied on episcopal precedent. McKendree usually received three and four year pastoral terms for its preachers; to remove a pastor after two would break that convention. But there was another precedent, likely one closer to Keener's heart, and no achievement or mere custom could save Haynes from paying the inexorable price the bishops charged for the unpardonable sin of criticizing the bishops. In October 1889, Bishop

⁸⁴ B. F. Haynes, "Achanism in the Church," *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, September 4, 1889, p. 5.

⁸⁵ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 39, 38.

Keener appointed Haynes to serve as presiding elder of the Nashville East district. The move, while not strictly a demotion, reduced Haynes salary by \$2200, down from his \$3300 salary at McKendree.⁸⁶

Keener's appointment failed to sustain the boldly-preaching Haynes at McKendree, a decision Haynes believed was influenced by wealthy laity displeased with his meddling in their personal and professional affairs. If so, Keener had confirmed Haynes's critique of episcopal weakness more than he had rebuked it. But the slight had been well noted, as had Bounds's decision to reprint the critique. The appointment to presiding elder in October 1889 would be Haynes's last ascending step. Punishment and demotion were to follow.

Many MECS leaders associated the holiness movement with such populist and republican style criticism of wealthy laity, leading pastors, and the bishops themselves. Haynes had not been exposed to holiness doctrines at this stage in his life, in part, because the Tennessee Conference was largely and unusually free from holiness activity that was ongoing elsewhere in the connection in the 1880s. But Haynes's social and political concerns, including prohibition and the corrupting influence of money, and the robust prophetic idiom of biblical and Protestant jeremiads, led him to view the episcopacy through the same anti-declension and anti-corruption lenses that prohibitionists, populists, and others utilized in their critique of the Democratic Party. Such views set him up rather well to embrace the holiness message in the mid-1890s.

But the next stage of the crisis for Haynes and for the Tennessee Conference would not involve holiness controversy. It flowed not from holiness doctrine to debates over polity but from reformist political convictions and organizing to a crisis over the integrity of Methodist

⁸⁶ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 53. Haynes said that friends, "who were hurt at my removal," offered to make up the difference in salary. Haynes refused them, considering it potentially an affront to his successors.

polity. It started not with a ‘crank’ holiness evangelist or emotional holiness revival but with a liberal, well-placed, and blue-blooded Methodist preacher running for public office as a third party reform candidate striving against domestic violence and child abuse. Given the intensity and frequency of Methodists’ prophetic engagements with political matters on behalf of ‘civilization,’ the idea that a Methodist preacher would run for office seems unsurprising. But the violence of the episcopal reaction that followed certainly was surprising, even terrifying. It is to that crisis we now turn.

CHAPTER THREE

Conference Rights and Righteousness

For sixteen years, from 1873 to 1889, B. F. Haynes rose briskly within the MECS. A man of notable personal ability, churches prospered through Haynes's ministerial leadership. A social companion and confidant of bishops, Haynes was marked for high office. After serving three circuit appointments in his first four years of ministry, Haynes rose rapidly and dramatically to ever more prominent and responsible positions. Starting at age 26, Haynes served escalating station appointments at Springfield, Gallatin, and Pulaski by age 34. After that, he was appointed to the "first pulpit of southern Methodism," McKendree Station in Nashville at age 36, and then to presiding elder of the prominent East Nashville district at age 38. When Haynes came to the October 1890 Tennessee Annual Conference, he was weeks shy of his thirty-ninth birthday, and already an established leader of the most important conference in his denomination.

Well-convinced Methodism had the best doctrine, polity, and ministerial and spiritual practices among the Protestant churches, Southern Methodists were certain theirs was the best of Methodism. Middle Tennessee Methodists (MECS) called themselves the "Old Jerusalem Conference," and believed their conference was first among the MECS conferences. They had the best leaders, too, the most devoted and "manly," i.e., courageous in relation to principles and justice, a combination of courage and integrity, a conference of brave, honorable, and noble men. Names like William McKendree, Peter Cartwright, Robert Paine, Thomas Osgood Summers, and J. B. McFerrin inspired these Tennesseans, whose conference once included the Old Southwest and portions of the Old Northwest, an heir to the original Western Conference. After the founding of Vanderbilt University, Tennessee Methodists buried Bishops McKendree, Joshua

Soule, and H. N. McTyeire—who died in 1889—on the institution’s campus in Nashville.¹

As they saw it, to be a leader of the Tennessee Conference was to be among the best in all of southern Methodism. The presence of the connectional ministries such as the *Advocate*, publishing house, and Vanderbilt University had much to do with that pride. The NCA even labeled Nashville “the most solidly Methodistic town in the world.” But the Tennesseans understood that Tennesseans put the publishing house there, made the *Advocate* the general organ, and founded the university. Nashville was the connectional metropole because Middle Tennesseans like J. B. McFerrin made it so. Thus the connectional interests were not fortunate coincidences; they were battle honors. Indeed, the metaphor of an elite, historic, and experienced combat unit might capture well the sense of group pride, belonging, esprit de corps, and warm fraternity felt among Tennessee Conference clergy. These institutions provided striking evidence of the spiritual strength and vitality Methodism like so many monuments to Tennessee Methodists’ skill in “organizing to beat the devil.” They were, at least as they saw it,

¹ Their resident bishop in 1962 asserted “no conference in Methodism is richer in history than the Tennessee Conference.” Cullen T. Carter, *Methodist Leaders in the Old Jerusalem Conference*, 9. Given the standing of Tennessee Methodists within Methodism, and the standing of Methodism in Middle Tennessee, Carter noted that there had been “jealousy in some conferences, and among other denominations.” 292. For a delightful example of dissent and Conference pride from a member of a smaller conference of “no big commercial centers, no high sounding Vanderbiltian announcements, no boasted ‘Jerusalem’ Conferences, no ponderous Connectional Boards,” see “The Quarterly and the Mississippi Conference,” by “R. A.,” NCA February 15, 1890 p. 5. For the burials on the Vanderbilt campus, see Carter, *History*, 194-195. Presiding Elders – today called District Superintendents – served in a middle management role, answering to the bishop and supervising the work of 15-20 pastoral charges and the itinerant clergy or local pastors that served them. Presiding elders of more rural districts would have more circuit charges where each charge might include multiple congregations or preaching points. Generally, experienced clergy more culturally suited to rural areas – T. J. Duncan and J. W. Cullom for example – would be appointed presiding elders of districts composed of many rural circuit charges. More cultured and urban or county-seat town suited clergy – like Kelley and Haynes – would be assigned to districts like Nashville or East Nashville that held more station appointments. In either case, presiding elders were responsible for guiding, advising, helping, and supporting the pastors serving the various charges in their district, and leading the district in evangelism and revivals. Presiding elders raised on Conference and with longer service might know most of the lay members and families within the bounds of their districts. Most elite long-serving clergy alternated between presiding elder and station appointments. The move from presiding elder to a pastoral appointment they labeled “returned to the ranks.”

the best of the best.²

For Haynes, the story of conflict, crisis, and professional demise that followed must be understood in the light of his earlier pride in being a respected leader of this conference. His protest had to be taken seriously, because of the seriousness of his character, and his standing in the leading conference of southern Methodism. The Tennessee Conference's pain, bitterness, and the outrage over the events of October 1890 will only make sense in the context of conference pride and sense of fraternity. Their commitment to the political movement for prohibition was both an occasion for conference pride and a cause of their troubles.

The Tennessee Prohibition Party nominated Gallatin pastor and favored son D. C. Kelley for Governor on June 4, 1890. The NCA announced "It does not need to be said that Dr. KELLEY is a man of great mental alertness and an able public speaker. He will make the canvass interesting for his opponents, whomever they may be." Little sign appeared that a great controversy would result. Elected in May, new and inexperienced NCA editor Elijah Embree Hoss's editorial of June 28, 1890 entitled "The Church and Prohibition," quickly changed the tone. Hoss quoted the May 1890 General Conference's declaration "We are emphatically a prohibition Church," then inserted a caution that while "we are a prohibition Church, but we are

² "Revivals in Nashville," NCA February 14, 1891 p. 9. Charles W. Ferguson, *Organizing to Beat the Devil: Methodists and the Making of America*. (New York: Doubleday, 1971). For how Tennessee became the central conference, see chapter entitled "Capital" in Smith, *Cross and Flame*, 121-139. On Tennessee Conference and Nashville's connectional importance, see "Our Own Connectional Church," NCA May 9, 1889 p.1, importance of Nashville specifically, "As the seat of so many of our Connectional institutions, the whole Church feels an interest in Nashville Methodism." "Nashville Methodist Notes," NCA September 12, 1889 p. 8. "The Tennessee Conference" NCA October 27, 1888 p.8 written by "J.W.B.," or "Rev. John W. Boswell, Assistant Editor" (from the masthead), noted there were more than 126 preachers; Tennessee Conference called the "mother Conference" and "Old Jerusalem Conference" (they always capitalized Conference, and put OJC in quotes). Boswell also noted "the wealth of middle Tennessee" "the age and standing of the Conference" zealously engaged in "spreading scriptural holiness over these lands." Boswell declared "We do not wonder that the Tennessee Conference is the mother of preachers and masters of Israel." The business of the session was crisp, all reports were read without "attitudinizing" – that is, commentary, explanation, or excess discussion. "We have no complaints to lodge against the times or the Tennessee Conference..." rather "we have everything to say in favor of both." Columbia District Conference TN, NCA November 13, 1886, p14; TN Conference Assessments by District NCA November 3, 1888, p. 9; "Tennessee Conference," including various reports and appointments, NCA October 23, 1886 p. 4.

not a Prohibition-Party Church.” Hoss affirmed the right of Methodists to vote for whatever party they chose—“the cracking of whips is a poor business”—but he rejected the notion that the actions of the General Conference entailed a command to its members to vote for “the Third Party.” An East Tennessee Democrat, academic, and combative sectionalists from the Holston Conference, Hoss was a strong advocate of prohibition so long as it did not challenge the Democratic Party’s fragile hold on Tennessee divided partisan politics or allow women to vote. Hoss had just suggested that the church’s solidarity against violent crime came at too high a price if it meant encouraging suffrage or giving Republicans the governorship. That outcome many Democrats imagined was tantamount to giving blacks the governorship via Massachusetts Republican and freshman Congressman Henry Cabot Lodge’s 1890 ‘Lodge Bill,’ or ‘Force Bill,’ as white southerners called it. It proposed giving federal courts and election monitors authority over elections in southern states to undo election restrictions that, in Tennessee, had just been enacted the year before. Hoss had announced his personal partisan view to the MECS and, as importantly, the voters of Tennessee. Given the chance to vote for his fellow MECS preacher and prohibition (and the specter of ‘black Republican rule’), he was voting wet.

In a case of protesting too much, Hoss had indeed cracked the whip. Hoss used the NCA to declare himself and the MECS opposed not just to Kelley’s run for office, but opposed to his success in the campaign as well. Ostensibly he aimed to affirm the spirituality doctrine, a core mark of MECS identity in comparison to the MEC that Hoss so loathed. But his words were not consistent with non-partisan neutrality regarding an election in his home state, and revealed as much interest in the success of his own partisan affiliations—and the failure of his opponents—as the neutrality of his denomination. The editor of the official paper of the Tennessee Conference that circulated heavily in-state had just come out against the candidacy of the

Tennessee Conference's top man, perhaps, in part, to declare himself the leader of the Methodist wing of the Democratic Party in Tennessee. With friends like Hoss, Kelley would need no enemies. But Hoss was not the only Methodist Democrat that would actively oppose Kelley's third party candidacy.³

The loyal Methodist engagements of the trio of Tennessee Conference prohibition leaders Kelley, Haynes, and T. J. Duncan, had been urged by repeated and increasingly intense Annual and General Conference resolutions, several of them written by Haynes. But those faithful political efforts would lead them into direct and painful conflict with the autocratic practice of Methodist bishops, who were, by virtue of MECS theory and episcopal election, no longer members of, or bound to, any annual conference fraternity or affiliation. Three separate controversies shook the conference in the 1890s. The first proved most important and decisive: the Kelley case of October 1890.⁴ That disaster exposed a crisis over two separate core marks of

³ NCA, June 14, 1890. p. 9. "The Church and Prohibition," NCA June 28, 1890 p. 1. The difference between Hoss and Kelley on party was simple. For Hoss, The Democracy trumped prohibition. Kelley told the editor of the *Examiner* to convince the Democratic Party to put in a prohibition plank in their platform... "Do this, Colonel, and we will hold a good old Methodist love-feast together." Kelley, *Bishop or Conference? As Illustrated by the Trial of D. C. Kelley*. (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1891), 109. Hoss's later threats to abandon the Democratic Party if it did not embrace Prohibition were merely the normal yelling that leaders of interest groups *within* political parties often do. Years later Hoss played a major role in provoking Vanderbilt Chancellor Kirkland to sever ties with the MECS. Kirkland bears the most blame for taking the school, but Hoss's heavy-handedness has been generally recognized. The *Nashville Christian Advocate* was the official organ of the entire MECS denomination, and its editor was elected (and reelected) by the General Conference. But it was also the official organ of the Tennessee Conference, Tennessee and Memphis being the only two Conferences in 1890 that did not have an official relationship with a paper other than the NCA. See also Joseph H. Cartwright, *The Triumph of Jim Crow: Tennessee Race Relations in the 1880s*. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976) and Roger L. Hart, *Redeemers, Bourbons, and Populists: Tennessee, 1870-1896*. (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1975).

⁴ The best primary sources for the controversy are: the 109 page defense with multiple witnesses compiled by D. C. Kelley, *Bishop or Conference? As Illustrated by the Trial of D. C. Kelley*. (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1891), easily the best source for the events and immediate reaction, though *rarely* consulted; the autobiography by B. F. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, from 1921 (but written over a longer period), 93-154; and the staggering 398 page history of Methodist polity that devotes entire chapters to the Kelley-Hargrove issue, T. A. Kerley, *Conference Rights; or Governing Principles of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as Found in the History, Legislation, and Administration of the Church. With Suggestions as to Hurtful Tendencies, Inherent Defects, and Needed Changes*. (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1898). All three authors were Tennessee Conference clergy of long standing, and eyewitnesses and direct participants. Each likely began writing immediately following the event. Kelley and Haynes include full re-printings of appropriate sources, including the Conference Journal, and various

MECS identity in comparison to the MEC, the ideal of a non-political church and the valuing of high episcopal authority, prerogative, and order.

While he considered accepting the Prohibition Party's gubernatorial nomination, Kelley wrote to 1889–1890 presiding Bishop John C. Keener asking for his permission, or at least a letter from the bishop that would explain to the Prohibition Party why he could not run. Keener replied privately, apparently expressing his displeasure. Kelley asked if he would reconsider, and if not, provide him with a public letter he could share. Keener sent a carefully worded reply—likely very different from the original letter—that neither supported nor rejected the endeavor, but noted that Kelley could not serve two masters. Taking this as episcopal approval, or at least permission to make his own decision, Kelley largely absented himself from his pastoral duties for the final two months of his term while he campaigned “to meet the profoundest need of my native State, as voiced by her best women.” Gallatin was on the East Nashville district, and Haynes, as Kelley's presiding elder, appointed a retired pastor to provide for the congregation in Kelley's absence. For the final seven weeks, Kelley—who fully expected to lose the race and return to pastoring—treated Gallatin Station as a point on a circuit, returning occasionally to tend to various church matters. He and his defenders maintained that he had not “resigned” the pastorate, nor had he “refused” to itinerate. Kelley even surrendered his salary for that time in order to enable the temporary supply pastor to receive compensation.⁵

newspaper items. The two most important “official” newspaper articles both appeared in the NCA – The aged Vanderbilt Chancellor Landon Garland for Hargrove, November 15, 1890, 3, and Haynes for Kelley: B. F. Haynes, “The Tennessee Conference vs. Bishop R. K. Hargrove,” November 22, 1890, 14-16. Haynes's defense was reprinted in full in both Kelley's and Haynes's books.

⁵ Smith, *Cross and Flame*, 235. Kelley, *Bishop or Conference?*, 108-109, Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 100-103. Keener's letter was taken by Kelley and Haynes as formal episcopal permission to be absent for the purposes of canvassing the state. The letter seems most likely an attempt on Bishop Keener's part to absolve himself of responsibility. Two caveats apply however. First, the letter from Keener to Kelley that appeared during the controversy was not the original letter. Kelley asked Keener to provide him with a second letter that Keener would

Many Methodist clergy had run for and even held office before without disciplinary action, including famed Methodist itinerant and Democrat Peter Cartwright who served in the Illinois General Assembly and lost a congressional race to the freethinking Whig, Abraham Lincoln. One of the two bishops elected in May 1890, O. P. Fitzgerald, had been the Democratic Superintendent of Public Instruction in California in the 1860s. The other new selectee, Atticus G. Haygood, had received a nominal appointment as assistant pastor of his home church that allowed him to spend several years in full time secular labors, travelling around disbursing money to African-American colleges for the Slater Fund. What made Kelley's foray into politics offensive, especially in Tennessee where East Tennesseans' Republican ways made statewide Democratic control particularly fragile, was that he was not running as a Democrat. Prominent Democrats that year rallied not because of their candidate, John Price Buchanan, but "because they were fearful that the Democratic vote going to Kelley" might result in a Republican victory. Although defeated 10 to 1 by the Democratic-Farmer's Alliance ticket, and 7 to 1 by the

be willing to be made public; it is that second letter that appears in public record, not the private one Keener originally sent. Smith argues, probably correctly, that Keener "although privately opposing Kelley's involvement," refused to take a public stand. Smith thus decides that Kelley was "left with the decision." Second, Keener's public letter never stated a problem with the Prohibition Party, with an itinerant elder running for office *as such*, or with Kelley's previous record on political questions. The spirituality doctrine was not mentioned directly. It does indicate that the time burden of campaigning would not allow Kelley to discharge his pastoral duties. It does not warn in any clear way that running for office under those conditions would, or might, result in disciplinary charges, and could easily be taken as indicating little more than that someone would have to fill in for Kelley during his absence. Keener's letter would be consistent with two competing theories of Keener's motives. He might have been setting a trap for Kelley, including just enough to indicate support for a conviction, but not enough actually to warn Kelley of the likelihood of a trial, expulsion from the ministry, or a forced location. Or, Keener's letter might be taken as a bishop telling a veteran minister that it was up to him to decide what he felt his duty was, while remaining silent as to how the new presiding bishop or the Conference might react, matters he might assume someone of Kelley's experience could judge just as well as Keener could have. Given Keener's stature as senior bishop, his aggressiveness about the importance of his senior status (he was still telling younger bishops what to do after he retired), and the level of intent and animosity indicated by Hargrove's actions, and, thus the likelihood that Keener knew exactly what Hargrove had planned, and might have been involved in planning himself, the former seems more likely than the latter. Nowhere did Keener say, "you do not have my permission," nowhere did Keener say "it is unwise; do it if you must, but expect serious trouble." The tone of Keener's *public* letter assumes that running for office on the Prohibition Party ticket was an honorable and worthy task, perhaps even equal to the honor and worthiness of pastoral labor. A critic of secrecy, Kelley decided, correctly, that he should only be bound by the content of the public letter.

Republican, Kelley's candidacy—unaided by Hoss's commentary—still garnered a Prohibition Party high of 11,000 votes, including nearly 30 percent of the vote in Davidson County (Nashville) – historically a “wet” Democratic stronghold. Kelley's 1890 campaign had hoped that the Prohibition Party could win over the Farmer's Alliance vote. Stressing social and economic reform, Kelley went after corporations and politicians, condemning trusts and convict labor. Buchanan also courted labor and the farm vote. Kelley's campaign did particularly well in Middle Tennessee, the area within the bounds of the Tennessee Conference. Two years later Buchanan ran as an independent endorsed by the Populist Party. That year Judge Edward H. East—a Sunday School teacher at McKendree and lay delegate to General Conferences, as well as a former Whig, dissenting unionist member of the secession-approving Tennessee legislature, and Brownlow-appointed Tennessee Secretary of State—ran on the Prohibition ticket. The Democrat Peter Turney still won by a 26,000 vote margin.⁶

Episcopal jurisdiction over the Tennessee Conference changed hands from Keener to Robert Kennon Hargrove in the fall of 1890. Hargrove, remembered at his death by a delightfully easy-to-translate description as “a compact man bodily and mentally... who moved upon straight lines,” had begun his professional life as a mathematics professor at the University of Alabama. Hargrove was enraged by Kelley's candidacy. A man of whom Fitzgerald inauspiciously said “his special gifts were accuracy and punctuality,” Hargrove called the cabinet (the presiding elders) together in advance of the Annual Conference in order to make

⁶ Robert H. White, *Messages of the Governors of Tennessee*, Vol. 17. (Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1967), 363-364, 357. Carter, *History*, 202. Smith, *Cross and Flame*, 235. Isaac, *Prohibition and Politics*, 64-67. Bishops made annual appointments. Upon joining the “Itinerant” (full time) clergy, Methodist pastors vowed to obey the bishop and to continue to serve where appointed until the next meeting of the annual conference. It was not uncommon, however, for clergy to write the bishop who had appointed them asking for time away or freedom to pursue another opportunity until the next conference. Sometimes this time away included going on vacation-work trips with the bishops themselves, as Haynes did on his western tour while serving in Pulaski.

preparations to punish Kelley, ostensibly for abandoning his pastoral charge. In fact, he intended to force Kelley to surrender his clergy status and “locate.” A transfer to the Tennessee Conference from Alabama and Kentucky, Hargrove was elected bishop in 1882 from the Tennessee Conference, the last elected of five (Haygood refused his election) at the General Conference held in Nashville. Carter declares “evidently it was the opinion” of many that a Tennessee Conference man should be elected. But, unlike Kelley, Hargrove had not been elected a delegate by the Tennesseans; he was an alternate. Smith writes that Hargrove was not “a popular figure,” and had not been elected “perhaps because of his coolness toward prohibition.”⁷

Hargrove made his episcopal residence in Nashville from 1882 to his death in 1905. He had been Haynes’s pastor at his home church in Franklin in the late 1860s when Haynes was a young man, and Haynes felt close to him. Hargrove preached the funeral for Haynes’s father in 1877; the report said Hargrove “knew him well.” The Haynes’s fifth child, Lulie “May” Haynes, was baptized by the bishop in 1884 while Haynes was pastor at Gallatin. Haynes was personally closer to Hargrove than he was to Kelley. Indeed, Haynes had written and moved a resolution against worldly amusements in 1887 aimed, in part, at refuting statements made by Kelley. He had written and proposed a similar measure, known as the “Duncan” resolutions on worldliness

⁷ Kathleen Minnix, *Laughter in the Amen Corner: The Life of Evangelist Sam Jones* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1993), 148. Carter, *Methodist Leaders*, 121. Smith, *Cross and Flame*, 235. O. P. Fitzgerald, *Fifty Years: Observations-Opinions-Experiences*. (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1903), 81. Fitzgerald added of Hargrove: “He never shirked a duty because it required hard work, he never went into the pulpit unprepared; he never quit working at any problem until he got a solution.” 82. Hargrove and Kelley had both been delegates in 1878; but Kelley was third in order, Hargrove sixth. Carter, *History*, 201. Smith reports (235) that Hargrove “had been a schoolman more years than he had been a pastor,” a statement not supported by Carter’s review (*Leaders*, 121) of Hargrove’s appointments that reports Hargrove served twice as a college president over five years, but served 12-13 years as a pastor. But most of that service was in Alabama. For the Tennesseans, Hargrove had been sent by the bishops to take the best appointments – the Presidency of Tennessee Female College, then McKendree, Nashville P.E., Franklin P.E. – before being elected bishop. Reading between the lines, some Tennesseans may have viewed Hargrove as something of an ecclesiastical interloper. He might have earned his pastoral stripes, but not with, among, or before the eye of the Middle Tennesseans. In this sense, Hargrove might be seen as an ironic victim of the transfer system himself. Bishop McTyeire – another Alabamian who made good in Tennessee – appointed Hargrove to McKendree in 1873, the year Haynes began his ministry.

at the 1890 General Conference only months before, and a “very strained” relationship had existed between Haynes and Kelley for some time.⁸

In conversations with Hargrove that began two months before the annual conference meeting, Haynes discovered the intensity of Hargrove’s fury toward Kelley, so “intemperate,” “amazing,” passionate, and “severe” that Haynes was “mortified, and went home sick at heart.” Haynes lamented “the known fact of the bitterness” Hargrove felt toward Kelley, feelings he had “freely vented” in a “noted” speech during a meeting of the Board of Missions. During Haynes’s first few years in ministry, Hargrove and Kelley had been, alternately, the pastor of McKendree and Nashville presiding elder, and thus alternately each other’s successors and supervisors. Both roughly twenty years Haynes’s senior, Hargrove and Kelley were elder brothers and role models for him, and his family in Franklin remembered both as the family pastor. Hargrove now accused Kelley of “seeking to stab the Church and bring ruin upon it” and condemned the “agitation” of Prohibition “throughout the church” which had been “injurious in the extreme.” Haynes responded that Hargrove was a noted Democrat, opposed to prohibition, with a “personal ecclesiastical dislike” of Kelley. Hargrove’s intent was not to reform or even rebuke Kelley, but to force Kelley to “locate or leave,” that is, leave the ordained ministry or leave the denomination. Attempting to break up the prohibitionist leadership of the Tennessee Conference, Hargrove could not have missed Haynes’s intense prohibition activity. Lacking personal animosity toward Haynes, Hargrove repeatedly offered him the chance to transfer off

⁸ “Franklin, Tenn.,” NCA March 3, 1877. Haynes Family Group Sheet, Private Family Records. Haynes’s presiding elder T. J. Duncan baptized the sixth, B. F., Jr. or “Frank” in 1886, while NCA editor O. P. Fitzgerald baptized their seventh child, Albert F. at the Haynes family home in Nashville in 1889, and E. M. Bounds baptized their ninth and final child, Philip Leroy, in 1895 (their eighth child died in infancy in 1894). May’s second husband was U.S. Navy Rear Admiral David C. Cather, M.D. The Cathers are buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Kelley pastored Franklin, too, before the war, when Haynes was but a small child. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 99, 104-105. The report said of Haynes’s father “he was an excellent man, and his death is much deplored.”

the Conference with plum appointments to Dallas, Texas, First Church by Bishop Charles B. Galloway or his choice of Augusta or Macon, Georgia, by Bishop Haygood, actions that indicated a well-coordinated plan involving other bishops. A Tennessean through and through, Haynes refused. Hargrove then tried to convince Haynes to go to fellow prohibitionist Kelley and persuade him to locate. Hargrove would settle for either a trial for immorality and likely expulsion, or a location wherein Kelley's character passed. Haynes refused, outraged that Hargrove would either try a man that was not guilty, or release a guilty man without penalty. Hargrove moved to plan B, which he discussed with Haynes. Hargrove expected that, as Kelley's presiding elder, Haynes would "arrest" (call into question) Kelley's character, thus setting in motion a formal trial.⁹

When the time came in open Conference—meeting in Pulaski that year—and Kelley's name was called, Haynes stated "nothing against him." Kelley gave his report. Then the bishop waited, refusing to move on until someone accused Kelley. George W. Winn asked Haynes if he had actually said nothing against him. In a series of moves later ruled illegal under Methodist law, Hargrove declared Winn's query an arrest of Kelley's character, and set out to appoint personally an investigating committee composed of Kelley opponents T. B. Fisher, A. T. Goodloe, and J. A. Orman. Haynes protested that an arrest had to precede appointment of an investigating committee. The bishop asked Winn if he had so intended to arrest, Winn agreed, and the bishop appointed the committee. Kelley protested that he had not received notice that he would face charges, a requirement under Methodist law. He added that the bishop had "of his own motion" appointed a committee without the requirement that the accused shall excuse himself while the conference determined if his character should pass. Kelley protested that the

⁹ Haynes, *Tempest Tossed*, 132-133, 106-107. Haynes, "The Tennessee Conference vs. Bishop R. K. Hargrove," NCA, November 22, 1890, 14-16., also Kelley, *Bishop or Conference*, 34-44.

conference had the right to determine the applicability of law and the right of appointing a committee. Kelley announced “I therefor protest against the infringement of my personal rights on one hand, and the rights of the Conference on the other.” Hargrove in turn declared Kelley’s protest “trivial and evasive,” and “judged that a mere technicality in a case so grave and notorious should not stop an investigation.” Hargrove had admitted that if the Conference—which in every case had sole jurisdiction over the reputation and character of its own members—had been left to its rightful prerogative and duty, it might not have arrested or tried or punished Kelley at all, and that that knowledge motivated Hargrove’s actions to usurp the rights of the conference. Indeed, the conference likely would have debated and passed a resolution that unambiguously reaffirmed its commitment to prohibition while expressing regret or displeasure that Kelley had assumed the role of candidate, while passing his character. Having finished its investigation, the committee retired to deliberate. During the break in the sessions, Kelley gave a “stirring” campaign speech at the Giles County Court House. Half the conference delegates listened.¹⁰

The stacked investigating committee returned a recommendation for trial and named the prosecutors. T. J. Duncan moved non-concurrence, and read correspondence between Kelley, Keener, and Prohibition Party chair George W. Armistead. Kelley made a personal statement of defense; the bishop declared that Kelley could not discuss the case, the bishop’s interpretation of law, or any facts. So restricted, Kelley then addressed “the effects,” to put every minister’s reputation and character in the bishop’s hands “to do with it what he will.” Hargrove demanded that Kelley come to order; Kelly answered, “I shall proceed, sir.” Again the command, again Kelley’s refusal, then Hargrove’s “I will have you understand that I am presiding over this

¹⁰ Kelley, *Bishop or Conference?*, 68. “A Clergyman in Politics,” *New York Times*, October 5, 1890, p.5.

body.” While Hargrove slammed his gavel “continuously and with great vigor,” Kelley protested that even the Romans hell-bent on crucifying Jesus, first bid him talk in his defense, then declared, “I have said what Christianity and manhood demanded of me to say.” Kelley opponents Walker Lewis and R. A. Young moved the previous question and a roll call vote. The Tennessee Conference members, intimate with all the facts, principles, and personalities involved, voted as the roll was called. By a tally of 116 to 25, they rejected the investigation committee’s report that Kelley should be tried.

Legally, it should have ended at that moment. A motion was made to pass Kelley’s character, which the bishop ruled out of order. Then Hargrove declared it his “duty” to appoint a *second* committee of investigation. The house exploded in stunned indignation. Points of order, speeches on the law, questions to the chair, and protests rang out—nearly all dismissed in one way or another by the bishop. Citing the law that a conference “may” appoint another committee, T. J. Duncan defiantly asked the bishop if “may” meant “shall.” Haynes appealed to the College of Bishops for redress. Hargrove’s second committee was composed of two of the 25, and one among the 116. Some thought the request by Kelley’s opponents for a roll call vote was a clever way to reveal the sympathies of the house so that the bishop could select the outcome. When the bishop discovered one of the two unable to serve, he appointed another of the 25 to take his place. Eighty-seven members of the Conference signed a lengthy protest that listed the bishop’s errors. The second committee reported as the first did, and Hargrove appointed a trial committee, a majority of which were from the 25. When the bishop attempted to force the leading witness for the prosecution on the trial jury, one of the prosecutors, T. A. Kerley, threatened to resign in disgust. The trial chairman, J. A. Orman, referred every defense question put to him to the bishop. Stenographers would not be allowed. The defense cannot

challenge jurors for cause. The defense cannot see the list of replacements. The formal bill of charges appalled Haynes, who thought its irregular language constituted an ominous sign of episcopal autocracy: instead of the usual language, “The Tennessee Conference vs. D. C. Kelley,” the charges read, “The M. E. Church, South vs. D. C. Kelley.”¹¹

Knowing the case was hopeless, defense attorney Haynes offered no witnesses, preparing instead for appeal. The trial committee returned a verdict of guilty, but “in view of mitigating circumstances,” stopped short of expulsion, and suspended Kelley from all ministerial functions for six months. Kelley read a paper formally appealing, not to the College of *Bishops*, holding their annual meeting in May 1891, but to the *General Conference* that would meet next in May 1894. But the election for governor was just weeks away, and the Prohibition Party’s candidate had just been convicted of ‘immorality’ in a church trial. But many thought he had never been convicted or even tried by the Tennessee Conference. He had been ‘railroaded’ by a Democrat in a Prince Albert frock, who, many were convinced, was himself guilty of more than mental compactness. With Democratic victory assured that fall, the new Tennessee General Assembly was called to order in the new year. Dr. J. D. Barbee—the Book Agent for the MECS Publishing House, a member of the pro-Hargrove minority, and trial prosecutor—prayed the opening prayer. When the six month suspension concluded, Kelley could be found in Mississippi, giving speeches in support of prohibition.¹²

¹¹ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 125-126. Kelley, *Bishop or Conference?*, 30.

¹² Carter, *History*, 248-260., Smith, *Cross and Flame*, 236-238., White, *Messages of the Governors*, 364. *New York Times*, May 13, 1891. Carter incorrectly says the NCA statement he cites was from Hoss. It was from W. M. Leftwich, the Tennessee Conference secretary. Smith declares that Haynes had agreed to do Hargrove’s bidding. Hargrove had been thus “abandoned by his presiding elder” and it was that “double-cross” that “angered” Hargrove such that he “did not comport himself well in dealing with the conference.” It is quite possible that Haynes had remained silent or had sent conflicting signals, when being pressed by a friendly bishop to do something Haynes considered appalling. But Haynes remained adamant that he had never assured anyone he would arrest Kelley’s character, an act he says he never considered doing. The suggestion that Hargrove was Haynes’s victim in October

To Haynes, the “ecclesiastical degradation” of Kelley and those who defended him against “the violence” of his prosecutors did not fit the offense. Kelley’s choice to run for governor was not popular. Haynes had opposed it, and declared that “ninety-five percent or more of his brethren deplored his candidacy.” But most clergy on the conference did not consider it a moral offense. Nor did they think he was guilty “in a disciplinary sense” of “refusing to do the work” assigned to him by absenting himself, with episcopal approval, for the final two months of his term.¹³

Hargrove demoted Kelley from Gallatin Station to Springfield Station (Haynes had been promoted from Springfield to Gallatin in 1881). Over thirty years before Kelley had been appointed to Franklin and Huntsville, Alabama Stations—the portion of Alabama north of the

1890 – or even more outrageously – that Haynes victimized both Hargrove AND the Tennessee Conference is, to state it as mildly as one might, entirely unconvincing. Haynes emerged from October 1890 the standard bearer of the Tennessee Conference. Hargrove emerged the villain. That Haynes’s later holiness advocacy meant that he could no longer be treated with respect does not require that Hargrove’s guilt be transferred to any holiness scapegoat. Readers will judge the veracity of Smith’s oft-cited statement that “the bishops’ decision to act against Kelley probably derived less from partisan conviction than from fears that holiness preachers would use Kelley’s candidacy to justify their habit of deserting assignments for evangelistic work elsewhere” on the basis of three simple facts. First, the Tennessee Conference was entirely anti-holiness as will be seen later. None of the punished were holiness advocates. Second, no MECS bishop had much trouble targeting directly an itinerant elder doing things the bishops did not like. Thirdly, the timing, the chronological order is off. Haynes was entirely “guilty” of being a holiness advocate after late 1894-early 1895. But by his own testimony he had not even heard holiness preaching until 1894. The prohibition crusade was its own – separate and distinct – bishop-disturbing protest. Bishops made the same offer to Tennessee Prohibitionists they did to North Georgia ‘sanctificationists’ – poverty via abusive appointment and transfers intended to force the transgressor to “locate or leave” the church entirely. That many holiness advocates were also third-party prohibitionists does not mean that Kelley, Haynes, and Duncan were holiness men in 1890. Bishops later used formal legislation to secure means to expel those who had located. Taken together, the intent was to drive certain people out of the denomination entirely. Farish notes half the story. Kelley was at Gallatin, not Lebanon. Kelley did not secure W. G. Dorris as supply, Haynes did (a sensitive point because if Haynes ‘had to’ secure Dorris, it put Kelley in a poor light). While noting that Hargrove was said to dislike prohibition and political activity by preachers, he does not note that it was also claimed that Hargrove had personal issues with Kelley. Lastly, Farish says that the Bishop was charged with maladministration; this is true. He was also charged with immorality. *Circuit Rider Dismounts*, 321, n1.

¹³ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 96, 98. As Haynes saw things, Kelley had sought and received the permission of the appropriate bishop and thus was not guilty of anything as serious as having abandoned his charge. Moreover, a fellow clergyman’s reputation was at stake. Kelley had showed a lack of wisdom in pursuit of a just cause; he was not guilty of what amounted to a charge of moral failure (betraying a sacred oath). Despite concerns for the separation of church and state, Haynes felt Kelley should run – not because it was a good idea, but because he had given commitment to the Prohibition Party and felt that withdrawal would be both dishonorable for Kelley and send the signal that the MECS was not solidly behind Prohibition. Hargrove, no doubt, intended to send just those signals.

Tennessee River had been part of the Tennessee Conference before 1870—both better appointments than Springfield. Haynes’s demotion from East Nashville presiding elder to the Alex Green circuit was much more severe. In an era when the average Tennessee Conference clergy salary was around \$550, Alex Green paid \$350 a year in comparison to \$1500 for presiding elder.

Kelley’s civil lawyer, Jordon Stokes, charged that conference secretary W. M. Leftwich had secretly omitted and added material to the minutes at Hargrove’s order. Hargrove named Leftwich East Nashville presiding elder in Haynes’s place. T. J. Duncan was also removed as presiding elder and sent to the humble Nashville North High Street and McTyeire Memorial, with Duncan and Haynes now under Leftwich’s authority, perhaps should occasion arise for any more arrests of character the next year. By 1893, Bishop Keener had transferred Duncan to the Los Angeles Conference. These moves effectively undermined Methodist prohibition efforts. Conference historian Cullen Carter noted that “from 1893 to 1901, temperance reform in Tennessee was stationary. The temperance reports at the Annual Conference sessions during this period were rather feeble in comparison to the stand against the liquor traffic in other years.”¹⁴

The backlash was immediate. Baptists had a field day, giggling and hissing at Hargrove’s complete and perfect vindication of standard Baptist critiques of the “evil of the Episcopal office.” The episode allowed Nashville Baptist editor and prohibition leader E. E. Folk to indict the entire body of Methodist preachers, shaming both “unscriptural” episcopacy, and the clergy

¹⁴ Carter, *History*, 330-331. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 141-142. “Tennessee Conference,” NCA, October 25, 1890, 11. Carter, *History*, 300-301. For Stokes’s charge against Leftwich, see *Bishop or Conference?*, p. 58. Among Haynes’s formal charges against Hargrove was that he had instigated, or consented to, changes in the journal. The next fall, in October 1891, the Tennesseans removed the long-serving W. M. Leftwich as Conference Secretary, replacing him with Haynes. Haynes’s accuracy in note taking had even been recognized by Bishop Hargrove, and his colleagues had abundant evidence that he could be trusted to stand up to any bishop tempted to ‘influence’ the Journal. Before the Civil War, the portion of Alabama north of the Tennessee River fell within the bounds of the Tennessee Conference. Postwar, Alabama was divided into two conferences, with the North Alabama Conference receiving Huntsville. T. A. Kerley went to McFerrin Memorial on the East Nashville District.

of the Tennessee Conference. “How a man can remain a preacher in the Methodist conference,” said Folk, “subject to an irresponsible master we can not see.” Indeed, he wondered, “how an American citizen with all of his glorious ideas about liberty can do so, passes our understanding.” Within less than a decade, Methodists would wring hands over the “decrease of the increase” in growth. Within a generation, Baptists outnumbered Methodists in Middle Tennessee.¹⁵

During the 1870s and 1880s, the MECS had rallied from the shocks of the Civil War—including the ugly moral state of the postwar South, and an MEC determined to deliver an ecclesiastical *coup de grace*—by pressing the practices of revival and more intense searching for a deeper faith. This stressing of greater holiness, calling of sinners from sin, and widespread religious revival and conversion had, by the late 1880s, produced a remarkable increase in the membership of the MECS. The boom produced a confident denomination and greatly enhanced the stature of Methodist bishops who had led the rebound. So great had the growth in members, properties, and clergy been that the bishops declared in their 1890 episcopal address that “the one thing needful is the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire upon the entire body.”¹⁶

¹⁵ E. E. Folk, “B. F. Haynes vs. R. K. Hargrove,” *Baptist and Reflector*, December 11, 1890, 8, and “The Kelley Case Again,” *Baptist and Reflector*, October 23, 1890, 8. As quoted in Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause*, 268. Hoss declared Methodists capable handling their own affairs, and noted that he could have pointed out Baptist flaws, too, but had not. Hoss eventually quipped “if the *Reflector* will give itself a little more closely to the task of disciplining the sore-headed deacons and fussy sisters, who often make life a burden for Baptist pastors, we promise to do our level best toward keep the Methodist Bishops straight.” NCA, December 13, 1890, 1. The classic statement of Baptists’ anti-Methodist-polity polemics is J. R. Graves, *The Great Iron Wheel, or Republicanism Backwards*, 1855.

¹⁶ Between 1885 and 1889, the MECS added 185,384 members, an increase of 19% in only 4 years. *Journal of the General Conference*, 1890. 31. Fitzgerald stated the Methodist confidence, saying “it is truly refreshing to hear so much of the success of the gospel, and we feel a pardonable satisfaction when assured that Methodism is doing her share in the great work. It will never be otherwise so long as we are true to our doctrines and faithful to our methods.” NCA, November 24, 1888, p. 8. Fitzgerald quipped “The Queen of England worships God in Scotland with the Presbyterians, and in England with the Episcopalians. In these United States, she would probably show a leaning also toward Baptists and Methodists, as she seems to like established religions.” NCA January 10, 1885 p.1.

But a change was coming. Internal dissent—Methodists’ own critiques of the mistakes and/or waywardness of Methodism—had played a vital and underappreciated role in sustaining Methodist zeal and focus on the high standards of the “doctrines and discipline” of the MECS, thereby vigilantly marking the boundaries between Methodist piety and the ways of the world. By the 1890s, Methodist leaders increasingly discouraged, labeled as unmethodistic, and even marked for shaming dissent itself. Methodists revised their critiques of worldly ways in the wider society, and shifted away from critiques of worldliness within the church toward ironic critiques of Methodist internal critics for their ‘ensoriousness’ and ‘disloyalty.’ A new Methodist literature developed, marked not by moral or spiritual clarity and accessibility fit for a movement committed to ‘spreading scriptural holiness,’ but by obfuscating discourses on topics that had once been plainly understood, discourses more likely to produce ennui than evangelical zeal.

Prohibition radicalism had created ecclesiastical conflict, for radical critics of the political status quo were among the most intense dissenters in religious affairs. Debates over episcopacy, conference, fraternity, professional courtesy, and evangelists were intra-Methodist debates. But many of those most engaged in criticism of the house positions were also political dissenters. Again, this was not caused by holiness advocacy; in many cases, it was not even related to holiness advocacy. In the case of Haynes, it preceded his involvement in the holiness movement. In fact, many of those involved in these ecclesiastical debates were not holiness advocates at all. The battles between bishops and clergy over prohibition, episcopal power, and evangelists, involved people who were on the same side on the sanctification debates. These polity and political debates played out in newspapers, and show the vital role of newspaper editors played in providing or denying a means for working out issues, a voicing of minority views. They

controlled the working out of the mind of southern Methodism. Taken together, this crisis displayed Methodists' inner conflict over the virtues of conference, conference values and identity, and the theological and professional side of Methodist polity.¹⁷

The restricting of internal dissent and decline of readily understood commitments did not happen, at first, because of social or intellectual changes within Methodism. It is true that 1890s editors E. E. Hoss and J. J. Tigert were not the clear advocates that T. O. Summers, former editor of the NCA and Book editor, and even O. P. Fitzgerald were. But the crisis that provoked talk of censoriousness and gag rules, and long-winded obfuscations, occurred over issues that Methodists had thought they understood in unity, such as the doctrines related to, and definitions of, sin and salvation, the respectful relationship between Methodist clergy and Methodist bishops ("itinerancy and episcopacy"), the right and duty of clergy to address public matters of a moral nature, and the role of John and Charles Wesley as theological and ecclesiastical touchstones for

¹⁷ For Methodists debating discipline, itinerancy, appointment, and transfer see the following, NCA April 4, 1889 p.8: "The young preacher who is most familiar with his Discipline is the one who is most likely to do his work as it ought to be done. The Bible first, and then this little book that is your directory as to methods, forms, and usages, in doing the Lord's work." NCA November 3, 1888, p. 8 "Conference Discipline" that celebrated conferences cracking down on their own for "violations of the itinerant law." On Methodist itinerancy from a little guy see "North Carolina Notes" January 26, 1889, p.4. "Two Errors with Their Evil Tendency" NCA January 26, 1889, p.13 (about appointment of preachers); "The Call to the Ministry" Lecture by E. E. Hoss of Vanderbilt University NCA November 17, 1888, p. 13; NCA September 8, 1888, p.1 "Twelve Transfers" – to Denver conference; it's good to rotate bishops and preachers around after at least two years' there (principle of general itinerancy); "Passage of Character," NCA February 2, 1889, p.8; On supporting fellow preachers accused of wrongdoing – November 17, 1888, p. 1 "the air of that room was wholesome." On the controversial practice of transferring of preachers from one conference to another, NCA September 12, 1889, p.8. On the meaning of "conference," Fitzgerald wrote "*bear in mind what is specifically meant by a Methodist Conference*. The word defines itself. It means brotherly consultation, the report of facts showing the state and needs of the Church, interchange of opinion preparatory to the arrangement of the work, and the distribution of laborers for the coming year. It does not properly convey the idea of an arena for angry debates or personal wrangles, such as have made some Annual Conferences sadly and shamefully memorable in the history of the Church. A Conference – it is a good word in its etymology and in its historical suggestions. It has the aroma of courtesy, conciliation and brotherly kindness. As we retain the word, let us also practically hold on to its original significance as far as possible." "The Annual Conferences," NCA September 4, 1886 p. 8. For more on the meaning of conference, "Annual Conference: Some Reminders," NCA September 17, 1887 p. 8. "The Statistical Test" by A. G. Haygood about conferences and business v. conferring NCA November 17, 1888 p 14. "A Spiritual Conference," reprinted from *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, NCA September 3, 1887 p.2 urges that Conference should be a place of "Pentecost and Transfiguration." On complaint there was too much business in Annual Conferences, NCA October 24, 1885 p.8. Fitzgerald on conferences: "The chief method of true Methodists is the method of habitual devoutness." Annual Conferences should be characterized by doing its "business" recognizing "it is all God's business." NCA, September 15, 1888, p.1. "The Annual Conferences."

Methodist identity. Wider societal and political unrest did play a role, dividing Methodists on the issue of how bad was the wickedness of the world (were social and political trends ominous or hopeful?). Those more likely to perceive ominous trends in social and political events were somewhat more likely to decry worldliness, error, and drift *within* Methodism, and thus camps aligned roughly on the basis of who was doing well, and who was not. The fusion of social and political dissent allied with intra-religious dissent characterized the “Country” or “low church” protest against a more contented and accommodated “Court” or “high church” perspective within the MECS. None were more contented than Fitzgerald, who declared that “there is no proper place or function for a croaker in the militant church.” The winsome chief liturgist of postmillennial Court happiness and booming MECS fortunes, the high-on-progress Fitzgerald supposed that everything would be fine just as soon as those who were saying things were not fine would shush.¹⁸

Court croaking against croakers aside, Fitzgerald had overestimated both the bliss and the unity within the MECS. As with the revivals of previous eras, traditionalist croakers emphasized matters of dress and personal behavior as markers of religious sincerity, and eschewed accommodation with “the world.” Antebellum Methodists had agreed on what constituted “the world”—both in perspective and in practice. By the 1890s, the union was dissolving.¹⁹

Internal calls for a clean spiritual house, right doctrine, and just polity were not calls for schism, however. Such efforts characterized more than Methodist history. Indeed, they were the birth right of every Protestant. One historic Protestant formulation affirmed *ecclesia reformata*,

¹⁸ “Croaking and Croakers,” NCA, August 15, 1889, 1. Fitzgerald was more even-handed two months later, distinguishing between the “reformer” and the “revolutionary” or “iconoclast,” in “The Difference,” NCA October 10, 1889, 9.

¹⁹ Briane K. Turley. *Wheel within a Wheel: Southern Methodism and the Georgia Holiness Association*. (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1999), 204.

semper reformanda, or “a reformed church, always reforming.” Vigilance against “drift” is a core Protestant motif, and the jeremiad—named for the biblical ‘weeping prophet’ Jeremiah—a favorite Protestant genre. Decrying “corruption” or declension and calling for “reform” are enduring core Protestant practices, essential riffs in a Protestant’s repertoire. They are also core rhetorical features of the American political tradition, and were abundantly present among various, even competing, political groups in the late nineteenth century. In this sense, the question of what to do with the inevitable charges of corruption and decline and the inevitable calls for reform is, and has been, a vital question for Protestant denominations. Thus, the question of how denominations process their own internal dissent (and how they treat dissenters) has enduring significance for denominations, and also the related themes of American religious mobility and the political shape of religious bodies.²⁰

Long before the Hargrove-Kelley bombshell, MECS clergy were restless, argumentative, and worried. Widely aware of religious and secular trends in both America and Europe, they felt

²⁰ For MECS ecumenism and relationships with other denominations, see the following. For the negative side of MEC-MECS relations, see Bishop Keener’s remarkably hostile and petty response to MEC fraternal delegates, *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*. See NCA, September 26, 1889 p. 9 for mutual praise and salutations between NCA and Presbyterians’ *Central Presbyterian* (Presbyterians: “a granite pillar of our common Christianity”) and less charitable, even aggressive, comments regarding Congregationalists in New England. Several comments regarding how to address issues of this sort including baptism, frequency of communion, and “Campbellite” understanding of communion, NCA October 3, 1889 p. 11. Fitzgerald called the Protestant Episcopal Church “‘our little sister’ Church,” probably a response to the tendency of some Episcopalians to call themselves the “mother Church” of all branches of English Christianity, including Methodism, NCA October 24, 1889 p. 1. For MECS rejection of Protestant Episcopal overtures that evidence a history of animosity between the denominations in America, see 1890 General Conference Journal. Extensive commentary on Presbyterian internal debate regarding changing of the Westminster Confession of Faith, “Our Beloved Presbyterian Brethren,” NCA October 31, 1889 p. 8. For prediction that “strife among evangelical Churches... will cease one of these days,” NCA November 14, 1889 p. 8; Defending Methodists against charges from the *Baptist and Reflector* that their women are for woman suffrage, “A ‘Reflector’ That Does Not Reflect Truly,” NCA November 14, 1889 p. 9. Call to get along: “An irenic spiritually-minded Protestantism would not only hold its ground,” [against Catholicism] “but soon take the world for Christ.” NCA November 28, 1889 p. 8. On the good that comes from denominational competition, NCA November 28, 1889 p. 8. Positive comments about Quakers, NCA April 17, 1886 p.1. For evangelical unity as a sign of the millennium, NCA June 26, 1886 p.8. See also “Fourth of July Sermon,” NCA July 17, 1886 p. 6-7, 14 for “denominational banners still waiving, but lifted high above them all the cross.” A very harsh, even satirical rebuke of the “our little sister” – the Protestant Episcopal Church – for demanding union on its terms, “Christian Unity,” NCA July 23, 1887 p.1.

the church and its faith and practice variously attacked, ignored, and, perhaps most worrisome, secularized, accommodated, and weakened. Their internal dissent, and their criticism of the wider society, often lay in tension with the glues/bonds of denominational loyalty. In Methodist terms, they did not have professional motives to call for the ongoing internal reform, given that any criticism might readily be taken as personal criticism of specific ministers, laity, or bishops. But they dissented anyway, and over a host of issues. They argued over the right way to do this or that, practice this or that art of ministry, the right way to handle political or moral issues in the pulpit and public press, and the correct interpretation of biblical passages and denominational doctrinal standards. They also debated the proper way to approach that most sensitive of topics for Methodist preachers, i.e., the unwanted/unwelcome appointment.²¹

Their debates were often sharp. One week after a testy dispute between Kelley and Georgian A. G. Haygood over the administration of the Church's mission program, and one week before the 1886 General Conference, Fitzgerald warned "The number of preachers who can carry on a newspaper discussion without lapsing into offensive personalities is very small. Deduction: Let all concerned make it for themselves." A week later while in Richmond for General Conference, he suggested that "Satire is a very effective weapon in the hands of those who can use it skillfully, but if you would have the spirit of Christ do not cultivate that

²¹ For example, in advance of the 1890s General Conference, debates ran hot over whether or not new clergy should be granted the right to administer the sacraments before their ordination. Alternatives included barring un-ordained clergy from being assigned appointments or the status quo, wherein young itinerants on trial were appointed to charges without sacramental authority. For an example of Methodists arguing against connectional editor Fitzgerald see, "Worthy of Imitation," by S. P. West of Anniston, Ala. who calls upon other Annual Conferences to follow the Tennessee Conference that memorialized the General Conference "to make the ordination of preachers a condition precedent to any appointment in the pastorate or to allow them, while in charge of circuits or stations, to do all the work of a pastor, though unordained." NCA October 31, 1889 p.2. Other responses to Fitzgerald, NCA November 7, 1889 p. 15 and November 14, 1889 p.2. Support for Fitzgerald, "Should Preachers 'On Trial' Be Ordained?," by "L.M.W." NCA November 14, 1889 p. 3. A response to Kelley, NCA December 26, 1889 p. 2. A layman's appeal for ordaining young preachers, "Hopes and Prays for a Change," by A Layman, NCA December 26, 1889 p. 2. Also, "The Preacher 'On Trial,'" by Havilen T. Strout, NCA December 26, 1889 p. 13.

dangerous gift.”²²

Among these disputing late nineteenth century Methodists, historian Christopher Owen delineates two broad groups and five specific types in his Georgia study. Discerning Methodist “modernizers” and “traditionalists,” Owen divides the modernizers into “progressives” (such as Atticus Greene Haygood, and D. C. Kelley of Tennessee) and “neoconservatives” (such as Warren Akin Candler). His traditionalists fell into three types: “Old Methodists” (Rebecca Latimer Felton), “holiness advocates,” and “professional evangelists,” the latter two represented by Georgians A. J. Jarrell and Sam P. Jones, respectively.

Owen’s progressive modernizers were “smaller, but broke more completely with the Methodist past,” while embracing “science, industrial growth,” and limited efforts in social reform. They subjected “traditional Wesleyan theology to searching criticism.” Neoconservatives also favored industrial capitalism, stressed foreign missions, and “a well-paid, educated ministry.” They opposed “radical reform,” but were more conservative on theological questions than progressives were. Among the traditionalists, Owen’s disorganized old Methodists were distrustful of major denominational projects and often resentful of Bourbon elites like Haygood and Candler. Owen notes some ironies, including that Progressives “used the church hierarchy to crush dissent while traditionalists hoped to democratize the church polity.” In addition, “many traditionalists more readily welcomed female participation in church (and politics) than did neoconservatives.” Owen’s modernizers and traditionalists fit well the Court and Country

²² NCA May 8, 1886 p.1., NCA May 15, 1886 p. 1. The Kelley and Haygood dispute ran for several weeks during the General Conference. “Dr. Kelley’s “Open Letter,”” by Atticus G. Haygood, NCA May 1, 1886 p. 5 where Haygood took a remarkably condescending tone and accused Kelley of arrogantly attempting to control the Missions programs of the Church. “Our Foreign Missions,” was Kelley’s reply to Haygood, NCA May 8, 1886 p. 9 where he chides Haygood for debating about “D. C. Kelley” instead of missions. The low point of the debate appeared in the May 22, 1886 NCA p. 13: Kelley’s “A Card,” and Haygood’s “Response to ‘A Card,’” and “Denial, Not ‘Disclaimer.’”

camps, respectively, with two additional points. First, Owen asserts that “the neoconservative-progressive axis”—the Court—“kept its grip on MECS denominational machinery.” Second, given the numerical dominance of “Post Oak” rural circuits, stations, and membership, it is likely that the majority of lay Methodists fit broadly into the traditionalist old Methodist camp. But clergy in elite pulpits, college posts, editorial “tripods,” and connectional positions were urban and “High Steeple,” and generally more reflective of the modernizing ethos. Moreover, it was from academic and editorial work that bishops were mostly chosen.²³

Methodists of all camps noted events during the quadrennium 1886–1890 related to worldly amusements and political activity. During the Texas prohibition campaign in 1887, newly elected thirty-eight year old Bishop Galloway engaged in a widely-publicized running newspaper debate with fellow Mississippian, ex-Confederate president and Episcopalian Jefferson Davis, aged seventy-nine. Many observers believed that Davis’s outspoken opposition in which he labeled a Methodist bishop “a political parson” who had “left the pulpit and Bible to mount the political rostrum”—southern code language for antebellum abolitionist preachers, and typical anticlerical and Protestant code language for Catholic priests—resulted in the narrow defeat of the prohibition measure in Texas. Davis declared that “the Prohibition party [was] composed of only Yankees, Cranks and Negroes, with a few recreant Confederates.”²⁴

The other event, also in 1887, occurred in Tennessee. Assistant Editor of the NCA, the merely thirty-year old Georgian Warren Akin Candler, a staunch Bourbon, protégé of A. G.

²³ Owen, *Sacred Flame of Love*, 151-152, 165, 169. Sam Jones was both a professional evangelist and an old Methodist. By “radical reform,” one must include the Prohibition Party and the W.C.T.U. Joe Coker notes that “prohibition has long been disparaged as a reactionary and priggish impulse – a ‘pseudo-reform, a pinched, parochial substitute for reform,’ Richard Hofstadter has called it, spread via ‘the rural-evangelical virus.’” Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause*, 236.

²⁴ Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause*, 80-83. William J. Cooper, *Jefferson Davis, American*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000) 695. Owen, *Sacred Flame of Love*, 181.

Haygood, and brother of Coca-Cola magnate Asa Candler, was filling the pulpit as supply pastor of McKendree Church in Nashville due to the election of J. D. Barbee as book agent. On October 9, 1887, just before Annual Conference, Candler preached a sermon against theatre-going that drifted into attacks on the theatre itself, and comparisons of the morality of modern and ancient literature. He also accused congregation members of spending more than \$1000 in support of the theatre. In the audience was noted actress and singer Emma Abbott. At the conclusion of Candler's sermon, before the congregation had been dismissed, Abbott stood, challenged Candler, and defended her profession. No doubt shocked, Candler replied simply that Abbott's comments belonged more in a theatre than in the house of God. After Candler's comment, a meager applause was heard. But the secular press either made a mistake, or more likely lied, saying that the congregation had loudly applauded the actress.²⁵

The exchange provided juicy material for the dailies in Nashville and beyond. Most secular papers supported "Miss Abbott" (who was married and several years older than Candler) noting that "she has notably kept her good name as a woman and an actress free from reproach." The *Nashville Banner* surmised that Abbott's display, while it "evinced more verve and pluck than discretion," may have been emboldened by "finding in that large worshipping congregation the familiar faces of some many of her theatrical patrons." Obviously, said the *Banner*, "either his theory is impractical or the church is woefully remiss in its discipline."²⁶

The event indicated the tensions between the leading edge of America's budding entertainment industry and Methodist tradition. Candler's supporters included Bishop McTyeire, Vanderbilt professor Wilbur Tillett, the lay leadership at McKendree, and a host of Methodist

²⁵ For a brief account from an eyewitness, see William Waller, ed., *Nashville in the 1890s*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970. 16-17. See also NCA, October 22, 1887, pp. 4-6.

²⁶ "The Church and the Theatre," *Nashville Banner*, October 10, 1887, p. 2.

preachers and laity as evidenced from the letters he received in the weeks following the incident. Even Nashville's Central Baptist Church passed a resolution "heartily" endorsing Candler's stand against the theatre, the rights of a pastor to preach against sin to his congregation, and charged that Abbott had violated "the laws of our land." Fitzgerald fully defended his junior colleague, even concluding with his initials so that all would know he had written this defense himself.²⁷

The controversy appeared to be dying down until D. C. Kelley published an unsigned statement in support of Abbott. The Abbott-Candler affair quickly found new life as the Candler-Kelley affair. Here too, the youthful Candler received much fan mail from Methodists, many of whom questioned what the fifty-four year old Kelley was thinking. A few wondered how Kelley, as missionary treasurer for the MECS, could possibly continue in his high position in denominational leadership after having backed an actress (in the Methodist worldview, a *professional sinner*) in a spat with a fellow Methodist preacher enforcing Methodist discipline. Bishop McTyeire's fury was so great it inspired the following doggerel: "'Candler in the pulpit,/Emma in the aisle,/Kelley get your hair cut/McTyeire style.'"²⁸

As the tide of opinion rushed against him, Kelley defended his actions in the *Nashville Banner*. The NCA had been closed to him by Fitzgerald, while the new assistant editor appointed before the incident, W. A. Candler, used his page to bludgeon Kelley. Surprised that the secular press would turn so sharply on Candler, Kelley said "no one regrets so much as the writer that

²⁷ "Mr. Candler Endorsed," *Nashville Banner*, October 20, 1887. "The Theatre Invading the Church," NCA, October 22, 1887, p. 1. The October 22 and several issues following included heavy commentary and reports – most from Candler himself who kept up defense of his name for months after the event. See also text of sermon and various eyewitness accounts in the October 22 issue, pp. 4-6. One wonders if traditional Methodists (and other evangelicals) in 1865 noticed or commented on the fact that President Lincoln was shot while attending the theatre.

²⁸ Smith, *Cross and Flame*, 248-249. For Candler correspondence, see Warren A. Candler Papers, Emory University, especially October to December 1887. For the Candler-Kelley exchange, see *Nashville Banner*, October 19, 1887 p. 3, October 24, 1887, p. 4, and October 27, 1887 p. 3, and Farish, *Circuit Rider Dismounts*, 348-352.

the criticism would have been made, as it afterward appeared, on a brother in trouble.” He announced, “I have never knowingly struck a weak man.” But Kelley’s defense focused more on the McKendree members and Abbott. Kelley had imagined Candler flush from victory in putting down Abbott and besmirching the reputation of the congregation, riding high and strutting. Congregation members had been accused of “perjury at the altars of the church,” said Kelley, “many of whom I have loved for a score of years.” He worried that “many of the tenderest and best will make no reply, but they will bear the wound no less deeply.”²⁹

Kelley announced, “I accuse Brother Candler of nothing worse than enthusiasm and thoughtlessness.” Noting that “human order is often divine disorder,” Kelley defended Abbott as a “gentleman” because she was a woman who had declared herself to be speaking the truth as she knew it, and had waited until the preacher had finished his sermon. Kelley said “custom is nothing in God’s house when it obstructs truth, less than nothing when it protects uncharitable error.” Kelley corrected Candler’s declaration that modern narratives were more immoral than ancient Greek ones, with comments that Candler understandably took to be a slight on his education at Emory College under Haygood. Kelley held the “moral of this whole episode is that when a man stands in a pulpit which ranks with the foremost in the land, with a reporter in his front, he had best polish off the points of his rhetoric which project beyond the straight edge of truth.” Kelley concluded, “it is a mistake to abuse the audience. Sam Jones may be an

²⁹ *Nashville Banner*, October 24, 1887, p. 4. My view is contra Smith, who argues that “the main sentiment was against Candler,” and that Kelley spoke “for the majority.” It is likely that Smith conflates opposition to worldliness with being a “holiness” preacher, thereby reading later anti-holiness polemics back into an 1880s spat that had nothing to do with sanctification debates. *Cross and Flame*, 249. It might also be noted that Candler received a strong showing of votes for Bishop in 1890; Kelley, despite *vastly* superior qualifications in 1890 compared to Candler, received none. Kelley had privately counseled Candler previously about his aggressive tone in the pulpit. Kelley’s claim that he had imagined a strutting rather than humbled Candler seems quite plausible. Despite Kelley’s talent for saying things that surprised and annoyed his coreligionists, his own Conference repeatedly elected him to represent them at General Conference, a sign both of their esteem and the value they placed on free speech.

exception.”³⁰ Candler used his editorial page to criticize Kelley and the secular press. He also attacked Kelley’s allies in the women’s movement, including the declaration of his “matured” conviction that the W.C.T.U. should stop its agitations for woman suffrage and ordination.³¹

Despite being a wealthy, urban, Bourbon neoconservative hardliner, the net result was to make the thirty-year old Candler the young hero of the Old Methodist wing, and reinforce Kelley’s reputation as a loose-tongued radical. Candler became a reliably loud and decisive critic of any violators of ministerial and episcopal prerogative. He moved on in 1888 to the presidency of Emory College. The popular support Candler received from Methodists who thought the church had drifted from its moral and spiritual moorings no doubt helped him be elected bishop in 1898 at the age of 41. In the fall of 1888, Kelley was appointed pastor of Gallatin Station, a prominent appointment, but one that removed him from connectional office and the Nashville newspapers. No doubt bishops noticed that Kelley’s criticisms of Candler had at least the hint that a man of such youth—especially one from off the Conference who could not possibly have understood what McKendree symbolized to the Tennessee Conference—should never have been appointed even briefly to the most prominent and sensitive pulpit in the connectional city. One week after the incident between Candler and Abbott, during 1887 Annual Conference, Bishop A. W. Wilson appointed B. F. Haynes pastor of McKendree, likely an attempt to select a pastor who would be more mature than Candler, and more conservative than Kelley.

Neither McKendree nor Kelley were through with controversial topics. Haynes, who sided with Candler on the theatre, continued sharp sermons addressing the dangerous influence

³⁰ *Nashville Banner*, October 27, 1887, p. 3.

³¹ “A Mother or a Minister, Which?” NCA, January 21, 1888, p. 8. “The National Convention of the W.C.T.U.,” November 26, 1887, p. 8. NCA Jan 28, 1888 p. 8 announced that the secular press had a “favorite divine” and noted that “this is one more blunder of our Connectional officer” and that the press was “in large measure, responsible for it.” NCA had declined to publish Kelley’s recent letter “it will do you harm and do the Church no good.”

of wealth while pastor at McKendree, including the “Achanism in the Church” sermon from 1889, as has been seen previously, which included criticism of wealth and its influence on the bishops. While no millionaire stood in open meeting to challenge him, complaints from a few wealthy members resulted in being reassigned as presiding elder in 1889.

That same fall, Kelley published a four-part series critical of episcopal overreaching in the *Advocate* entitled “Episcopacy and Itinerancy.” Kelley’s low-church country dissent pulled no punches. He noted the growing complexity of the issues to be considered in making appointments, then charged that bishops were increasingly seeking less advice and consultation with their presiding elders. He charged that the MECS had overreacted to the modest episcopacy imagined by the MEC in 1844. The MECS “has, in spite of good men in the office, tended to a high prerogative episcopacy.” The election of “born-to-rule” types like Bishop Soule, “life-time tenure of office,” and the “universal desire in our race to accomplish that which must be done in the easiest possible way” contributed to this “exalted” runaway power. Kelley compared the MECS unfavorably to the more democratic style in British and Canadian Methodism, and the lower prerogatives in the MEC. He protested that “no other laymen or preachers in Methodism are so silent as ours. No other cabinets are required to keep what little they know so secret. No other presiding elders know so little of what is to be announced. Do we really need that there shall be more silence, more secrecy? Or do we need more openness to light, more freedom of discussion?” If the General Conference would not *require* that all bishops “hear advice” then Kelley thought they should “tack ship” and follow the course of either British or “Northern Methodism.” Kelley complained of the episcopal habit of declaring before the reading of appointments things like “I believe that the pen has been under the guidance of the Holy Spirit in writing these appointments, and you, brethren, should so believe and so act.” But unheard

presiding elders also had “the same access” to the Holy Spirit. Kelley charged that “if any man in the episcopal college believes that his office has secured to him this added endowment which makes him less fallible than his brethren, it is time that he should no longer be a bishop.” Kelley thought it was “time to rout this heresy out of the Church.”³²

The May 1890 General Conference was held in St. Louis, Missouri. The Tennessee Conference clergy delegates elected in October 1889 were, in order of election/vote totals, D. C. Kelley, T. A. Kerley, R. K. Brown, J. M. Wright, B. F. Haynes, and T. J. Duncan; with R. A. Young and H. B. Reams as alternates. Kelley was selected for the Committee on Episcopacy; Haynes was chosen secretary of the Publishing Interests Committee. Haynes also received votes

³² “Itinerancy and Episcopacy,” by D. C. Kelley, NCA August 22, 1889, p. 5, “Itinerancy and Episcopacy: Second Paper” by D.C. Kelley, NCA August 29, 1889, p. 14, “Episcopacy and Itinerancy: No. III.” By D C. Kelley, NCA October 31, 1889 p. 4, and “Episcopacy and Itinerancy No. IV,” by D. C. Kelley, NCA November 14, 1889 p. 5. In earlier years, Kelley’s views of more open episcopacy were shared by McTyeire and Haygood. Acquisition of episcopal power seems to have swung the latter two back toward the norm, and both McTyeire 1866–1889, and Haygood, 1890–1896, were heavy-handed bishops. Mann, *Haygood*, 151-153. Two weeks after Kelley’s lengthy dissent, Fitzgerald declared “the quadrennial agitation stirs our denominational waters, but need not make them muddy. Let discussion be friendly, as well as free. We all be brethren.” But a separate item on the same page declared “some of our hobby-riders are pulling their little hobby-horses out... where they have lain for four years, mounting them, and making a mighty racket; but that kind of a horse gives the rider exercise – and that is all.” NCA, November 28, 1889 p.1. The next week Fitzgerald offered “a few words on the situation as it appears to us as a watchman on Zion’s walls.” He stated “we are assured that Southern Methodism will maintain its character as a conservative Christian body...” and it “is healthy and growing.” As for the work of the Conference and the first time delegates elected, he went on to say “an infusion of new blood is a good thing. There is such a thing as ultra-conservatism, as well as reckless radicalism. If there should be an element of the one kind in the body, it might be balanced by the other, and thus be secured the equipoise of a progressive conservatism.” Regarding agreement, “discontent there is here and there, and always will be. In the movement of a system so vast and so powerful, friction is inevitable. Men are fallible. Administrative blunders will occasion grievances. Even the wisest action must at times fall hard on some persons. Men sometimes get misadjusted themselves, and therefore conclude that everything is wrong in the Church. There is no system of ecclesiastical government administered by human agents that can escape the consequences of human infirmity. But a wise surgeon would not amputate a limb because of a splinter in the finger, nor would a farmer tear down his barn in order to destroy a rat’s nest. There is a way to extract splinters, and the conservative but energetic common sense of the Church is rough enough on all sorts of ecclesiastical rodents.” He concluded, “this is our diagnosis. It is cheerful and hopeful as it ought to be. Let us not create trouble by predicting and dreading it. Let us trust in the Lord, and go on with his work. And may the peace of God, that passeth all understanding, keep our minds and hearts through Christ Jesus.” “Church Diagnostics,” NCA December 5, 1889 p.1. On the same page: “The Church needs more power rather than more machinery. It is the malign paradox of ecclesiastical history that as power declines machinery increases. The signs of our own times in this regard are not altogether auspicious.” The Methodist church was so influential, its bishops played roles not unlike celebrities. For example, the *Pulaski Citizen* carried a paragraph long endorsement by Bishop D. S. Doggett for a “Simmon’s Liver Medicine” that assured the readers it was no “quack” cure. Doggett had been dead for five years. *Pulaski Citizen*, February 12, 1885.

during the elections both for editor and assistant editor of the *NCA*, positions that went to Holston Conference elder E. E. Hoss, and St. Louis Conference elder and Haynes's mentor, Edward McKendree Bounds, respectively.³³ Kerley, Haynes, and Kelley moved that lay delegates be eligible for service on all General Conference committees. Substitutions that would have exempted laity from the Committee on Appeals (appeals coming from cases of discipline of clergy) failed, and the Tennesseans' un-amended motion passed.³⁴

The Tennessee clergy delegation, conspicuously minus delegation leader Kelley, signed a resolution that lamented weakened discipline, and called for a strengthening of the MECS stand against worldly amusements. Kelley, on point of personal privilege, and responding to an article in the St. Louis *Christian Advocate*, expressed his agreement with the church on theatre going and Sabbath observation.³⁵ South Georgia Conference delegates resolved that the Tennesseans' resolution be printed in an appendix to the *Discipline*.³⁶ The Tennesseans' lament proved sufficiently moving that a Special Committee on the Spiritual State of the Church was established with scholarly future bishop John James Tigert as chair.

Haynes and two lay delegates from Tennessee, S. V. Wall, and Edward H. East,

³³ *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 200. Young, Kelley, Brown, and Duncan had been delegates in 1886 along with J. B. McFerrin and J. W. Hill. Carter, *History*, 228.

³⁴ *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 52, 62.

³⁵ *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 51, 94. "Tennessee Annual Conference," at Murfreesboro with Bishop Keener presiding, *NCA* October 17, 1889 p. 8. The delegates elected in 1885 were J. B. McFerrin, R. A. Young, D. C. Kelley, R. K. Brown, J. W. Hill, and T. J. Duncan, with J. B. West, J. A. Orman, and J. D. Barbee as alternates. "Tennessee Conference," *NCA* October 17, 1885 p.8. List of all delegates to General Conference of 1886, *NCA* April 3, 1886 p. 4. R. A. Young travelling in Germany, "Wittenberg – Berlin," *NCA* March 19, 1887 p. 4. Young's travel account includes very positive commentary about the state of Christianity in Germany and the traditional Protestant tripartite division of history: "Christianity, as a dispensation of religion, originated in Jerusalem. It was deeply corrupted in Rome. Its restoration to primitive purity was begun at Wittenberg. The world's debt to Luther is enormous." Young thought that the world's five "great names" were "Moses, Aristotle, Julius Caesar, Paul, Luther."

³⁶ *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 84.

introduced a prohibition resolution that declared that “while we do not believe that it is within the province of the Church to dictate the political affiliations of its members, this Conference does express the opinion that our members should not permit themselves to be controlled by any organizations that are managed in the interest of the liquor traffic.” The Temperance Committee—understanding that the Haynes resolution was an ultimatum to the major parties to dry up or else the spirituality doctrine ‘deal’ was off—recommended that the section quoted above be removed from the resolution, rendering it largely redundant with previous resolutions in support of prohibition, even short of the 1886 General Conference measure that made “the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages punishable as an immorality,” not an imprudence, as before.³⁷

Tigert’s Special Committee on the Spiritual State of the Church declared itself “sorrowfully constrained,” and quoted the episcopal address of 1874 that had declared “our piety, our self-sacrifice, our Christian enterprise, have not been equal to our growth, much less to our standards and to our time-honored ecclesiastical landmarks.” The 1874 bishops declared that “an inordinate love of the world, in the forms of wealth, of fashion, and of amusement, has largely diffused itself amongst our people and corrupted their spiritual integrity.” Spiritual practices had been “frequently neglected or abandoned,” such that they admitted that “actual departures from the ‘old paths’” had occurred. The 1882 General Conference had ordered the bishops’ 1874 address reprinted. The 1890 special committee declared it to be “in large measure true of the Church now as then.” Tigert’s committee approved the bishops’ 1874 declaration that “purity and power...must be maintained at all hazards so that neither heresy nor corruptness in life be tolerated for a moment lest they increase into more ungodliness.” Yet, the 1874 bishops

³⁷ White, *Messages of the Governors*, 357. *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 73, 212. Farish, *Circuit Rider Dismounts*, 314.

had said, “there is a growing tendency, we fear, in this direction.” The special committee declared for itself sixteen years later that “faithfulness at this juncture... will secure proximate universality of the old-time simplicity and purity and, with these, of the old-time power.”³⁸

The episcopal address of 1890, read by Bishop A. W. Wilson stated “we trust that the power of the Church may remain to the end of time unimpaired by the intrusion of heresies destructive to the simplicity and purity of its faith.” They held that the “spiritual life of the Church” had “suffered no decline in the last four years,” rejoiced at “faithful preaching” and “extensive revivals,” and noted “very many of our members have made increase in faith and holiness.” “Our people,” the bishops declared, “are true to the principles of vital godliness” and “of experimental religion.” The bishops averred that the “functions of the pulpit and pastorate” were “largely usurped by the secular press and platform” that spreads “doctrines... subversive of the authority of the word of God and of the foundations of spiritual life.” They noted the attempt to “substitute the amenities, culture, and entertainments of educated society for the graces, virtues, and fellowship of the Church of God,” while they rejoiced that Methodists resisted this, knowing that the church was “incapable of subjection or of conformity to this world.”³⁹

Yet the bishops admitted it was “well known [that] the individual exceptions to this statement are many.” Pulpit instruction, “the impressive and emphatic vows of the baptismal covenant,” and the vows of membership were “insufficient to restrain these from indulgences in dispositions and practices quite incompatible with Christian holiness and the purposes of the Christian Church.” Such members, the bishops said, “would have the Church enter the arena of this world, and compete with it upon its own ground and according to its own methods; and

³⁸ *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 160, 162.

³⁹ *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 27-28.

failing this, they refuse submission to the order and discipline of the Church, bring confusion into our ranks, and by example and evil counsel pervert unwary and inexperienced souls.” The reasons for this rebellion included “ignorance,” and “weakness and instability,” but most involved “the arrogant claim, set up by wealth, culture, and station, to exemption from the hard requirements of self-denial and unworldliness imposed by the gospel.” The bishops recommended “uniform, impartial, judicious, and firm administration of discipline.” They lamented the decline of the class meeting, “whose province and power have been taken up by no other agency,” but declared “it cannot again be made compulsory; and its voluntary observance seems to require a larger measure of spiritual life than is common with us.”⁴⁰

Turning to political matters, the bishops recalled the principle “in the world, though not of it,” and declared that “very many questions of social order are, on one side, principles of godliness, and the assertion and enforcement of them within the limits of its own life and action are the Church’s witness to the truth before the world.” “It is within the province of the Church,” said the bishops, “to exact that in the discharge of their functions as citizens, in the conduct of business, in the regulation of the family, and in the observance of social requirements” that members “shall conform to and illustrate the law of life given in and by the Son of Man.” Yet,

⁴⁰ *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 28. A. G. Haygood also called for more use of discipline against “the big ‘colonel’ or ‘major’ or ‘judge’ or banker or merchant prince or other man of money,” for these “law breakers” should “reform,” “withdraw,” or “be expelled,” since “this fear of losing money by losing the disobedient rich is a delusion and a snare,” Atticus Greene Haygood, *High Steeple and...Its Official Staff*, reprinted from “Quarterly Review,” 1893, 72-73, 75. For discussion of the class system, see NCA October 6, 1888, p. 1 and October 13, 1888, p. 8 [“Class-meetings, do you say, brother? That sounds like Methodism. –Ed”]. NCA, October 6, 1888 p.1. and “Church Conference” October 13, 1888 p.8. Also, October 20, 1888 p.1. NCA November 10, 1888 p. 1 “Co-Operative Labor” calls for large urban churches to revive the class-leader who “was never more needed than now.” Also, NCA February 23, 1889, p.1.; On the importance of revivals and a rebuke to those who think otherwise tied to support for class meetings, NCA March 9, 1889 p.1. Call for “Revivals” year round – “a continuous quickening from the dead,” by R. K. Brown, NCA February 15, 1890 p. 3. Support for class-meetings, “A Crisis with Methodism,” by Thales B. Reams, NCA September 5, 1889, p.3 and NCA May 8, 1886 p. 8. For Fitzgerald calling for revival, “The Great Need of the Times: A General Revival of Genuine Religion,” NCA February 22, 1890 p. 1. Class leaders called “drill sergeants” for the training of new Christians, NCA June 4, 1887 p. 1. Further support for class leaders and the pastoral and evangelistic use of old Wesleyan hymns urged, NCA July 30, 1887 p. 8. Class meetings had been weakened by the progressive purge in 1866, led primarily by McTyeire.

they stated “we cannot hope by impertinent and unwarranted interference in the affairs of government and society to change the currents of human life.” Rather, “by unequivocal testimony to the truth, and its constant and uniform” administration of discipline “within the sphere of the Church’s rightful authority,” the bishops said, “we may exert a healthful and saving influence upon the world.” The bishops concluded that “the careful observance of the scope and limit of the Church’s action, combined with bold, uncompromising enunciation of every ethical and spiritual principle of the gospel, will save us from embarrassment and entanglement in worldly schemes, and insure the greatest efficiency to our measures for saving men.”⁴¹

The bishops’ May 1890 instructions to mark more sharply the disciplinary line on wealthy laity suited the opinions of most Tennessee Conference clergy. But perhaps they had not been clear enough for the Tennesseans about the line between forbidden political entanglements and appropriately urgent moral reform. Many, including Kelley, understood that moral reform—*even if also political*—was allowed, even imperative. Perhaps, too, they intended to demonstrate that line by disciplining Kelley that October. But the animus of Hargrove’s actions that were widely reported in secular papers embittered and outraged the Tennesseans and sent shock waves throughout the church. Hargrove’s partisan motives are clear enough. So too is the fact that he felt prohibition agitation to be an unacceptable political act.

But there were other hints of a more personal nature behind episcopal spleen against clergy reputations that fall. Kelley had been a noted critic of episcopal overreaching, and Tennessee a center of democratizing sentiment even before Hargrove’s crackdown. Add to Tennesseans’ opining their highly visible pride, Hargrove’s so-so status among Tennesseans, Kelley’s popularity, and center/periphery piques felt by conferences beyond Nashville, and a

⁴¹ *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 29. The address gave more attention to Methodist missionary activity outside the US than to any other topic.

recipe for resentment existed.⁴²

In the summer and early fall of 1890, Landon C. Garland, longtime Vanderbilt chancellor, argued with claims Kelley made about his role in founding Vanderbilt. A debate ensued, with Garland asserting McTyeire's primacy against Kelley's claims. Elected in 1866, McTyeire had died in February 1889 as the senior bishop by election, and had been Hargrove's close confidant and patron going back to earlier days in Alabama. McTyeire had appointed Hargrove to McKendree. Garland had been McTyeire's professor and college president at Randolph-Macon College, and Hargrove's boss as president at the University of Alabama. Hargrove succeeded McTyeire as president of the Vanderbilt board. Garland's motivation was likely opposition to Kelley's candidacy, as few southern Methodists would have had any trouble recounting McTyeire's many accomplishments in 1890, and most Tennesseans would have long since formed their opinions about facts nearly twenty years distant. But it is possible that Hargrove was behind Garland's disputations with Kelley during the campaign.⁴³

But when the sickly eighty year old Garland came out in defense of Hargrove in the NCA in November 1890, it embarrassed the Tennessee Conference. Chosen by Hargrove for the task,

⁴² On a more personal note, in 1819, the Tennessee Conference had rejected the application of Hargrove's grandfather, Dudley Hargrove of Pickens County, Alabama, a cousin of McKendree, to ordination as a deacon because he was a slaveholder. Dudley died in 1823 when heavy timber "being used in the erection of a gin-house on his farm," fell on him. This might seem too distant or minor, but it was recounted with some oomph in a history of Alabama written in 1893 by Anson West who likely served in Alabama with Hargrove. Anson West, *History of Alabama Methodism*, 1893, 158.

⁴³ "Dr. Garland's Rejoinder to Dr. Kelley," NCA June 28, 1890 p. 9. McTyeire had been heavily eulogized after his death in 1889 and served as bishop for 23 years. Obituary for Bishop H. N. McTyeire NCA February 23, 1889, p.8 (full page) "his will was tenacious"; NCA, February 23, 1889 p.8. "Bishop H. N. McTyeire." More on p.9 of the same issue, including funeral services reported and many updates concerning specific bishops. Honors to him from *New York Christian Advocate*, March 14, 1889, p.2. "I die poor" – long pieces about McTyeire's correct use of money and episcopacy as model of poverty, NCA March 2, 1889 p.1. NCA March 2, 1889 p.1. "Last Will and Testament of Bishop McTyeire" and "Resolutions of the Faculty of the University of Tennessee" in honor of McTyeire and "our sister institution" (Vanderbilt University) printed NCA March 2, 1889 p.17. Given the events of October 1890, Hargrove's assertions of episcopal power were ironic. McTyeire had dissented from G. F. Pierce's episcopal power while editor of the *Advocate* and was the leader of the 1866 progressive revolt that sought to limit bossism. But McTyeire's episcopal style resulted more in liberalizing disciplinary rules and furthering "culture," education, and lay power than it did in restricting heavy-handedness.

Garland—who had not been present at conference—was a great figure, but despite his extensive knowledge of Methodist law, he was a layman entering a debate that dealt with how the bishops treated clergy. His elegant, scholarly, and condescending article began by mocking the use of “personal invective” as “the invariable mark of a weak cause, and of a bad temper,” before declaring Kelley a destructive idiot and accusing Haynes of lying and conspiracy. Garland even threw in a critique of Hargrove for being too *lenient*. But in condemning what seemed to upset him most – as, obviously, the aging academic could not possibly have cared about who preached at Gallatin for the last seven weeks – Garland basically quoted the “wet” Democratic opposition. He decried the “deplorable results” of “having left the fountains of living water to dabble in the pools of party politics.” Garland declared, “There is no telling the amount of injury done” in “the public respect for ministerial character.” One wonders if Garland—or editor Hoss—thought about the propriety, or the effect on “respect for ministerial character,” of broadcasting additional insults on Kelley, who had already been tried and punished, to say nothing of advancing unambiguous charges of immorality against Haynes, whose character had not even been arrested. Another non-Middle Tennessean in connectional power among them had attacked the personal character of Tennessee Conference clergy. The timing proved tragic. Garland’s article appeared in the November 15, 1890 issue. D. C. Kelley’s wife, Mary, had died suddenly a day earlier on November 14. Between his trial and conviction, Garland’s reckless article, and his wife’s death, Kelley came to be viewed as a martyr and hero of his convictions.⁴⁴

If Garland intended to protect Hargrove from any further criticism of his ministerial character, he failed miserably. Both as fearless and zealous about their reputations as Garland was sophisticated and condescending, Kelley and Haynes fired back with vigor. Haynes wrote an

⁴⁴ Landon C. Garland, “Dr. D. C. Kelley’s Trial,” NCA, November 15, 1890, 3. On Kelley’s reputation within the conference, see *Journal of the Tennessee Conference* (MECS), 1909, pp. 61-63.

extensive defense against Garland’s “unkind charge” entitled “The Tennessee Conference vs. Bishop R. K. Hargrove” that laid out in embarrassing detail the reasons why he had not mentioned Kelley’s absence, reasons that included the bishop’s state of mind and preconference attempts to get Haynes to cooperate. Convinced that Hargrove would construe anything Haynes said into an arrest of Kelley’s character, Haynes had said nothing. Haynes revealed that Hargrove had charged Haynes with “duplicity—a charge repeatedly made in private, to individuals.” Haynes noted that Bishops Fitzgerald, Haygood, and Galloway had each been guilty of the same offense as Kelley. Haynes corrected Garland’s feigned worries about evil “dabbling,” noting first that, under the charge against him, Kelley’s offense would have been just as great if he had been on vacation or conducting personal business, and second that local preachers held “places of public trust all over the country.” It was Garland’s personal invective that first put Haynes in the dock, thus it was Garland’s fault that Haynes told the truth in the *Advocate*, a statement that Kelley reprinted in full in his book *Bishop or Conference?*, and that Haynes years later reprinted in full in his autobiography. But Haynes ended with charges of his own. Haynes asked “were not the appointments drenched and soaked by the prejudices and partisanship of this case? If conspiracy means to ‘breath together’ then if the Bishop and a few men did not breathe together... then there has never been... a case of conspiracy.” Declaring it a “made-up case, a made-up jury, and a made-up verdict,” Haynes declared that if the Conference’s “rights” had not been “wantonly infringed.” If its “dignities and privileges were not outraged, then they have neither rights nor privileges, nor duties,” said Haynes. Hargrove, not the Conference, had arrested Kelley’s character, tried him, and suspended him.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 96-131. B. F. Haynes, “The Tennessee Conference vs. Bishop R. K. Hargrove,” *NCA*, November 22, 1890, 14-16. Haygood and Fitzgerald, just newly elected bishops in May 1890, were both guilty of abandoning itinerancy for politics. Haygood had worked for years for the Slater Fund – not a ministry of the MECS

Kelley's response that appeared in the Nashville *Banner*—Hoss denied him the ability to answer conspiracy charges made in the *Advocate* within the pages of the *Advocate*—was more a counterattack than a defense. Kelley addressed himself to “the presence and influence” of another “hand,” that had “taken advantage” of Garland's name to attack Kelley and Haynes. He noted that Garland's praise for Kelley's character seemed odd given the accusations of conspiracy. Kelley outed his “life-long friend” R. K. Brown who had told Kelley “you can count on me as standing by you” before he voted with the twenty-five. Kelley snarled that “no regulated mind” could see more religion in Haygood's distribution of money for black colleges or Fitzgerald's Public School work than in his own prohibition work, adding that General Conferences had never indorsed the former two. Kelley queried, “How could a sane man dream of a trial?” Garland had proved that Hargrove had “been in secret conference” pre-conference, and went further than Haynes in hinting that a minority of the Tennessee Conference had engaged in conspiracy in violation of “the sacred inclosure of our brotherhood.” Then Kelley declared that it had not been “the grand old Chancellor” Garland “who charged both my presiding elder and myself” with lying and conspiracy; “another hand [was] using him in this matter.” Kelley responded to the charge he was “intellectually weak” and of “mental aberrations,” saying it was at least a “great pleasure to know that none of the whiskey men quote me as being a friend to their traffic, as they do the two most eminent of my prosecutors.” Kelley said “this is the third time,” that “the hand behind this article has appeared in the same hidden way in print;” then he warned that the “116 accused of being ‘faithless’ to the Church, declared

– and should have been forcibly located or tried for betrayal for that supposed transgression of Methodist law he would now enforce. Fitzgerald had been the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state of California from 1869-1871 on the Democratic ticket. Note that these men did not briefly seek symbolic significance as Kelley did, running for an office he knew he could not win; they actually took outside jobs, neither particularly appropriate for clergy.

to be in revolt, may not be silent if further accused.” Kelly closed with a salute to “the heroism of the 116, with wives and children, bread and clothing, dependent on the word of a single man, he angry, dominating, and gifted with unbridled [appointment] authority,” and “assuming the same authority over [character].” Kelley had “seen soldiers charge batteries and breastworks” and “wept as I looked on their deeds of self-forgetful daring,” yet “my feelings were too deep for tears when I heard, one by one, the ‘ayes’ as the roll was called in Conference, and these men laid, one by one, their families and their honor on the altar of duty.” The one-hundred and sixteen were heroes; the twenty-five, and conspirators among them, were something else.⁴⁶

Hoss went against his stated policy and his personal assurance to Kelley by writing his own lengthy commentary about the trial. Hoss’s observation began “believing as we do in the most unrestricted freedom of speech”—despite the fact that multiple persons would accuse him of keeping material out, including his own Assistant Editor, E.M. Bounds, who declared Hoss’s comments “so indefensible” he felt he had to distance himself from them in print. Hoss alternately accused Kelley of a cover up for not revealing the rest of Keener’s private correspondence, quoted Kelley in secular papers saying things that Kelley had already denied saying, opined about the law, and declared that both Haynes and the bishop had made mistakes. According to Hoss, Kelley was absolutely guilty, but Hoss regretted the “severe” penalty, declaring he preferred merely “a vote of censure”—a likely result if the Conference had been left to its own course. Within weeks of his interjection, three separate items appeared. The next week saw an extended account of the funeral services for Mrs. Mary Campbell Kelley. Haynes’s lengthy remarks were printed, including his quote of Mary Kelley on her deathbed to her husband ““the hardest thing I have to do is to forgive your enemies, who have been so unjust.””

⁴⁶ *Bishop or Conference?*, 43-49.

Emotionally shattered, Haynes used his committal of Mary Kelley to express powerfully the indescribable thoughts and feelings of the moment. He promised Mary that she would have justice: “Rest thou, and wait!” That week and the next, corrections appeared. Hoss’s comments had included multiple errors, some seriously misleading. Hoss had taken his unnecessary shot at the widow Kelley, and left town in such haste that he neither reviewed Haynes’s article, nor took sufficient pains with his own. Hoss had to get to the South Carolina Conference, from which he wrote of pretty skies, pretty towns, his ‘amusing’ interaction with a “darkey,” and complained of prohibition being undermined by “the purchasable vote.”⁴⁷

Kelley’s response asked of Hoss “why should a man not present attempt to discuss the facts of the case when there were so many men present competent to do that work?” Kelley rebuked Hoss for his “slovenly and unworthy” editorial, lectured ex-professor Hoss on the difference between a hurried resolution never intended for inclusion into the ‘Manual of the Discipline’ and a law—“there is no law outside of your Discipline, my brother”—and noted that the “rebuke of bishops by the General Conference is an old song,” a “blissful illusion” obscuring the fact that no bishop had reported for his ministry or decisions on questions of law to the 1890 General Conference Committee on Episcopacy, as MECS protectiveness of episcopal personage

⁴⁷ “The Trial of Dr. D. C. Kelley,” NCA November 29, 1890, 1-2. E. M. Bounds on Kelley-Hargrove, *Bishop or Conference?*, 88-97, quote about Hoss/NCA, p. 97. “Mrs. Mary Campbell Kelley,” NCA, December 6, 1890, 11. Mistakes, clarifications, and corrections: NCA, December 6, 1890, 1, and “Questions of Privilege,” December 13, 1890, 9. “The Editor in South Carolina,” NCA December 13, 1890, 9. On charges that Hoss and multiple other editors had prevented pro-Kelley commentary, *Bishop or Conference?*, 50, 97 (twice, one from Bounds, the other from W. T. Poynter of Kentucky), 103 from W. T. Bolling. Haynes’s conclusion to his funeral oration to Mary Kelley: “Sleep on, gentle spirit! Thou needest repose from earth’s strange confusions. Thou canst now, well content, await the righting of earth’s wrongs in that realm where troths of friend to friend go unbroke, merit never trails unrecompensed, nor truth suffers at the hands of its natural friends; where confidences cannot be misplaced, or motives misconstrued; where innocence suffers not traduction, nor bends ‘neath imperious power; where no more burdens can reach thee too heavy to be borne. Sleep softly, once tired, wounded, brave, but now relieved, happy spirit! Rest thou – and wait!” “Mrs. Mary Campbell Kelley,” NCA, December 6, 1890, 11. Neither Haynes nor the Kelleys could have felt betrayed by wet editors and Democratic spokesmen who never pledged any “troth,” and whom Haynes in particular would *never* have labeled “natural friends” of “truth.” They mean fellow southern Methodists. Mary Kelley was 54.

even prevented requiring bishops to do just once in four years what preachers had to do annually – “report their work before their characters be passed.” Kelley declared (of himself) “there is one man who has, with outspoken candor, for years sought to conform the power of our Episcopacy to the ideas of free government, such as Christianity has given to every other body, civil and ecclesiastical, in America, the Church of Rome excepted. May it not be that in this trial he was reaping some of the fruits of his efforts in that direction?”⁴⁸

It became increasingly obvious that the Court would speak with one voice against the Tennessee Conference. Court spokesman and Book Agent J. D. Barbee used his opportunity while traveling the Annual Conferences to attack the Tennesseans. In response, W. T. Poynter quipped “the divine right of the episcopacy was not so well understood then as now. Dr. Barbee had not then made the rounds of the Conferences and enlightened the Church on the subject.” Poynter wrote, “an occasion was needed to injure this particular man,” and “it had been decreed that this was the time to crush” Kelley “who had more than once said and done things not to the pleasing of the ‘powers that be.’” Poynter said if the bishop’s actions were sustained on appeal, “we should be compelled to admit that the charges of our enemies as to the tyranny of our system are true, and more than true.” Bounds, his article reprinted from the *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, announced that, in Tennessee, Hargrove’s actions had “dishonored our episcopacy,” and “put the strongest weapons against us in the hands of our enemies, and in this our stronghold has given us a shock from which we will not recover in two generations.” W. T. Bolling, his article reprinted from the *Holston Methodist*, alleged that “the effort made to convict those who dare to protest against assumption of power, and pronounce them disloyal, [was] the same ever

⁴⁸ *Bishop or Conference?*, 50-53 (“Reply to the Editorial Article in the Christian Advocate”). Writing in 1891, Kelley said he did not believe Hoss to be part of the conspiracy against him. This says more about Kelley’s generosity – and perhaps as yet insufficient evidence – than it does about Hoss. The language was not strong and revealed that Kelley had at least considered him suspect.

made to cover up wrong and successfully usurp power.” T. C. Powers, also of the Kentucky Conference, wrote “a short catechism on the trial of traveling preacher,” since so many, including bishops, were confused. Kelley printed the thoughts of three lawyers: John Lellyet of Nashville, also a local preacher, Judge J. D. Thomas of Oak Cliff, Texas who was a member of the last General Conference, and Judge B. J. Tarver, a prominent Lebanon attorney and Democrat, two time delegate to General Conference, and member of the Tennessee Conference session that fall. Lellyet noted that Kelley, Duncan, and Haynes as leaders of the public advocacy of prohibition had been singled out for punishment, and determined that the bishop and prosecution did not actually believe Kelley was guilty of the charge, but that they “thought that to purge the Conference of...prohibition agitation would be doing God’s service... [by removing them from] membership and influence.” Reprinted from the *Texas Christian Advocate*, Judge Thomas’s article, named “Packing the Jury,” said the General Conference rule had not be clear enough, as “it was not apprehended that any man would be silly or obstinate enough to foist a second committee on the Conference at variance with its known moral sense.” Judge Tarver’s thoughts entitled “The Danger Line,” warned that if “so excellent a man as Bishop Hargrove” could do so based on this theory of episcopal power, then any lesser man who, “making known his wish to convict and degrade, and holding [appointment power over] income” could readily achieve “the degradation of any one he chose to degrade.”⁴⁹

None defended Kelley as forcefully as his attorney Jordan Stokes. He repeated Haynes’s allusion to Hargrove’s rant against Kelley during a meeting of the Missions Board, “of which Bishop McTyeire was reported at the time to have said: ‘I never expected to live to see a Bishop

⁴⁹ *Bishop or Conference?*, 97-101, 97, 103, 105-106, 70-72, 80, 84. On page 103, Rev. C. J. Nugent of the Kentucky Conference said “The general impression is that Dr. Kelley was really tried and punished for becoming a candidate for political office. A certain man disgusted many hereabout by candidating for the episcopacy. Which was worse?” Could he have meant Hargrove?

make such an exhibition of uncontrolled passion.” Stokes said of Haynes that though he had been “the attached friend of Bishop Hargrove,” and under his “influence” had poor relations with Kelley, Haynes “as a Christian and just man... felt that his friend was not to be trusted in a case in which he had exhibited so much... passion and vindictiveness.” Stokes claimed he had personal letters to show Hargrove’s “personal antipathy” but had not used them because he did not want to put others “under the ban of episcopal anger.” Stokes said that on the Saturday of Conference—before the stenographer arrived—Hargrove was “aggressive,” “dictatorial,” and “his face [was] so red that many feared apoplexy.” He said that to “return the same bill [of charges] was direct contempt of court.” Stokes charged that the bishop had “held before men” the “best appointments,” and that “three men were made to expect the Nashville District if they satisfied the wishes of the bishop—all three of them were used by him.” Stokes wrote in sufficient detail that those familiar with the persons and appointments would readily know which men he was speaking of, including some who did the bishops’ bidding in order to receive better appointments. Of the five members of the one-hundred and sixteen who had originally supported Kelley that were later placed on the second trial committee—two “near the bottom of the roll” were yes men who just voted with the majority; when they found out “the Bishop was larger than a majority” they acquiesced. Two others owed the bishop a favor, and the last had said out loud he had changed his mind. The man “appointed to represent the bishop” had been mayor of a town while under appointment. Two poorly-performing itinerants voted correctly, and replaced successful presiding elders who had voted incorrectly (the latter certainly Duncan and Haynes). One promising young preacher sitting up front had applauded a point of Kelley’s; his appointment was changed to a difficult assignment. Stokes said Hargrove was “a Bishop whose sympathy with preachers is only for those he can use, whom he declares not fit for places of

trust, if they differ with him on prohibition; a bishop who has been a constant self-seeker, serving the Church only when it lies along the line of his own interest; a Bishop whose idol is money.”⁵⁰

The Kelley case made headlines in Nashville and throughout the South. The *New York Times* even ran the story. Secular papers lined up against Hargrove. Most Methodist papers, however, came after Kelley, Haynes, and the Tennessee Conference, including some that had formerly published gushing praise.⁵¹ The 1890 event was not soon forgotten. Hargrove died in August 1905. In January 1906, Kelley was elected to lead the Tennessee Anti-Saloon League and travelled the state organizing local chapters. Carter reports that “Bishop Galloway was in sympathy with his additional work and his character was not arrested at the following session of Conference” in October 1906.⁵²

So angry were Tennesseans, that when Kelley died in 1909, the eulogist announced regret “that a technicality of service should have been turned into a bludgeon with which to smite a man who had done an enduring work for righteousness.” Conference historian Carter, seventy years after that October 1890 meeting in Pulaski, would briefly write of Hargrove that though he served twenty-three years as a bishop (in Nashville the entire time), “he only had charge of the

⁵⁰ *Bishop or Conference?* 55-60. Years later, Kelley defender and historian R. N. Price of the Holston Conference said of Hargrove’s time as president of Tennessee Female College 1869–1873: “I have learned that he cleared twenty-eight thousand dollars while in charge of that school, and that, feeling that he had money enough, returned to the pastorate.” The daughters of many Tennessee Conference clergy attended that school. R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism, Vol. V.* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1914), 398.

⁵¹ The editors (either editor F. L. Reid, or assistant editor Hillary T. Hudson, the latter the author of the classic primer of MECS identity, *The Methodist Armor*, that stayed in print with revisions for c. thirty years after it first appeared in 1882) of the *Raleigh Christian Advocate* attacked Haynes for his NCA article “Tennessee Conference v Bishop Hargrove” that was “full of spleen” and “very offensively personal.” They seemed inattentive to the fact that the NCA had published fresh charges of conspiracy and lying against Haynes, Dec 10, 1890 p 2. The same editor had a year before published the following about Haynes: “It has been my privilege to know this man of God personally, and to see his zeal in carrying the Gospel to the very poor. His report at the recent Conference was the best McKendree Church has ever presented. He is succeeded in the first pulpit in Southern Methodism...” “Nashville Preachers,” *Raleigh Christian Advocate*, November 27, 1889 p. 1.

⁵² Carter, *History*, 321.

Tennessee Conference one year,” adding that “his encounter with Dr. D. C. Kelley was the bitterest episode in the history of the Old Jerusalem Conference.”⁵³ A sharp narrowing of allowable dissent, and a narrowing of the wide MECS tent had begun.

Reflecting on “Episcopacy, Southern Style,” James Kirby notes that some historians, including Bishop Nolan B. Harmon, believed that the power MECS bishops held flowed less from “the nature of the office...[and more from] the character of the men who were elected.” Kirby determines that it was also “the definition of the office that called out such powerful men,” whose strength suited “the demands of the office.” Strong men in turn shaped an already strong office. Episcopal power was greatest in the power to appoint preachers and presiding elders, a power that when combined with MECS privileging of the office, “further enhanced the possibilities for autocratic administration.” It was a fearsome thing when in the hands of “strong man” types like Atticus Greene Haygood, whom Kirby calls “a troubled but vastly gifted man,” a man Sam Jones declared had “heart and brains, and will... who would, if he believed he were right, wreck a world to carry his point,” or a man like Candler, whom Emory students labeled “Shorty,” declaring ““what Shorty does not know has not been found out. Shorty did not make

⁵³ Carter, *Methodist Leaders*, 127, 122. The conference memoir at Kelley’s death rejoiced in his “gallant fight” in 1890 and regretted that “a technicality of service should have been turned into a bludgeon with which to smite a man who had done an enduring work for righteousness.” *Journal of the Tennessee Conference* (MECS), 1909, p. 62. In Tennessee Methodist memory, the Kelleys loom large. The bicentennial celebrations of the Conference in 2012 featured actors playing the role of a handful of prominent leaders of old, including both Margaret and D. C. Kelley. Bishop Hargrove did not make the cut. Nor have biographies of Hargrove appeared, a notable omission, given southern Methodists’ penchant for biographical treatments of their bishops. Haynes – who had briefly studied law in the 1870s – protested what he saw as Hargrove’s failure to protect the rights of the accused, asserting that such actions in civil courts would “be pronounced unjust, if not barbarous.” In sum, Haynes perceived that disagreeing with a Bishop or taking any position that a Bishop disliked in any way could now be made into a formal charge of immorality through an arrest of character. The “inalienable” and “constitutional” rights of preachers would no longer be protected through “parliamentary and legal self-defense.” Accused of conspiracy, Haynes saw an “iron-bound... episcopal conspiracy to degrade” and “oppress” and re-interpreted earlier attempts to offer him attractive churches elsewhere as a way of getting an honest, reputable and courageous man like himself out of the way. Haynes’ autobiography leaves little doubt as to his view of this episode and its aftermath. With the “constitutional rights” of the conference and preachers of southern Methodism so “trampled upon” by bishops’ “fixed purpose” to “menace” their “dignities and privileges,” during the 1890s Haynes increasingly came to view himself as “a break-water” against the “episcopal invasion of conference and preachers’ rights.” Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 124, 132, 136.

the earth, but was put there to run it.” Indeed, so great had MECS episcopal authority become in the hands of such men, that after 1918, a series of reforms were attempted and implemented that Kirby declares “can only been seen as a form of ‘backlash’ against the power of formidable, autocratic bishops.” These reform attempts in both the MEC and MECS, including term limits, residency limits, and forced retirements were unsurprisingly opposed by bishops, especially southern bishops. But even the later bishops themselves found reason to reign in their most obnoxious colleagues. In 1927, the MECS bishops ousted Candler as president of the “College of Bishops” by basing the office on rotation instead of seniority. Likewise they removed Bishop Collins Denny—elected in 1910—from secretary of the College. By 1930, the MECS elected men who modeled ““a changed attitude toward the way a bishop should treat his brethren in the cabinet or in the conference.”” By this time, Kelley, Duncan, and Haynes were all dead.⁵⁴

Several outcomes followed the Kelley crisis over episcopacy and politics with wider import for the social and political shape of the 1890s. The events of October 1890 likely delayed state, regional, and national prohibition by a decade or more. Few who knew the intensity of Middle Tennessee MECS energies for prohibition from 1885–1890 would have imagined that statewide prohibition would take twenty more years. Historians of southern politics and religion might note that 1.2 million southern Methodists answered in one way or another to exactly ten

⁵⁴ Kirby, *Episcopacy*, 168-169, 171, 206, 213. Minnix, *Laughter in the Amen Corner*, 153. Kirby notes another difference between MEC and MECS episcopal practice. Where the MEC elected “missionary bishops” who had no power whatsoever within the United States, MECS bishops served overseas duties. Kirby says that while this “created considerable hardship for them and their families, it also provided a unique opportunity for service in which several of them flourished.” 171-172. The language of Episcopacy versus Conference is a long and important one in Methodist history. Something of a version of the “the chicken or the egg” question, southern Methodism generally gave greater powers to its Bishops compared to conference-centric northern Methodism. As perhaps with any episcopal form of government, protest against ‘tyrannical bishops’ was a common feature of every period of Methodist history, and a veritable truism amongst holiness advocates of the period in question. In addition to Kirby see also Russ Richey, *The Methodist Conference in America* (Kingswood, 1996) and *The Methodists* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998).

clergymen in Prince Alberts. The executive function in nineteenth century Episcopal Methodism had virtually no localism. Methodist polity was unlike that of Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and even Catholics on this point. There was no “bishop of Tennessee” or “bishop of Texas.” These ten ruled everywhere throughout the South. Historians need to ask less why a Methodist pastor in Salisbury or Selma thought as he did about this or that political matter and ask why did “the ten”—who could ship that pastor out of town or even out of the state at will—thought as they did. October 1890 made individual political opinion and action by regular clergy, especially younger clergy, increasingly unthinkable.⁵⁵

For the internal affairs of the MECS, the October 1890 action was a suitable preview of coming attractions. Having shamed Kelley and deported T. J. Duncan and with them, third party reform thereby ensuring womanless reform, the bishops would next come after Sam Jones, B. F. Haynes, and holiness advocates. To be clear, Kelley, Jones, and Haynes did not have holiness advocacy in common; not in 1890, not in 1900, or at any point in between. Theologically, they were different men, different kinds of Methodists. What they had in common was an insufficient commitment to the Democratic Party’s wet definitions of the spirituality of the church, the assertions of secular males regarding a preacher’s/woman’s place, and a willingness to criticize lawless Court administration of the MECS. In short, they were political and ecclesiastical dissenters, and for that, they were singled out for denominational punishment. That fact could

⁵⁵ 1890s observers outside Methodism would be unlikely to know or care about the polity distinctions between a local Methodist preacher and an itinerant Methodist preacher. They simply knew Methodist leaders were against prohibition. In the 1880s, it mattered what Annual Conferences and General Conferences said. From October 1890, and through the decade at least, it was irrelevant. Only the will of bishops held any decisive importance. Indeed, the episcopal action of October 1890 delegitimized both third party reform and women’s reform precisely at a moment when cross-party, cross-racial, and cross-gender coalitions were forming and reforming. What might have been can be imagined, if a more moderate system, or less abusive men, had been in place. While historians looking for sources of southern autocratic ways have many sources that precede these late nineteenth century MECS bishops, that they provided a fresh manifestation cannot be doubted. That several of the most autocratic among them were progressive men of letters – not a rural ‘bumpkin’ among them – might also be noted.

hardly have been lost on the thousands of their fellow MECS itinerant clergymen who have been criticized by later observers for their narrowness, inattention, and/or hostility toward political reform, observers who, by and large, would pay little attention to such narrow causes as restricting the ability of bishops to, say, punish a preacher for his political opinions, or even sway an election. Historians looking for religious efforts at social and political reform perhaps should not skip over articles entitled “Itinerancy and Episcopacy.”⁵⁶

Despite Methodists’ love for their bishops, and southern historians’ attention to various Methodist sayings and doings, and the decisive role bishops played, no major study of the MECS bishops – with or without attention to political issues – has yet appeared. Even scholarly biographies of individual bishops have become scarce in the last half century. Historians’ preference for local or state studies likely has played some role; or perhaps the topic has been deemed too “denominational,” as if the denominational and the political were alienated realms. Historians may also have allowed their subjects’ repeated words concerning the spirituality of the church to obscure the ubiquity of their subjects’ politically-tinged and politically-motivated actions. Such disclaimers have often signified their opposite. But Methodist political judgments in this era were shaping denominational polity, and episcopal denominational polity judgments were shaping Methodist political action. MECS reticence or resistance on this or that political

⁵⁶ The spirituality doctrine was often just the religious side of a core commitment of the Democratic Party, the anticlericalism that the MECS and Democratic Party had in common. In effect, Hargrove was as much ensuring party discipline in his wing of the Democratic Party as he was enforcing a feature of MECS core identity. But most importantly, Hargrove was enforcing episcopal prerogative. He was, in a myriad of ways, showing Kelley and the Tennessee Conference who was boss. But each of these, stated more positively – protecting the church from distracting side issues, keeping the church in good graces with temporal lords, and maintaining ecclesiastical order – reaffirmed the interlocking and mutually-reinforcing relationship between the “e” and the “s.” For, at least in this period of MECS history, ‘South’ and ‘Episcopal’ were much emphasized – and often indistinguishable – modifiers of the other two words in the name: Methodist Church. MECS was a good name. But since the stress on episcopacy was such a southern distinctive, and the meaning of southern so signified a strong episcopacy, many in the denomination thought “Episcopal Methodist Church” would carry just about the same freight, while appropriately fronting that the southern church was more Episcopal than the Methodist Episcopal Church.

issue may be deeply biographical, i.e., located firmly within the biographies of 8 to 10 bishops.

Despite the idiosyncrasies and personalities behind Hargrove's "arrogation of power," historian Kathleen Minnix gets it right saying "reacting to the holiness movement, political prohibition, and professional evangelists"—in the addition to criticism of episcopal administration of appointments—MECS leaders sought "an expansion of the episcopacy" and "expanded ecclesiastical control." These were the "high prerogative," or as their opponents called them, the "high church party," led by the bishops but whose spokesmen – or 'mouthpieces' – were, most principally, J. J. Tigert, editor of the scholarly *Review*, and, especially, E. E. Hoss of the *NCA*. In fact, most of the various Conference "Advocates" and "Methodists" backed the house position, several more aggressively and inelegantly like South Carolina's *Southern Christian Advocate* under W. D. Kirkland, and the *Alabama Christian Advocate* under Thomas Armstrong. Against such Court advocates formed a "low church" party primarily represented and facilitated by just a few conference papers with gutsy Country editors: the *St. Louis Christian Advocate* under E. M. Bounds and William B. Palmore, the *Holston Methodist* under R. N. Price, and, after April 1891, the new *Tennessee Methodist* under B. F. Haynes.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ Minnix, *Laughter in the Amen Corner*, 149. Minnix also mentions the *Texas Christian Advocate* as a "low church" paper. Price said of his work with the *Holston Methodist* – later renamed the *Midland Methodist* – that in the Hargrove-Kelley matter his paper "espoused the cause of Dr. Kelley." Under Price, "the paper was Low-Church, resisting the progress of ritualism and taking the democratic view of Church polity." It also supported prohibition and denounced "lynching bees and other forms of anarchy," while it "broke lances with [MEC] Bishop Gilbert Haven and other negro equalityists." Price said of Hargrove that he viewed prohibition as a political question and opposed preachers' involvements in politics. R. N. Price, *Holston Methodism, Vol V*. (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1913) 74, 399.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Tennessee Methodist

Denominations have original ideals and later histories. The content of arguments varies but that disagreements will occur is a certainty. How denominations or other religious bodies make decisions, forge consensus, and keep their reforming, or argumentative, energies moving in productive directions is a recurring question for denominational polities to answer. The way those arguments play out is funneled through or refracted by the respective polity traditions, and shaped by the languages of dissent employed. The Kelley-Hargrove controversy was a particularly painful historical moment. But, as such moments do, it provided an opportunity for denominational leadership. Unfortunately, they missed it. The polity war that that controversy provoked was not about public policy or social justice. It was not about doctrinal or theological orthodoxy. It was not even about John Wesley or being “Wesleyan.” Rather, it revealed—through the evocative language of dissent—the affective and effective issues of polity itself, for example, the complex of relationships between laity, clergy, and elite denominational leadership, the means and methods of decision-making, achieving and maintaining consensus, trust, order, and morale, and how dissent and dissenters were to be treated.

Methodists had worked out a polity, even a strong one. They had also worked out a proper polity tradition, including an ethos and method for how to address disagreements. Moreover, while they had strong and useful offices, an obvious means to solve such problems, they did not have the officers and the will to do it. Thus, at a moment when the MECS desperately needed wise, gracious, and good leadership, they did not have it in sufficient supply. Some of the officers they had too often had practiced polity not as a means of grace, but as a

means of order. The concern with episcopal power put all questions before the bishops to solve. But letting these particular bishops and leaders handle things ex-officio produced its own troubles. Crackdowns and gag rules were useful in establishing order, but they were ungraciously brute and bruising methods. Polity was more than how decisively to lay down the law, it was also how the bonds of trust, love, and loyalty among and between fellow believers were created and sustained. These bonds were powerful, not fragile, but they were tender, sensitive to what was said and done, and to how things were said and done. When persons and behaviors must be right—and Democrats and bishops had to be right—reform, revival, even honest speech, and the women and men who advocate and practice them, were liable to be jettisoned, truncated, or muted. On that point, at that particular moment in Methodists' history, the MECS failed. As a group, MECS elites in the late nineteenth century modeled how not to address conflict. When practiced well, the MECS system of polity possessed abundant potential to prevent mistakes, and when they occurred, to resolve them appropriately. But burdened with defending and demonstrating an unreasonable and untenable theory of exalted episcopacy, the official administration of a particular group of bishops and their editorial allies in this particular period of MECS history struggled to achieve a well-ordered and gracious administration.

Tennessee preachers' political efforts challenged the MECS's core mark as a spiritual and non-political church. Preachers' criticisms of worldliness in the church also implicated episcopal leadership and thus challenged the MECS's core mark as a church with a high prerogative episcopacy. MECS Court leadership met these challenges with a backlash against the clergy's radical politicking and republican free speaking. Bishop Robert K. Hargrove punished D. C. Kelley for such acts, and shamed B. F. Haynes for his 'betrayal' of episcopal friendship and efforts to run Kelley out of the itinerancy. But a defiant Tennessee Conference honored Haynes

instead. In March 1891, responding to NCA editor E. E. Hoss's criticism in the Nashville *Christian Advocate* (NCA), a group of ministers and laity gathered at Bellbuckle and determined that it was long since time for the conference to have its own paper. They needed, as Haynes recalled in 1896, "in the dark times of our unhappy troubles...to defend the good name of our Conference, and protect ourselves from misrepresentation and slander being sent widespread, over the domain of Methodism [a paper] which could represent us as a loyal body of Methodists, and not as a Conference in revolt, untrue to Methodist polity, doctrine, and usage." They chose the name the *Tennessee Methodist*, proposed it be officially adopted by the conference, and elected Haynes editor with J. M. Wright and John M. Webb corresponding editors. The new paper was a stock company and Haynes invested heavily. The first promotional issue appeared in April, with regular issues beginning in July. In May, meanwhile, the bishops in annual consultation at Wilmington, North Carolina, rejected Haynes's appeal on Kelley's behalf, upholding Hargrove's administration with one technical exception. The bishops determined that the Tennesseans had not requested to appoint their own trial committee; but if they had, that request had to be granted. So great was the bishops' confidence in their own prerogatives, they did not worry about the symbolism when the published report of the Wilmington decision was signed "R. K. Hargrove, Sec."¹

¹ T. A. Kerley, "Notice," NCA March 14, 1891, p. 12. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 169-170. "Episcopal Decisions," NCA May 16, 1891 p. 9. "A New Methodist Paper," *Daily Tobacco Leaf Chronicle* (Clarksville, TN), March 6, 1891. Haynes reported that John E. Harrison had originally been chosen editor, with Haynes urging his election, but Haynes was selected because he "had practical experience in journalism, and they were compelled in view of impecunious condition of the movement and its projectors," to have an experienced editor able to run the paper "on the most rigid economy." At this original meeting, Haynes subscribed "about five times as much stock as any other man," Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 170. Haynes's autobiography reprints his speech before the Annual Conference in 1896. Later that year, Haynes directed the funeral services for T. A. Kerley's wife, TM Dec 10, 1891 p.1. The NCA was increasingly becoming the vehicle of rebuking the errors of Middle Tennessee Methodists. Fitzgerald was not a Tennessee Conference man, nor was Hoss. The roles had reversed. Once, the Tennessee Conference chose its editor. That editor and paper – because the Conference was so important, became, over time, the paper for the entire denomination. By the 1890s, men from elsewhere were in connectional power in Nashville, using the Nashville

The Tennesseans responded by removing the long-serving W. M. Leftwich as Conference Secretary in October 1891, replacing him with Haynes, whose accuracy in note taking had even been recognized by Bishop Hargrove, and who could be trusted to stand up to any other bishop tempted to ‘influence’ the Journal. His peers also elected Haynes secretary of the Tennessee Conference in 1891, 1892, and 1893. This honor would be sufficient to entitle Haynes to a place among the top leaders of the conference. But all three—conference editor, conference secretary, and quadrennial delegate—put Haynes front row, center. Bishops picked presiding elders. But his peers chose Haynes for these honors.²

The end result was that Methodists now had two weekly editors in the same city. Haynes and his *Methodist* embodied the Country ideal of brave, principled, and increasingly defiant dissent, while Hoss and his *Advocate* epitomized the lofty, confident, and increasingly wrathful Court order. Their backgrounds showed both remarkable similarities and stark differences. Hoss was the son of a devout mother and railroad-working and Court Clerk father, both unionists of northern sympathy. He attended Ohio Wesleyan from 1866 through 1868, leaving when African American students were admitted, and finished up at Emory & Henry College in 1869 at age 20. Converted to “Democracy” in his twenties, Hoss was born into a staunch Whig family and grew up loathing Andrew Jackson. Two years older than Haynes, Hoss pastored four pastoral appointments for a total of six years, one year at his home church at Jonesboro, two in Knoxville where he helped a congregation whose building had been bitterly swiped by the MEC, two years pastoring in San Francisco, one year as president of Pacific Methodist College in Santa Rosa,

paper to reign in the Tennessee Conference.

² NCA, November 7, 1891, p. 9. Only a few clergy in this or other periods would have been general conference delegate, conference paper editor, and secretary of their conference at the same time. Two of three would have been relatively common, but not all three.

then a final pastoral year in Asheville, North Carolina. He then spent fourteen consecutive years in higher education at Martha Washington College (professor three years, president two), Emory & Henry College (professor for four years), then five years as professor of ecclesiastical history and pastoral theology at Vanderbilt University. Elected president of Emory & Henry just before Vanderbilt came calling, Hoss chose seminary teaching over a third college presidency.

When Hoss became NCA editor at age 41, he had not been in regular pastoral service since his mid-twenties. Haynes, elected editor of the *Tennessee Methodist* six months before his 40th birthday, had pastored eight appointments over sixteen years, plus a year as presiding elder, all on one conference. Hoss had not pastored as long as Haynes had, and never pastored churches as large or prominent as those Haynes had pastored. Haynes had no experience in college work, on the other hand, but had more experience in editorial work. Both had attended Emory and Henry College, had familiarity with legal circles, and showed a strong interest in history. Hoss achieved stardom rising to professor at Vanderbilt by age 36, but early in his tenure as editor struggled to shake the need to demonstrate his own talent. More accustomed to academic environments with awed students, Hoss had a tendency toward lecturing his readers in the early years of his editorship when so much conflict occurred in the MECS. Perhaps his strongest intellectual gift was his remarkable memory. He briefly supplied a congregation in Washington, D. C. that remembered him as “a walking encyclopedia.” Years later Hoss rejected W. A. Candler’s compliment that Hoss was “a versatile man,” suggesting instead that “‘miscellaneous’ is the adjective that I myself would use to describe my chief mental characteristic.” Hoss evidently wrote his editorials quickly; they reveal a fast, even commanding, mind, but an extemporaneous—and unedited—quality. His editorial colleague, John W. Boswell, remembered Hoss as “generous, open-minded, frank...quick, impulsive, emotional...learned,

critical, exact in the use of language.” Boswell said, “he overlooked the limitations of others in whom there was no presumption, and was patient with all except those who undertook to teach him.” More negatively, the biographer of later MECS Bishop James Cannon, Jr. described Hoss as “autocratic and mercurial.”³ Hoss and Haynes were children of war, having experienced the upheavals of the 1860s as civilians. Fitzgerald explained Hoss’s feisty personality as an inheritance of Hoss’s family and regional heritage of principled and combative East Tennesseans. An affable man in his personal relationships, Hoss’s biographers have noted his deep loyalty and warmth toward his friends.⁴

Hoss may have felt some pressure from J. M. Buckley of the New York *Christian Advocate*. Elected in 1882, Buckley was keen to show himself well-read and well-travelled, to demonstrate his sophistication as a writer and a thinker, and a model of how far the MEC had come. But Buckley was also an editorial warrior. Fitzgerald was a much different editor, and perhaps the shift from the peaceful pastor Fitzgerald to the scholarly combatant Hoss signified a change in the ambitions and attitude of the MECS. Fitzgerald himself had taken over for the

³ Isaac Patton Martin, *Elijah Embree Hoss: Ecumenical Methodist* (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1942), 85, 397, and 468. Hoss addressed the Tennessee State convention of the Democratic Party as a Democrat, *Columbia Herald*, May 15, 1896, pp. 1, 4. Robert A. Hohner, *Prohibition and Politics: The Life of Bishop James Cannon, Jr.* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1999), 39. On Hoss’s hot-headed personality: Possessing “a knightly love of combat,” Fitzgerald characterized Hoss as heir to the warring ways of East Tennesseans. A great-grandson of Tennessee frontiersman, general, and governor John Sevier, Hoss never waited for a fight to come to him. Fitzgerald, *Fifty Years*, 152. “By all accounts a strong and often somewhat partisan type,” Hoss would be blamed for “forcing the issue” resulting in the MECS’s loss of Vanderbilt University in 1914. He was “retired by the 1918 General conference over his own bitter and public objection to the conference so retiring him,” and died in April 1919 during the influenza epidemic. In rivalry with an Episcopal Bishop, he once modestly declared himself “the bishop of the Tennesseans.” Harmon, *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, 1159-1160. F. D. Leete remembered Hoss’s participation in an ecumenical negotiation where he sometimes “expressed his views without considering carefully the existing circumstances or the exact timeliness of his remarks.” Hoss was “tenacious,” and “difficult to handle,” and once left a negotiation room walking “backwards, with Bishop Denny supporting him so that he would not fall,” all while “declaiming vigorously, not to say raucously, as he departed, and perhaps afterwards.” Leete, *Methodist Bishops*, 432.

⁴ For the Civil War in their respective home areas, see Ash, *Middle Tennessee Society Transformed, 1860-1870*, Ash, *When the Yankees Came*, and Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics and Guerrilla Violence in East Tennessee, 1860-1869*. (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1997).

scholarly and serious Englishman T. O. Summers in 1878, in part, to bring the *Advocate* closer to the people. Buckley's fusion of elegance and belligerence likely influenced the choice of Hoss in 1890. The MECS Court was running from the humble itinerate preacher, and running from embarrassingly primitive Methodism, while seeking a scholarly pugilist equal to Buckley.⁵

Hoss's first editorial, "The Spirit of Schism," appeared June 14, 1890. A fine example of extra-Methodist polemics, it was largely an evangelical Methodist rebuke of the Protestant Episcopal Church and Anglicanism, whose "pretentiousness" he said "would be unendurable if it were not so amusing.... We may laugh at the folly of High-Churchism," including "so-called apostolical succession" wrote Hoss, "but we must be careful to cherish only kindly thoughts and feelings of those who are dominated by it." Hoss expressed thankfulness that the Anglican Bishop of London had rejected Wesley's request to ordain preachers for American Methodism.

⁵ Things might have turned out differently. With the third ballot, Hoss was elected editor of the NCA on May 23, 1890. On the first ballot Hoss received 47 votes, J. W. Hinton 35, W. D. Kirkland, 34, E. M. Bounds, 34, J. J. Tigert, 25, J. E. Godbey, 15, Paul Whitehead, 9, Anson West, 8, W. L. C. Hunnicutt, 5, C. W. Carter 3, B. F. Haynes, 3, Z. Meek, 3, R. N. Sledd, 2, W. C. Black, 2, C. B. Riddick, 2, J. J. Lafferty, 2, and receiving 1 vote each were W. C. Johnson, R. G. Porter, James Campbell, H. P. Walker, F. L. Reid, A. C. Smith, L. F. McClung, and R. N. Price. On the first ballot for Assistant Editor of the NCA, B. F. Haynes came in sixth place, receiving 7 votes, likely votes largely from Tennesseans. E. M. Bounds was elected Assistant Editor on the fourth ballot. The first ballot for Assistant Editor was Bounds at 84, Hinton at 52, J. W. Boswell at 42, W. D. Kirkland and R. G. Porter at 12, Haynes at 7, T. R. Pierce at 6, Tigert at 5, J. E. Godbey at 4, Anson West at 4, and W. C. McCoy, W. T. Harris, and W. L. Gray at one each. *Journal of the 1890 General Conference*, 200. Farewells from out-going Fitzgerald and Boswell and introductions from incoming Hoss and Bounds appeared on June 7, 1890 with the latter beginning their duties with the June 14th issue. NCA, June 7, 1890 p. 4., NCA, June 7, 1890 p. 5., NCA June 7, 1890 p. 8. The tone and style of the Court – especially its strong man critical representatives – was definable by its emphases. The Court stressed episcopal and Democratic order against democratic or republican or prohibition ideals. The Court stress on episcopal order and prerogative, at times, threatened to overtake its stress on Methodist practices and ideals of revival and deeper piety. Rhetorically, Court advocates talked less of Methodist touchstones and when they did talk of things Methodist, many had redefined that meaning in ways irreconcilable with any earlier age or "Ark" – whether Wesleyan, Asburian, or McKendrian – from earlier and well-affirmed chapters of Methodist history. One imagines that even the cultured antebellum Bishop William Capers would have recognized the Methodist-ness of Bishop Key over that of Editor Hoss, whom he probably would have viewed as an excellent grammarian and college professor, but a novel model of a Methodist preacher or advocate of Methodist piety. For some Court advocates, this shift was a case of ignorance; they had no knowledge or experience with the Methodism of Capers's or Lovick Pierce's youth. But men like Hoss knew much of the tradition – as evidenced by his detailed discourses – but chose to affirm and carry forward selectively. Perhaps Hoss could not help it. He was, in fact, that grammarian and college professor, never as suited to any former or later role as the academic ones in which he excelled but left behind when elected editor of the NCA. Methodists' seemingly endless need to climb – to be more cultured, sophisticated, respected, and 'respectable' – helped bind Methodists to an unimpeachable and infallible Democratic and 'Episcopal' order.

Hoss believed that “would especially have led us into the temptation to seek for the validity of our ecclesiastical constitution in the fact of our tactical connection with a long unbroken line of bishops, rather than in the extent and character of our labors for Christ.” Hoss continued urging that “We have absolutely no foundation on which to build up any hierarchical or sacerdotal system of doctrine or polity. The only thing that justifies our existence is the fact that we are an organized protest against all outward and mechanical conceptions of religion.” Hoss prayed “May the consideration of this truth send us back to the sources of our power, and may the Lord God of our fathers baptize us afresh with the affluent energy of his Holy Spirit.”⁶

But such big statements were not the regular fare. In his early years, Hoss consistently scolded others for minor errors and mistakes. He was especially critical of grammatical errors. He had to apologize himself when he attributed Jesus’s words to John the Baptist. Hoss praised John Wesley for being poor, pious, and learned, but then declared that most preachers had the first two, while “as to the third, we shall not now speak.” In one issue, Hoss used page one to rebuke those who misused the words “apt,” “phenomenal,” “exceptional,” “resurrected,” and “enthused,” and declared that “our correspondents will confer a special favor on us by never using them.” On the other side of the same page, he wrote against “a harsh, critical, censorious, fault-finding temper...on the lookout for flaws and defects... if they are not in sight, it will hunt

⁶ “The Spirit of Schism,” NCA June 14, 1890 p. 1. Hoss would be a leading defender of episcopal prerogatives in Episcopal Methodism, but it remained an evangelical Wesleyan sharply distinguishable from Catholic and especially Episcopal-Anglican notions of episcopacy. Hoss was among those southern Methodists of the period most intent on showing that Episcopal Methodism was quite different from the Episcopal traditions of Europe. Such critics of the Episcopal Church were partially motivated by the long-standing habit of some leaders in that denomination who preferred to recruit Methodist laity and especially clergy with more education and social standing. As former professor at Vanderbilt, Hoss would have been familiar with this practice. Later Hoss defended the only claim he believed Methodism makes about its polity or any church could make – “it approximates perfection; or that it does certain things, and services certain ends in the best possible way” – as opposed to “Episcopacy, or Presbyterianism, or Congregationalism” whose advocates frequently claimed that each had “a special and authoritative support in the inspired writings.” “The Polity of Methodism,” NCA July 12, 1890 p. 1.

them up.” He mocked the editor of the *Michigan Christian Advocate* for saying ‘raised in a parsonage,’ and quipped that many erring boys reared in a parsonage were given an “occasional ‘raising.’” When James Campbell of “the Texas” (*Advocate*) teased Hoss for his lack of knowledge about cotton noting Hoss was from mountainous East Tennessee, Hoss accused him of insulting his home region. Years later during disputes between Hoss and Vanderbilt Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, an angry Kirkland mocked Hoss’s “peculiarly sensitive nature,” and, noting that Hoss had declared he was seeking a fair discussion, declared that this “squeamishness” would be “something new in [Hoss’s] temperament,” for “he has rarely been known to hesitate in matters of this kind.” Kirkland said “perhaps he prefers the easier road of innuendo.”⁷

Hoss was capable of warm, positive statements; his ruminations on history and figures in Christian history are notable examples. Indeed, when he wrote of matters poignant—the tenderness of childhood or old age—his natural talent and character showed through. His writings were often beautiful, even sublime. But in the early years of his editorship, Hoss largely operated by refutation. Correction and verbal combat inspired him. Despite this warring, Hoss often portrayed himself as a calm observer, an ideal he achieved more consistently in later years. He often declared that he would live in editorial peace while engaging in combative editorializing. Early in his editorship he so intensely and publicly rebuked “superficial utterances” by a few British Methodists that Bishop Galloway told Hoss that he was threatening to undermine “fraternal relations” and “embarrass” the MECS in turn. Galloway quipped that he

⁷ NCA February 21, 1891, 1. NCA April 21, 1891, 1. “‘Judge Not,’” NCA May 30, 1891, 1. Martin, *Hoss*, 203, 296. NCA, July 7, 1892, p. 1. See also NCA December 6, 1894 p.1 for Hoss mocking people who criticized him but who could not write well, an example of mocking someone because they lacked access to a good education. On J. H. Kirkland, elected chancellor at the ripe age of 34, see “Our University,” TM June 29, 1893 p. 1. J. H. Kirkland was the younger brother of *Southern* editor W. D. Kirkland, both sons of W. C. Kirkland. Hoss on “the woman question,” NCA May 9, 1891, p. 1.

shared the “modern sentiment for private executions.” After he was retired by the 1918 General Conference, an ill and “lonely” Hoss, with his wife near death, still fumed about negative comments made in his absence about the episcopal address he wrote (an “outrageous injustice and illegality”). Hoss assured Bishop Denny that if he could, he would find a way to secure “redress.”⁸

Hoss frequently rebuked polity critics as well. He protested against calling Methodist “ministers and Bishops”—note the capitalization—‘wets’ just because they disagreed on methods to achieve prohibition, labeling this a “satanic” practice. Hoss said critics of bishops should stop laboring on their articles, and instead copy the famous Baptist skewering of Methodist polity, J. R. Graves’s *The Great Iron Wheel*, since they, too, were merely saying the MECS was “absolutely dominated by eight or ten mediocre and commonplace old men who are themselves utterly beyond effective supervision or control of any kind.” Hoss framed criticisms of specific episcopal conduct and administration into personal attacks on innocent, talented, and venerable men. He produced no evidence that anyone had attacked the age of what was actually a young group of bishops, nor did low churchers question their general intelligence or talent. But any critic of episcopal administration was an outsider to Methodism. Hoss did not name or quote the offenders, lest anyone be able to refute his charges of denominational outrage, or have a right to defend themselves in the *Advocate*, a practice Hoss specifically complained against when others ‘insinuated’ against him.

This was the sort of early editorial policy with which ‘low church’ supporters had to

⁸ Martin, *Hoss*, 197, 447. Positive statements: “John Wesley,” NCA February 28, 1891, 1. “The Value of Old Testament History,” NCA March 14, 1891, p.1. For innocent – nearly helpless – positioning of himself, NCA, March 14, 1891, p. 1. Hoss was perhaps at his best writing of family and home life. An example of Hoss being warm toward Tennessee Conference and less directly, B. F. Haynes, NCA, November 14, 1891, p. 1. For an interesting statement from Hoss on the relationship between doctrine and ‘applied Christianity,’ see “Theology or Sociology,” NCA March 8, 1894, p. 1.

contend, the approach that might have provoked protest if Hargrove had not already done so. This sort of “connectionalism” or “loyalty” did not win over dissenters. Hoss argued against electing bishops each quadrennium (the “termite” position) because lifetime episcopacy removed even the “slightest temptation” that a bishop would use his office “corruptly or improperly.” Better to have men in office for life who could grow in office without molestation from any form of accountability, and about whom no bad thing would be allowed said. He did not make the obvious conclusion that it would also be best to elect the NCA editor for life, without worry or any temptations to improper motives. Hoss faced General Conference approval every four years. Hoss was not admitting that he was tempted to improper motives or a corrupt use of his office because that meddlesome accountability. He was bending over backwards to defend high episcopal prerogative and using various methods to silence and delegitimize critics of that prerogative.⁹

Bishop Haygood also exemplified the Court strong man style and the notions of exalted prerogatives. Responding to Haynes’s comments about episcopal efforts to transfer Haynes, Haygood disputed minor points, but threw in a dig at Haynes’s desirability. Bishop Galloway followed and more charitably questioned Haynes’s memory.¹⁰ Haygood later bashed the MEC

⁹ “A Temperate Word to Temperance Men,” NCA January 10, 1891 p. 1., NCA, March 28, 1891, p. 1. “A Quadrennial Episcopacy,” NCA April 11, 1891 p.1. On his complaint that others were taking “unfair advantage” by “simply insinuating” charges without naming and quoting – “a brave man never resorts to such a method,” NCA October 17, 1891, p. 1. See also NCA January 3, 1891 p. 1, and NCA January 10, 1891 p. 9, an attack on the *Holston Methodist* for suggesting changes to episcopacy.

¹⁰ Haynes revealed R. K. Brown’s statement that Bishops Haygood, Hendrix, and Key had met and that Haygood told Brown that they agreed Haynes was “a valuable and promising man, but is handicapped in his Conference by his connection with the Kelley canvass.” Haygood was in charge both of North Texas and South Georgia Conferences that year, so it is likely that he was behind the transfer offers to Macon and Dallas, not Galloway. Brown recalled Augusta, too, which was a North Georgia appointment. Haygood ended his comments with a shot at Haynes “I owe him many thanks, he did not transfer;” to which Haynes replied “Believing in the ‘evil of innuendo,’ I decline comment.” Haygood and Galloway denied that Galloway had spoken to Haynes, despite the fact that Haynes did not claim he had. What Haynes said was Hargrove had read him a letter from Galloway regarding Dallas. Galloway was known to be friendly to prohibition; Haygood by this time, openly hostile. Galloway denied

and “the woman suffragists” in its midst during internal MEC debates about seating of female delegates. Frances Willard and the W. C. T. U. received particular ridicule. Haygood also threw in a shot at the intelligence of African Americans. It was standard uninspired southern pique full of racial, gender, sectional bias. But Haygood’s tone was mostly trivial, inane, petty, and pointless, more satirical than it was stately, the sort of writing intended to produce hearty laughter at another’s expense. Although *New York Christian Advocate* editor J. M. Buckley—a gender conservative—received support, Haygood ended by writing that given the way things were “up yonder,” clearly “*Southern Methodism* has something to do in these United States.” Apparently for Haygood, that mission was mocking blacks, women’s reform, and the MEC. Such was Haygood’s actual positioning, whose 1870s and 1880s reputation as progressive and far-sighted stood in some contrast to his 1890s conduct. While most of the bishops did not engage in such speech, the Haygood example showed that bishops and the connectional editor could use the connectional organ to further bad-mannered free speech and ‘ensoriousness.’ A different way of protecting bishops had been practiced by Hoss’s predecessor. Fitzgerald had, upon occasion, bravely refused to publish intemperate material from bishops that he judged would reflect poorly upon their person and their office, or was unfair to their opponent. Hoss seems not to have followed Fitzgerald’s example on that point.¹¹

having ever written such a letter and suggested that Haynes misremembered, when it was as likely that Hargrove, twenty years’ Haynes senior, was more likely was behind the Galloway attribution. Haygood did not deny his offer of transfer, nor did he dispute Brown’s recollections that Haynes was a promising and valuable man. The episode revealed that the bishops would not accept or posit that any bishop might have made any mistake of any kind. Thus, Haynes or Brown had to be wrong. The odds that Brown was wrong are good enough. The odds that Haynes forgot what a bishop told him about where the bishop would send Haynes and his family are not good. NCA January 10, 1891 p. 9. NCA January 17, 1891 p. 9. NCA January 24, 1891 p. 9 (from Galloway and Haygood).

¹¹ A. G. Haygood, “The Drifts Up Yonder,” NCA, March 21, 1891, p. 9. Hoss mocked the Prohibition Party State Convention in 1894. The Party had twelve planks, the last plank stated, in part, “we favor...the right of franchise to apply to all citizens regardless of sex.” Hoss noted this phrase in support of woman suffrage “to which we are unalterably opposed on every ground.” Hoss similarly rejoiced at J. M. Buckley’s ‘The Wrongs and Perils of Woman Suffrage,’ and said “let it have the widest circulation.” NCA, June 21, 1894, p. 2. Hoss mocked other

Another route had been possible. The NCA during the years 1890 through 1894 had a sharp internal contrast in tone. After months of page one and page nine bashing of persons tied to the Kelley defense and other mistaken folks by Hoss and Haygood in the months following the Kelley controversy, assistant editor E. M. Bounds used page eight (the assistant editor's page) to write an article warning of the power of words, and another about "edification." He threw in a nugget about conversations "seasoned with love."¹²

Sorting out the proper relationship between the various Methodist papers and the NCA troubled the denomination. The General Conference selected only the editors of the NCA and the *Pacific Methodist Advocate* out of San Francisco, the latter paper a missionary exception that covered the whole western region, not a conference. Both had evolved into that status, having previously existed as independent or conference papers. But most of the Methodist press was in conference newspapers, most serving areas no larger than a single state.¹³

aspects, as well, but the point of his article was to delegitimize the third party and call for a statewide gathering of single issue voters. NCA August 30, 1894, p. 1.

¹² NCA February 7, 1891 p. 8. E. M. Bounds's editorials on page 8 had a very different tone and content than Hoss's on page 1. Bounds wrote of prayer, fasting, the mourner's bench, connectionalism, a series on Wesley, the anointing of the Holy Ghost, preachers and honesty at funerals, giving and proper means to raise money, revival, power from on high, tips on preaching, preachers and discipline, Christian perfection, prayer meetings, study habits for young ministers, etc. Bounds had a delightful capacity for rebuking his *friends*, as when he heard a "brother" minister excited about prohibition say he wished Jesus had not turned water into wine... "You stop right there. Opinions that lead you to criticize the acts of Jesus Christ must be dismissed at once." Bounds noted that it was hard to get men to care about great causes of reform; but once they did care, it was hard to keep them "to legitimate channels." NCA October 24, 1891, p. 8.

¹³ Other papers of particular age and note were the *New Orleans Christian Advocate* that served the Louisiana and both Mississippi Conferences, the *Southern Christian Advocate* – occasionally confused with the NCA by historians – that served South Carolina, the *St. Louis Christian Advocate* that served the Missouri Conferences, the *Richmond Christian Advocate* for Virginia and Baltimore, the *Raleigh Christian Advocate* that served the North Carolina Conferences, and the *Texas Christian Advocate* that held sway in the several Conferences of Texas, thereby possessing a subscription power that rivaled the NCA. Several of these lost some official backing as new journals were founded. Those included the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* for the Georgia Conferences and Florida (the *Florida Christian Advocate* would be founded also), the *Alabama Christian Advocate* that served both Conferences in that state, the *Central Methodist* that served the Kentucky Conferences, the *Holston Methodist* that served its Conference, and the *Arkansas Methodist* that served the Conferences in Arkansas. *Our Brother in Red* served the missionary concerns in the Indian Territory, while the *Episcopal Methodist* of Baltimore, *Memphis Christian*

The usual justification for starting a new conference paper was news and information specific to each conference. But such a narrow scope would have removed the need for editorializing or article content. In practice, each conference paper gave voice to its conference's sayings, not just its doings, thereby providing more room for Methodists' conferring free speech. The weekly demands of filling that space provided their own practical justification for editors to speak their minds. That free speaking was itself, in time, controversial, particularly when Hoss was editor of the NCA. Functionally, with so many Methodists having opportunity to 'have the floor,' there seemed to be a danger that discussions could stray from an orderly affirmation of a unified message. Such fears—given an explosive issue like the Kelley trial that forced editors to choose, and ample editorial space—helped sort the various papers into two camps. The Court papers gave voice to a Ciceronian affirmations of optimism and confidence in episcopacy, cultural advance, and "The Democracy." Dissenting papers gave voice to 'Cationic' Country expressions of 'conference rights' (a preachers' republicanism), urged accountability and reform in ecclesiastical and public affairs, and often a restorationist or 'Old Methodist' vision of Methodist piety. This was the standard Methodist declension narrative with heavier doses of public concern. The conference rights protest drew others in. Haynes's paper, in particular, became the standard bearer for a whole host of reformers, croakers, and protesters. It was the dissenters' sheet, the paper that many thought told the rest of the story.

In response, the NCA doubled down on its place as the official word and the house position. Negotiating the relationship between the NCA and other Methodist papers was not new. Debates and discussions—even accusations—had appeared during Fitzgerald's tenure and before. But Fitzgerald's mature approach modeled modesty and sensitivity to the feelings of

Advocate, *Montana Methodist*, and *Western North Carolina Methodist* served their respective Conferences. "Methodist Journalism," NCA November 30, 1893 p.1.

other editors that went missing under his less experienced successor.¹⁴ Fitzgerald used humor to hear others' and register his own dissent: "Now and then some of our brethren of the Conference organs express a desire that the CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE shall be a paper worthy of our great Church. This is also our desire, and to this end we work and pray. Conference organs ought to be worthy of the Conferences which they represent. For this, too, we pray." Fitzgerald's principle was revealed when an anonymous "slur" about the publishing house and NCA was published to which he responded "we have no cause and no desire to conceal from the Church any facts bearing upon the management of their Connectional work. We would have all officials in Church as in State held to strict accountability. We would invoke for a Connectional officer the same treatment accorded to other servants of the Church. Criticize if you will, but remember the Golden Rule." Fitzgerald also acknowledged that free speech had to include the right of dissent, and he responded directly and fairly to sharp, even intemperate, criticism.¹⁵

¹⁴ On Methodist Newspapers and the relationship between them and role of the NCA see NCA April 4, 1889 p.8 "Southern Methodist Journalism" praises the *Arkansas Methodist*, *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, the *Holston Methodist*, and the *Southwestern Methodist* for indications of "fresh journalistic enterprise" and pledges to be a good citizen of this "journalistic corps" by exhibiting "courtesy, fairness, and magnanimity." The very next item, "Perhaps Not Worthy of Mention" includes a criticism of the NCA by the *Richmond Advocate* for passing "in silence" a memorial celebration of Bishop McTyeire held in Virginia. The response noted how many such memorials occurred across the South and concluded "When Virginian or Virginians are intentionally slighted in these columns, it will be when another man edits them." On opposition to secular newspapers instructing preachers as to how and what to preach, including "Each Church has its creed, and the man who preaches in any given Church must conform to the standards. The secular press is neither the censor nor sponsor of the pulpit," see NCA July 4, 1889 p.8. Fitzgerald chided "one of our esteemed religious exchanges" for crediting NCA articles as "Ex.," which was "not the real name of this paper." NCA October 24, 1889 p.1. The subscription goal for NCA in 1886 was 50,000 NCA June 12, 1886 p. 4, while NCA July 3, 1886 p. 8 reveals that "under its present management, editorial and financial, in the last eight years it has increased in circulation from 7000 to 27,000 subscribers." On Fitzgerald's understanding of his role upon election to third term, "The Editor to His Readers," NCA June 12, 1886 p. 8 and, "The Fifty Thousand," June 19, 1886 p. 1 the latter being a place where Fitzgerald discusses the NCA's role in connectionalism and unity. Call "To Brother Editors" for all reciprocal sending of duplicates to NCA, August 28, 1886 p.8. For conference desire to start new paper and Fitzgerald's response "A Memphis Conference Paper," NCA September 4, 1886 p. 7. Fitzgerald commented after ["At the request of the author we print this article, believing as we do in free speech, and being willing that every Annual Conference should judge as to its wants – ED. ADV.].] Praise for E. E. Hoss; praise for Rev. William Baker, editor of the *Way of Holiness*. NCA November 27, 1886 p. 9. Laying out the role of the conference papers as distinct from that of the "general organ," "Letter from East Tennessee," by R. N. Price of the *Holston Methodist*, NCA August 20, 1887 p. 17.

¹⁵ NCA *Supplement*, May 7, 1887 p. 1. "Our Reply to 'Cumberland' and the Editor," NCA, February 16, 1889, p. 8.

In contrast, when critics suggested that editors of official organs could not speak freely and thus Methodists needed independent papers, Hoss's refutation confused 'manly' independence with mere bravado and boldness. Hoss exemplified the connectional editor as absolute defender of the house position of his superiors. To be fair, it is quite possible that Hoss's defense of house positions was a defense of positions he held without reference to the fact that the bishops did also. If so, he agreed fully with the most strident and controversial bishops.¹⁶

Hoss's early response to Haynes's new paper announced on page nine that "there is an

For a case of disagreeing with O. P. Fitzgerald, Bishop Marvin, and Dr. Pierce on correct forms of preaching, see "Preaching from Manuscript," by L. Pulliam, NCA July 18, 1889 p.14. Another wonders if Editor Fitzgerald and Book Agent Barbee are off the mark in "The 'Menagerie' – Is It With the Standards?," by Rufus E. Travis of New Providence, Tenn., NCA August 8, 1889 p. 3. Fitzgerald rebuked G. W. Graves's views on Baptism saying "[Our respected brother here puts himself against the opinion and usage of his Church – ED.]." "Baptizing Infants," NCA October 17, 1889, p. 15. A response, "Baptizing Infants," NCA October 31, 1889 p. 14. For a call for writers to sign their own proper name based on long experience in newspaper work, NCA October 31, 1889 p. 8. About the changes in and popularity of the NCA under Fitzgerald's watch, "The Christian Advocate," NCA October 31, 1889 p.8. For Fitzgerald responding to charges in the *Richmond Christian Advocate* that he did not quote enough material from southern Methodist newspapers, including his final remark "we try to profit by all the criticisms that are made upon our work, but we confess that it is difficult to get any good out of the above paragraph." NCA, November 21, 1889 p. 8. For Fitzgerald's view of "Newspaper Controversies," and evidence he received over 100 newspapers, NCA February 1, 1890 p.1. See also "The Christian Advocate. Its Outlook," NCA July 24, 1886 p.8. For a remarkably sharp criticism of NCA by the *Central Methodist* followed by Fitzgerald's irenic reply, see "What Does This Mean?," NCA December 18, 1886 p. 8 where Fitzgerald reprinted the following criticism from the *Central Methodist*: "The Editor of the Nashville ADVOCATE has organized a court, himself of the bench, and tried and convicted of high crimes and misdemeanors all the editors of our Church, outside of Nashville. We submit to the verdict, assuming there is no appeal." Fitzgerald then replied: "What does this mean brother? We are not conscious of having thought, felt, or said any thing that would justify such a statement concerning us. Either our brother wholly misunderstands us, or we wholly misunderstand ourselves. We are in love and good fellowship with our editorial brethren. Please explain." Generally a proponent of free speech, Fitzgerald outlined the NCA's position in reference to an upcoming General Conference saying "in common with our brethren of the Church press generally, we have been disposed to open our columns freely for the discussion of such questions as may be likely to engage the attention of the General Conference. Having confidence in the discrimination of our readers, we have not thought it necessary to accompany everything we did not approve with an expression of dissent, though we have tried, and will continue to try, to keep all discussions within the limits of good temper, good taste, and proper denominational fealty." "The Closing Ecclesiastical Year," NCA November 7, 1889 p.8. Fitzgerald's NCA held to more positive views of the common duties of the Methodist press "to extend the knowledge of God and bring the world to Christ." "What We Thought in 1884," NCA February 8, 1890 p. 8. The NCA declared that "Our aim is to make a paper whose patriotism is as broad as the Republic, and whose Christianity is as wide as the world." "The 'National' Advocate," NCA, January 19, 1889, p.8.

¹⁶ "A Rule With Exceptions," NCA May 23, 1891 p. 1. Bounds on the relationship between public opinion and reputation, and actual character, e.g., "men are very sensitive, to a babyish extent often, of what the public say of them," NCA June 13, 1891, p. 8.

entire absence of any thing like a factious or contentious spirit from its columns. We shall hope to live in perfect peace and harmony with our Brother Haynes. That we should always agree with him, is not to be expected; but when we disagree, we shall strive to do so in a thoroughly Christian way.” But as the institutional representative of the Tennessee Conference’s “conference rights” dissent, the *Methodist* began its life under a cloud with powerful and active opponents. Hoss’s comments assumed conflict, and despite posturing as a disinterested observer, Hoss had already made himself a participant in the Kelley-Hargrove matter. He repeatedly belittled the “low church” camp generally, and took special notice to undermine Haynes and the opposition paper that the Tennesseans had started under his nose. In short, Hoss was a combatant, even a commander, in the forces arrayed against the Tennessee Conference. For the remainder of Haynes’s life as a Methodist minister, he would labor against serious and persistent opposition, some of it willing to resort to “calumny,” as Haynes labeled it. That opposition had its basis in his role in the Kelley controversy and his role as the editor of the Tennessee Conference’s paper, a paper whose existence offended the “high church” party. But the paper and its conference were also caught in an awkward double standard. While some observers from other conferences welcomed the new paper because they felt that Tennessee’s claim to the NCA was selfish, others viewed the founding of the paper as part of an attempt to undermine the connectional organ. As Haynes recalled, “its purpose and mission were looked upon with suspicion and were much misunderstood.” Despite this, Haynes said “it was not long in forging its way to a position in the very front rank of conference organs.”¹⁷

¹⁷ NCA, July 11, 1891, p. 9. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 142. Vote taken at Franklin District Conference to support TM for adoption to the next annual conference as Conference organ: 39 yes, 24 no. The paper received official recognition and welcome from *The Southern Christian Advocate*, *The Brother in Red*, *Episcopal Methodist*, *Arkansas Methodist*, *Holston Methodist*, *Raleigh Christian Advocate*, *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, *Alabama Christian Advocate*, *Texas Christian Advocate*, *St. Louis Advocate*, *Central Methodist*, and *Wesleyan Christian*

In his first issue, Haynes addressed the relationship of his *Methodist* to Hoss's *Advocate*. "A conference paper," said Haynes, "will reach hundreds and thousands of homes in our own conference which the Nashville *Advocate* does not reach. Being a local paper, and devoted to matters especially of interest to our own people and to a degree which a connectional paper can not in the nature of the case be, the TENNESSEE METHODIST, rightly conducted, will naturally circulate more largely than the Nashville *Advocate* now does in our conference. And this without necessarily injuring or displacing the Nashville *Advocate*. There is large room for both, and both are needed, and should be of mutual help to each other."¹⁸ But Haynes clearly had an additional role for the *Methodist* in mind. In that same inaugural issue, his article entitled "The Church Press" compared MEC and MECS journalism. In the MEC, every paper was a "connectional paper" controlled by General Conference that elected the editors; there were no true conference or "independent" papers. The MECS system, much preferred by Haynes, had a single connectional paper controlled by General Conference with all other papers being

Advocate. "The Tennessee Methodist as viewed by the Church Press," TM, June 18, 1891 p. 5. Several commented on the need for a separate local organ for Tennessee, *The Richmond Advocate* calling the previous arrangement "selfish and shabby." Local Tennessee news going out of the NCA opened the way for more connectional news. The *Florida Advocate* and *Western North Carolina Methodist* added their welcome on July 2, 1891 p. 5, when praise and welcome even appeared from the *Western Christian Advocate* of Cincinnati, Ohio. Haynes wrote of the effects of – or manifestations of – ambition/popularity in the fall of 1891 saying "perfidy is the price of popularity – generally these days. Fidelity is fanaticism. Loyalty to Discipline is lack of discretion. Perils preached are but pessimism proclaimed. Worldliness, wealth, and wine propose to rule or ruin the ministry. We give this trinity notice, now, that they will fall disastrously in the end." TM, October 29, 1891, p. 1. Similarly, "When the virus of ambition enters the heart of a Methodist preacher he can see no evils in the Church, and all who see and deplore and warn against them are denounced by him as pessimists. The ambitious, absorbed in the desire and pursuit of a coveted place, and bending all his energies toward its securement, can see no evils save those which obstruct his passage to the coveted goal, and has neither time nor energy nor thought to spend on aught else." TM, November 19, 1891, p. 1.

¹⁸ "The Church Press and the Home," TM April 30, 1891 p. 1. Haynes further explained that "The TENNESSEE METHODIST is in no sense a rival or an antagonist of the connectional organ, but its well-wisher and fellow-laborer in a common field broad enough for both. The latter is the organ of forty-three conferences and justice to this large connectional constituency forbids its supplying the place of an organ for the Tennessee or any other one conference. With the establishment of this paper, when adopted as our conference organ, the Tennessee conference will only step into line with all the other conferences, except the Memphis. We believe all the conferences have organs except the Tennessee and Memphis, and the Memphis is taking steps to have one." The two Mississippi Conferences shared the *New Orleans* with the Louisiana Conference.

independent conference papers (except the *Pacific*).¹⁹

Efforts by conference papers to expand their subscription lists irked Hoss, who complained often that conference papers were seeking a connectional field, for example, that their editors were appearing at Annual Conferences other than their own, or were making various price-cutting inducements for subscriptions. Haynes's *Methodist* did both. Hoss demanded that the denomination-wide field be reserved to the NCA. But his own editorial policy undermined this approach. Hoss did not operate a 'wide as the connection paper.' His habit of taking firm stands on controversial matters and pummeling those who held contrary views prevented the *Advocate* from operating as the organ for open discussion of contested points. He was helping to create a connection-wide demand for an alternative to his paper. Moreover, by attacking conferences and their editors via 'the connectional,' Hoss was providing a motive and need for each conference to defend itself with its own connectional circulation. In short, Hoss was personally dividing the connection. He could have pursued another path, unless one assumes that he was, in fact, being directed in this policy by the bishops themselves. There is little wonder that the NCA went from 27,000 subscribers to 17,000 in Hoss's first eight years in office—a staggering loss of 10,000 subscribers (or 37 percent). The *Advocate* had reached its zenith under the irenic and open policies Fitzgerald employed. Without Fitzgerald's unusual gift for consensus building or a commitment to an open forum, Hoss practiced connectionalism by purge.²⁰

¹⁹ "The Church Press," TM April 30, 1891 p. 5.

²⁰ Hoss on being an editor "The Woes of An Editor," NCA May 12, 1892, p.1. "The Religious Press and the Religious Use of the Secular Press," NCA October 24, 1891, p. 13. The NCA went from 7000 subscribers in 1878 at Fitzgerald's election to 27,000 in 1890. Hoss gave to his successors a weaker office, and by the time he was done with the MECS, he had helped lose Vanderbilt University as well. People who disagreed with him—some of whom must have resented his condescending ways if nothing else—likely made up a majority of MECS membership.

Hoss's complaints about the injustice of editors trying to get a wider audience—many also being investors in their papers—also invented a new connectional 'sin.' "Gilderoy," a pseudonym for Rev. Robert Gilderoy (R. G.) Porter, a senior Mississippi itinerant and frequent contributor to many Methodists papers in the era, wrote to Haynes saying "I see the *Tennessee Methodist* is going a'courting around generally among the conferences." Haynes defended the practice by praising the "loyalty" that Gilderoy expressed in three principles. First, Gilderoy took his official Annual Conference paper, the *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, then the NCA as the connectional, and then as many papers as possible, since the more his people read the better off they were. Haynes affirmed these principles, and used the last to justify why the expansionistic *Methodist* was "a'courting."²¹

Eager to defend the connectional office, Hoss proposed a meeting of all the editors to agree on policy, while also saying that the MECS had too many papers. Given the uninviting prospect of Hoss-inspired downsizing of their jobs and insults to their various conferences' pride, it seems no such meeting occurred. When the editor of 'the St. Louis' came to the Tennessee Conference, Haynes welcomed him, invited him to return often, reprinted his editorials, and praised his addresses. Haynes also welcomed and endorsed the *Memphis Christian Advocate* upon its birth November 10, 1892 (on page 1). Meanwhile, Hoss published "A Word to the

Later complaints about holiness papers undermining the connectional were indirectly accurate. The *Advocate* under Hoss – and other anti-connectional intra-Methodist warring against low churchers and their views—drove off subscribers. Hoss's complaints about independent papers undermining the connectional missed the fact that the editorial policy employed in the 1890s undermined both the connectional and the connection.

²¹ 'Gilderoy,' "Mississippi Conference," TM, January 5, 1893, p. 2. T. A. Kerley represented the TM at the conference. Gilderoy was a member of the North Mississippi Conference, and claimed – surprisingly – never to have attended previously any other Annual Conference but his own. "Gilderoy's Loyalty," TM, January 5, 1893, p. 1. Gilderoy's identity, see Farish, *Circuit Rider Dismounts*, 349 n3, which includes Gilderoy's comment that "what they do at McKendree Church, in Nashville, is felt to a greater or less extent to the borders of Southern Methodism," and Turley, *Wheel Within a Wheel*, 161. Farish says it was "Porter," Turley says "Potter." The 1890 General Conference Journal, 200, lists an R. G. Porter receiving votes for both editor and assistant editor of the NCA.

Wise,” a remarkably threatening article that complained of “trespass,” and announced “if it is continued, we shall fight it.” Hoss reported from the Holston Conference noting “Dr. Haynes, of the Tennessee Methodist, was present for several days, mingling with the brethren, and preaching and speaking.”²²

While Hoss took his own shots at ‘low church’ positions, he was not alone. The *Alabama* and *Southern Advocates* typically engaged in more direct, explicit, and brusque critiques than did the more elegant Hoss. The articles of certain ‘high church’ correspondents were published in several such papers, including the articles of Court defender John E. Edwards of Virginia, whose commentary included ad hominem argumentation as a matter of course, and wholesale condemnation of any who disagreed with the house positions he affirmed. For men like Edwards, and the *Southern*’s editor, W. D. Kirkland, critics should be run out of the church entirely. It is possible that Hoss’s rebukes functioned as announcements of the official policy and declarations of open season on those who opposed it, calls then answered by various Court champions both in person—Hoss, Kirkland, and Barbee used connectional positions to make verbal rebukes—and in print. Meanwhile, the NCA could criticize unnamed targets, thus sounding a general alarm instead of engaging in ‘personalities.’ So supportive were ‘the Alabama’ and ‘the Southern,’ that they were among the very few papers that escaped censure from Hoss. Rev. W. B. Duncan of South Carolina wrote to Haynes saying “I suppose you know

²² NCA, Nov 8, 1894 p. 11; Hoss threatening to shut down other newspapers, “To Be Considered,” NCA, October 25, 1894 p.1., other feuding between Hoss and the little rivals he disliked, see November 1894 issues, including NCA November 29, 1894, p. 8; and NCA Nov 8, 1894 p.1 where Hoss feuds with three separate newspapers on one page, including the *St. Louis Christian Advocate*. An example of Haynes’s support for Palmore, “Tennessee Conference Notes,” TM, November 3, 1892, p. 1. Welcoming ‘the Memphis,’ and new editor J. W. Boswell, TM December 8, 1892, p.1 and TM December 15, 1892, p. 1. “A Word to the Wise,” NCA, October 6, 1892, p.1. “Holston Conference,” October 27, 1892, p. 9.

our Kirkland? His motto is to come out on top.”²³

The *Tennessee Methodist*'s origins in the Kelley dissent were clear. The *Western North Carolina Methodist* welcomed the paper saying, “it has no controversy in it. You would think Kelley and Hargrove were in heaven.” On that same page appeared Kelley's explanation of why he was expanding publication of his defense of himself and the conference, *Bishop or Conference?* But the tone and content of the paper were different from the tone and content of the Kelley-Hargrove polity dissent. The first trial or example issue of the *Tennessee Methodist* appeared on April 30, 1891. Two items on the first page suggested its aims. The first, simply entitled “Salutatories,” pledged the paper to no particular program. Haynes's statement was a defiant assertion of his reputation for loyalty. “As to the policy of a Methodist paper we deem any outline needless. Methodism is too old and too well known, and an itinerant Methodist preacher's obligations in relation to it too well known to require an outline of any intended policy. Our loyalty to Methodist doctrine, polity, and institutions renders any pledges, public or private, equally unnecessary. We have made and now make no such pledges of any sort whatsoever, but enter upon this phase of our ministerial work as we have entered upon pastoral work for eighteen years past – with a single eye to the highest good of the church of our love.”²⁴

²³ W. B. Duncan, “South Carolina Letter,” TM April 6, 1893, p. 2. Kirkland was editor of the *Southern* from 1885 to 1894, when he was elected head of the Sunday School Department. “The New Connectional Officers,” NCA, June 7, 1894, p. 8. J. J. Tigert was elected editor of the MECS Review, and S. A. Steel to editor of the Epworth League paper.

²⁴ “The Tennessee Methodist,” TM July 2, 1891 p. 5. D. C. Kelley, “The Conference or Bishop,” TM July 2, 1891 p. 5. Kelley wrote: “For the convenience of the bishops in annual session, the facts and arguments bearing on the trial at the last session of the Tennessee Conference were printed in a pamphlet. The question of their further publication was left in abeyance at the time. Two reasons have determined the offer of the pamphlet to the public. First, the importance of the principles involved, separate from all personal relations. Second, a number of our papers in the absence of the facts have since the decision of the bishops, declared that the conference had not the wisdom or the courage to demand its rights; the facts of the pamphlet are the proper defense of the conference... Proceeds to go to the fund for the education of daughters of itinerant preachers.” “Salutatories,” TM, April 30, 1891 p. 1. The first issue of April 30 was to provide potential supporters with an example of the paper in order to aid subscription

A second statement moved much closer to a clearer view of the original aims of the paper, however. “The Church Press and the Home” began with the concern for the spiritual wellbeing of Christian homes before moving to the question of the press: “if any one thought has burdened our heart, and any one purpose reigned supreme over all others in assuming charge of this paper, it has been the desire and the purpose to make it another help to the homes and children of the church.” Haynes later said that though it “stood unflinchingly opposed to the high church tendencies,” the paper sought not to agitate about the sufficiently-ventilated Kelley-Hargrove case but rather to correct the Conference’s reputation from the charges made that they were “a conference in revolt against constituted authority” by “ignoring the case altogether, and simply devoting its columns unremittingly and exclusively to the work of building up the spiritual life of the conference and aiding both preachers and laymen personally and officially to serve the church with increasing fidelity and fruitfulness and in bringing souls to Christ.” Haynes claimed that the paper was “widely read” by MECS preachers, having as many as 2000 of 4700 MECS “travelling preachers on its subscription list at one time,” a high figure indeed. Between Hoss’s *Advocate* and Haynes’s *Methodist*, clergy would have the full scoop.²⁵

The theme of family religion also characterized the paper, as reflected in an early advertisement, “The Tennessee Methodist: A Weekly Methodist Family Paper.” Haynes declared “This paper seeks to help ‘spread Scriptural holiness over these lands.’ It desires to be an efficient aid to the pastor in his work. It desires to be a medium of communication between our

efforts. p. 4.

²⁵ “The Church Press and the Home,” TM April 30, 1891 p. 1. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 153-154. Given the intensity of the low church v. high church debates, the paper’s role as primary vehicle for low church views, editorial assistance from luminaries like J. M. Wright, future bishop A. Coke Smith, E. M. Bounds, and Sam P. Jones, the paper’s open forum approach, Haynes’s own vigorous and ‘definite’ editorials, and the paper’s low price and other sales inducements, Haynes’s claim regarding subscription seems reasonable. The paper was \$2 a year, only \$1 for preachers and widows of preachers, but Haynes often ran specials that put the annual price at \$1.50/\$0.75. It might further be suggested that some clergy who took the paper might not have advertised that fact.

preachers, by which they can hear from each other and assist each other by communicating through its columns their trials and triumphs, their methods of work, and every thing which can be of help and interest to each other. To this end it is desired that the preachers write frequently for its pages. Let us have reports from your charge. We want to hear all about your work. Report Deaths and Marriages promptly; also Revivals and every item of interest in your charge.” Others noted the qualities of the paper, and its editor. “Brother Haynes is a progressive man on the right line” said the editor of the *Little Worker* published at Williston, Tennessee. W. H. Lewis of St. Charles, Missouri determined that the *Methodist* was “logical, vigorous, and independent,” a “live paper, fully abreast of the times, and has the courage to follow its convictions... its utterances respecting the important issues of the day are unambiguous, positive, decided.” Lewis said “its voice on the living questions... gives no uncertain sound.” The *Episcopal Methodist* of Baltimore praised a statement of Haynes’s saying “the above is written in the broad yet aggressive tone characteristic of this excellent journal.” A Holston Conference preacher declared the *Tennessee Methodist* “a most excellent family religious paper,” and, announcing he despised “a milk and cider paper or person,” told the editor “your paper is Methodistic: is in line with the Church in doctrine, polity, and spirit.” He further proposed that the Tennessee and Holston ‘Methodists’ be merged and based in Chattanooga.²⁶

²⁶ TM, July 16, 1891, p. 7. (*Little Worker*), TM July 16, 1891 p. 4. [Lewis] “Appreciated,” TM September 1, 1892, p. 1. “Strive to be Patient,” TM, October 8, 1891, p. 1. Rev. C. T. Carroll, “Holston Conference Notes,” TM, November 24, 1892, p. 2. Carroll also reported on Fitzgerald’s administration of the Conference, debates over sanctification and Methodist doctrinal standards, and the 1892 national and state elections. The Savannah (TN) District Conference indorsed the *Tennessee Methodist* saying “many of us have long felt the need of a Conference organ in the bounds of the Tennessee Conference, and that it was really necessary to the proper development of the work within our limits.” “We heartily indorse the movement,” they continued, “and recommend its adoption by the Tennessee Conference at its next session.” TM, July 23, 1891 p. 4. The editorial and business offices were at “No. 156 North Cherry Street, Between Church and Broad Streets, where we will be pleased to have our friends call and visit us.” The editors also invited “wide-awake laymen” to write and use the paper to “discuss plans and stimulate our membership to greater activity and larger liberality in our Church work.” They also sent copies to business leaders in Nashville in an effort to boost advertising. “Our circulation is mainly in Middle Tennessee, covering the very territory which contributes to Nashville’s business.” Haynes reprinted a charge for support from the editor of

Haynes embraced a lively open forum style that provided space for issues to be debated and gave voice to minority or controversial positions that would not have been printed or as frequently printed in other papers. Topics ranged from parenting to public policy. He printed without comment articles affirming positions he did not hold. One favorite format was the symposium, where Haynes would invite several articles from eminent and/or passionate figures debating different aspects of a topic, appearing together either in a single issue, or in a running commentary over several weeks. For example, Haynes ran a long series on presiding eldership by T. J. Duncan in the spring 1892, a symposium on weekly prayer meetings, and a symposium on education. Often these discussions would spill over into long running commentary by Haynes or other contributors. For example, the symposium on gambling was followed by forums entitled “The State Press on Gambling” with supporting quotations and commentary from newspapers all over Tennessee in direct response to the *Methodist* on the issue, a feature that must have required considerable effort and advanced planning on Haynes’s part. Often the ripple effect elicited more commentary on the topic in later issues, or as in the case of gambling, an apparent jump in state-wide commentary on the issue. In Fitzgerald’s colorful language, one well-planned and strongly-stated croak could get the whole frog pond going. The symposium format gave multiple opportunities for ‘ventilation’ of a subject, as each opinion provoked others in later issues and in other papers.²⁷

the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* entitled “The Church Paper.” July 23, 1891 p. 1. On family religion, or faith and the home, see TM, June 23, 1892, p. 1, where Haynes argued that devout parents paid more attention to academic education in schools than they did the more important issue of religious education in the home. See also “Family Religion,” TM, July 28, 1892, p.1., and “The Greater Made the Less to Our Hurt,” TM June 23, 1892, p.1. For Hoss on family themes, see Martin, *Hoss*, 224-225, and 209-219.

²⁷ On prayer meetings, TM August 25, 1892 p. 3. On education, TM March 16, 1893, p. 2, On Gambling see TM January 19, 1893 p. 5., with follow up forums on February 2, 1893, p. 1, and February 9, 1893, p.1 both called “The State Press on Gambling.” See also Clement C. Cary (holiness evangelist), “From Georgia,” TM September 6, 1894, p. 2. Cary’s letter was almost entirely about politics, including prohibition, the Populists, Haygood’s

Haynes also voiced his own political opinions, at times in contrast to Hoss. For example, Haynes appealed for greater sympathy and support for “women who have to make their own livelihood,” and noted the question of pay equity...“it costs a woman as much to live as it does a man.” Haynes declared “Help Those Women!” in an article supporting rescue work. In contrast, a newspaper near his hometown reported that Hoss, speaking on the floor at the Methodist Ecumenical Conference in 1891, “invited anybody who had a higher estimate of woman than he had himself to show his face. Scarcely had the words been uttered, before a large proportion of the delegates stood up in answer amid applause from others. The Doctor was somewhat nonplused, but continued with his remarks, holding that if God had intended men and women to do the same work he would have made them alike. He, too, called attention to Paul’s words.”²⁸

Haynes affirmed the necessity of Christian involvement with politics, published repeated criticisms of “mob law” including a symposium on the topic, praised the work of Nashville’s Humane Society that was “a product and could only be a product of a Christian civilization,” generally supported labor, argued for progressive taxation, MECS missionary and educational work among African Americans, supported “A Door of Hope,” a ministry for ex-convicts, and the obligation of Christians to vote. Haynes declared that the “rock” of “insane sensitiveness and prejudice against the church press or pulpit or religious assembly discussing things political” was

declaration that he had not voted while bishop, and the Scomp-Candler-WCTU crisis at Emory. Haynes sought to avoid a publishing a paper that would “descend to the level of a mere reflector of current news, a thin bulletin board to chronicle the movements of church affairs, the electrifying speeches and sermons of connectional men, and advocating with tremendous earnestness such measures only, as the church authorities all endorse, or whose only opposition is that of a well-known hopeless minority.” He was no doubt referring to Hoss’s *Advocate* that, unlike the *Methodist*, did not represent the “spirit, tone, loyalty, and heroism of this noble body of Methodist preachers.” “We have been denounced in its columns as in revolt – as untrue and traitorous to Methodist law and usages,” Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 180, 183.

²⁸ “Working Girls,” TM July 23, 1891 p. 3, quoting and affirming the article of the same name in the *Nashville Banner*. Haynes listed every officer of the Nashville Woman’s Mission Home in “Help Those Women!,” TM October 29, 1891, p. 1. *The Comet* (Johnson City, TN), October 15, 1891, p. 2. See also Martin, *Hoss*, 79.

a threat to the church itself, and pronounced “this rock must be split by us, or we will be split by this rock.”²⁹

While Haynes expressed various opinions and sentiments on a range of topics, the theme of vital spirituality was dominant. Haynes reacted strongly to “The Bishops’ Call” for a week of prayer, especially the implication that there was a “lack of spiritual power in both preachers and laymen.” Of the bishops he said, “this is the opinion of those in the best position to know and understand the case, and their united opinion should come to us with very great force.” He made other hopeful statements, as when he reported on his fall 1892 tour of annual conferences that had been a wonderful and encouraging experience for him. He published a thankful, warm-hearted, and New Year’s blessing-filled testimonial of the tour and congratulated the conferences on an improvement in the “spiritual tone.” He further reported that Bishop Fitzgerald—looking “vigorous and fresh” after the fall conference rounds—had “delighted his many friends in Nashville last week by spending a few days in the city,” and had “brightened our sanctum with his genial presence last week.”³⁰

²⁹ Contra those who advocated “absolute divorcement” from politics, TM September 8, 1892, p. 1 and on importance of voting and voting “right,” “The Church Our Only Hope,” TM June 11, 1894, p. 1. On Labor-Management relations and strikes/violence, TM, August 4, 1892 p. 1, TM August 25, 1892, p. 1, and TM July 12, 1894 p. 1. On animal cruelty, and a judge who refused to enforce laws against it, TM February 9, 1893, p. 1. Haynes arguing for progressive taxation and very worried about income inequality, “One Method of Cure” TM March 23, 1893 p. 1. Commentary about/condemnations of lynching, TM May 12, 1892, TM Oct 5, 1893 and TM Oct 12, 1893; NCA also, November 9, 1893 p. 9 (lynching of 3 men, 1 woman, near Lynchburg TN Nov 3), NCA May 5, 1892, p.9, May 12, 1892, p. 1, August 16, 1894, pp. 1, 8, September 13, 1894, p. 8, September 20, 1894, p. 1., October 4, 1894, p. 8., “Lynching Again” and “Lynch Law: A Symposium,” TM September 27, 1894 p. 1, and 1, 4. The Symposium included statements from thirty-eight different individuals on lynching, most of them Tennessee Conference clergy. “A Door of Hope,” TM, May 3, 1894, p. 1. Haynes supported separate denominational organizations for African Americans while encouraging MECS support for Lane and Paine Colleges, TM September 1, 1892, p. 1, and Gammon Theological Seminary, and African-American ministry of the MEC, “Gammon Theological Seminary,” TM March 29, 1894, p. 1. “Shall We Split On The Rock or Split The Rock?,” TM August 30, 1894 p. 1.

³⁰ “The Bishops’ Call,” TM, July 23, 1891 p. 1. The plan for the week of prayer began with Sunday August 9, 1891 which was to include “Sermons on the baptism of the Holy Spirit as an inducement of power and a preparation for service.” Monday was for greater spiritual power for preachers, Tuesday for “more spiritual-mindedness” for all members, Wednesday for increase of home religion, family altars, etc., Thursday was prayer for youth and

Haynes's issued passionate calls for a spiritual revival of the MECS ("it is not to-day the peculiarly and distinguishing glory of Methodism that she is pre-eminently characterized by intense spirituality"), full-throated laments about worldliness and money, and anxious warnings about "mammon rule in the Church" by rich men "whose fortunes are mute witnesses to the unheard wail of oppressed widows." His calls for deeper spirituality ("the neglect of family prayer is notorious" and "the decay of discipline is almost universal among us") expressed the spiritual diagnosis behind the low church view. They differed from Court optimists who, said Haynes, not only refused to see or acknowledge these problems, but often sought to "impugn the motives of those who call attention to them, or ridicule them as pessimists, or waive them aside as disaffected grumblers."³¹

By the spring and summer of 1892, the *Methodist* was gaining ground. Certainly its friends thought so. H. L. Booth declared the paper "freighted with wisdom for the learned," yet "admirably adapted to the masses." Booth urged other editors to "examine the first page of the METHODIST closely, and observe the directness and practical utility of its keen-edged truths." Its emphasis on "pure spirituality" made it "a *peerless* youth, with easy grace and modest mien"

institutions of learning, Friday for foreign missions, Saturday for domestic evangelistic work. Haynes on annual conference tour, "Gratitude and Good Wishes," and "Signs of Improvement," TM, January 5, 1893, p.1. Haynes did not like responsive readings: "this programme included the reading of the Psalter responsively, the repeating of the Apostle's Creed in concert, and other, to us, unmethodistic features...Our Discipline contains ritual enough and has not too much. Let our city preachers avoid going beyond the Discipline in ritualism, and let the country brethren not fall below its requirements. Let us 'not mend our rules but keep them.'" TM July 23, 1891 p. 1. Haynes went fishing with other ministers, TM June 18, 1891 p. 2., Haynes was a sharp critic of the "International Lesson system" for Sunday School; it took the Bible out of Sunday School for children he thought, "The Exclusion of the Bible By Protestants," TM June 25, 1891 p. 1. Haynes's paper also included rather positive thoughts on higher criticism by literary editor J. M. Wright who said "The Bible is immortal, it is God's word. Let them investigate and when the investigation has been thoroughly made and all the light has been thrown upon the sacred pages that the higher criticism can shed the church will step forward, apply her sifting process, garner the truth and throw the chaff to the winds. If the Lord has a work for higher criticism to do and that work has to be done on the battlefield; fear not, the grandest victories of the church in the past have been won in the same way." "Conservatism and Progress," TM June 18, 1891 p. 1.

³¹ "A Grave Matter" ...TM June 30, 1892 p. 1., "A Problem, a Peril, and a Plea," TM, August 18, 1892, p.1.

full of “something alive and warm with the Holy Spirit to quicken and move the Church to a higher plane of evangelical life.” Booth was also “glad you are wide-awake to State and National issues.” J. D. Scott announced that “he who sits upon the tripod sits upon a throne, shaping the destiny of a vast empire for weal or woe,” and praised the paper for its “well-developed spinality,” that “without fear of favor sends forth clean, clear-cut convictions on questions vital to the public interest, and is able to give reasons for the faith that is within.” The paper was “worthy not only of existence, but of a large patronage.”³²

On the first anniversary of publication, Conference humorist W. R. Peebles imagined the paper as a young girl whose parents belong to the “‘masses,’” a “pleasant, good-natured, and kind” child of “modest manners” that had not been “fretful, nor peevish, nor cross.” Peebles encouraged the ‘child’ to be “social and accept all invitations” to travel the connection. He urged the ‘child’ to remember that “your family is wrapped up in you and feel like you are as good as anybody,” even “the great, the famous, and the cultured.” Peebles said “folks who are poor and don’t know much like you,” as “you are a general favorite at our house.” They liked the paper because “you are not stuck up.” The older Peebles encouraged Haynes to attend to the “grand men who have taken their degrees in the University of Itinerancy.” Peebles advised “don’t ever go to winking your eye and shaking your head like you know something and ‘a’int agoin’ to tell.’ And never do you get to insinuating things. If you have anything to say just walk right out into the open and say it.” Peebles pressed the paper to go after men of “bonds and business and boodle,” then joked that that line sounded much like the alliterative Haynes.³³

A supportive J. E. Harrison mocked other “church papers” that “looked with alarm upon”

³² H. L. Booth (from Martin’s Mills, Tenn.), “On Our Paper,” TM June 30, 1892 p. 4. Rev. J. D. Scott (from Seguin, Texas), “Words Commendatory,” TM April 28, 1892, p. 2.

³³ Rev. W. R. Peebles, “Her Birthday,” TM, April 28, 1892, p.2.

the *Methodist*, as if “dynamite was hidden somewhere in its fair tresses, and it was said in effect ‘Look out! The thing is liable to go off!’” Harrison said “those of us who were present at its birth knew the little daughter better than that: we knew that she was a goodly child, mild and kind, sweet-tempered and loving.” Harrison declared “it is stronger, more robust and vigorous than many older children,” and, while growing in strength and power, “it grows sweeter in disposition and more lovely in its manners.” Harrison testified “it is the child of Providence. God’s blessing has been upon it from the beginning.” Harrison rejoiced that “it has brought the ‘Old Jerusalem’ Conference into intimate relation with the other Conferences as nothing else could do” and had “exhibited the true *animus* of this Conference to the Church at large. It has done more to heal all dissensions than could have been accomplished by any other agency. It has opened a way for continual and full intercourse between the churches” and other ministries. It had “presented incentive and opportunity for the latent ability” of Conference preachers, and had “not turned the Conference from the connectional organ. It has not engendered strife among brethren. It has the beatitude of Jesus, ‘Blessed are the peacemakers,’ resting upon it. It has brought forth ripe and sanctified scholarship as a benediction and guide to the young men of the ministry.” Harrison declared “it has presented the Church with the best Editor in the connection. (Don’t you cut this out).” He concluded, “it has in one year accomplished untold good, and has done harm to no one. It has fought for Christ and Methodism, and has boldly combated the kingdom of evil.”³⁴

A distinctive tribute using plainfolk dialect as a symbolic dissent appeared “From Her Doatin Unkle Josiah” from “Mountain Home,” who offered a twelve stanza poem in the paper’s honor. Calling the paper “Tenny” and imagining Haynes as her academy teacher, the author noted that some “that wuz kinder pregudised again’ the enterprize predickted that it would be a

³⁴ Rev. J. E. Harrison, “The Favor of the Lord is Upon It,” TM, April 28, 1892, p. 2.

sorter sore-headed, quarrelsum, mud-flingin' consarn." 'Josiah' then declared his "insaciable gratifykation as techin' the unpresidented success uv our charmin Konference Orgin." The last four stanzas of the poem "Lines to The Tenisee Methodis" read:

An' notwithstandin' that her naim Wuz handed out az evil
By some uv her own *distant* kin Befo' she left her kradle;
Yet she has gone befo' the world On luv's unerrin' mission,
And proved that 'virtue, tho' maligned, Is still above suspicion.
She goes to hearts that is bowed down Beneath the weight of sorrow
An' points 'em to a goalden crown In God's own bright tomorrow
Dear Haynes, in her tuition you've Swept thro' the goalden portal
Uv 'journalistical' success An' made yore naim immortal.³⁵

Whatever immortality Haynes achieved as master of the *Methodist*, episcopal pleasure and support for the conference proved fleeting. While Bishop Fitzgerald called his adopted city of Nashville "the metropolis of Southern Methodism," a group of Tennessee clergy protested when reports appeared that Fitzgerald was to move to California while Haygood was already there. Later Fitzgerald went to Atlanta, but the Tennesseans believed the situation "necessitate[d] the presence of two live Bishops in the great center of Methodism," the 'live' comment a witty reference to the bishops buried on the Vanderbilt campus. But the problem was that Hargrove would be the only bishop present in town once Fitzgerald left. An easier and saner solution would be to ship the offending Hargrove to California instead.³⁶

Episcopal personality and caprice shaped the conference experience in the 1890s. In 1891, well-liked Bishop A. W. Wilson restored several Hargrove-punished Kelley supporters (or '116ers') to key positions. In 1892, prohibition-favoring C. B. Galloway did even a little better,

³⁵ "The 'Ole Barde' On Our Anniversary," TM, April 28, 1892, p. 3.

³⁶ TM, July 23, 1891 p. 3. Episcopal appointments for the 1891-92 year appeared TM July 2, 1891 p. 5. NCA, May 12, 1892, p. 9.

even though bishops Hargrove, W. W. Duncan, and Fitzgerald were all present at conference that year, in what may have been a display of episcopal resolve. But in 1893, with the rougher and firmer Bishop Keener in the chair, the dissenters received demotions. More harshly, Keener got rid of T. J. Duncan, '116er,' prohibition stalwart, General Conference delegate, and excellent, even model, presiding elder, by transferring him to the Los Angeles Conference. Exiled from his conference and sent among strangers, Duncan would never again be elected to General Conference, thus he would never again make speeches or popular resolutions on condemning worldliness in the Church or urging political prohibition as he had in 1890. What the wet ruffians who tried to kill T. J. Duncan during prohibition campaigns in the 1880s could not do, episcopal strong-men like Keener could do. A long and mournful piece titled "The Transfer's Soliloquy" had appeared in the *Methodist* earlier that year. It ended "Thus Bishops do make cowards of us all; and thus the native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of fear, and many a one whose courage seeks the door with this regard, his footsteps turn aside, scared at the name of Bishop."³⁷

Such episcopal intimidation was a response to continued prohibition radicalism by the Tennessee Conference. It worked. After 1893, the conference waffled on its commitment to prohibition, finally arriving at a price too high to pay in T. J. Duncan's exile. But before that, the radicalism had endured. The *Methodist* featured a heavy volume of prohibition material. The Tennessee Conference adopted in 1892 a radical prohibition resolution that declared moral suasion insufficient to address "an evil created at the ballot box and perpetuated by the same instrumentality." The Conference resolution included calls to include temperance instruction in

³⁷ Carter, *History*, 262-263. TM, November 5, 1891, 4-5. TM, October 27, 1892, p. 5. 'A Modern Shakespeare,' "The Transfer's Soliloquy," TM, April 6, 1893, p. 2.

public schools, urged preachers not to place drinking laymen in positions of visibility and influence, recommended the use of grape juice “for Sacramental purposes,” and “heartily” endorsed “the godly women of the Christian Temperance Union.”³⁸

In every issue, Haynes devoted page seven of his eight page weekly to prohibition advocacy, with contributions that showed his wide familiarity with the prohibition movement in Europe and America. He reprinted the sentiments of “low church” ally R. N. Price, who, seeing public support for enacting prohibition laws, not merely fomenting sentiment, in separate articles from Bishops Galloway and Key, declared “the Hargrove-Kelly [sic] case has caused a widespread suspicion of the loyalty of our Southern Bishops to the prohibition cause. The dread of negro supremacy and the dread of the supremacy of a party that antagonizes the South, have seemingly influenced the sentiments of our bishops. But Bishop Key’s talk... had in it the right ring... The church of the present day should get the country into its hands... and... crystalize reform sentiment into statutory and constitutional law. Let us quit saving the party and go to

³⁸ “Report on Temperance,” TM, November 3, 1892, p. 7. The 1891 Report, TM, November 12, 1891, p. 7, reported that nearly 300 licensed saloons operated in Nashville alone, not counting illegal operations. The Savannah District Conference (Tennessee), affirmed “that we are emphatically a prohibition church... we are opposed to all forms of license of this iniquity, whether the same be “high” or “low.” TM, July 23, 1891 p. 4. In this they were affirming and quoting “Report No. 4” of the Committee on Temperance from the 1890 General Conference in St. Louis; that report was reprinted in full by Haynes almost a year later in “The Voice of Our Church,” TM, April 30, 1891 p. 5. A defense of prohibition appeared from S. P. Richardson, reprinted from the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* in Georgia entitled “Prohibition and Politics.” Richardson stated “the one vital mistake prohibitionists have made, and are still making, is in keeping the prohibition issue out of politics. The main reason assigned this is, that a third party would destroy the unity of the Democratic party at the South, and give the radicals control of the politics of the country. ... There is no necessity in Georgia for a third party.” ... “if the whisky men and the lower classes among the negroes can divide the Democracy let them divide. The time has come when the more intelligent prohibitionists can no longer be scared by the whisky howl of dividing the Democracy. We don’t want a third party, all we want is to be represented just what we are, an anti-whisky party.” Richardson, “Prohibition and Politics,” TM, July 16, 1891 p. 7. The nomination of Judge East for governor on Prohibition Party ticket, TM June 9, 1892 p.1. Haynes resented attacks on Prohibition Party leader “Ex-Gov. John P. St. John” made through the *New York Christian Advocate*, and suggested that they were evidence of a cooling of support for prohibition among another Methodist editor, “What Next?,” TM, September 13, 1894, p. 1. See also “Prohibition,” including quotation of Bishop McTyeire, and “Prohibition v. Local Option” by T. A. Kerley (disagreeing with D. C. Kelley). TM, July 16, 1891 p. 7.

saving the country.”³⁹

Haynes ran a lengthy symposium on prohibition and political parties in the summer of 1893 that sparked an extended debate. The articles ranged from standard affirmations of a non-political church to those that declared voting itself a political act that already politicized the church, effectively named voting for the Democratic Party an act of sin, and urged “a suitable political home” and “a pure clean political church” over complicity with the corrupting and home-wrecking liquor menace.⁴⁰

While episcopal appointment power remained an essential means for enforcing order, for Haynes – by custom, free from interference as editor of a conference paper – the greater threat remained Hoss’s *Advocate*. Increasingly, the question of dissent and complaint became the locus of dissent. The question being debated was should the Methodist press, or preachers through that press, should criticize episcopal administration, the editor of the NCA, or any other connectional officer? Hoss’s answer was an emphatic no. Only the NCA editor and the bishops had that right according to the 1890s MECS Court party.⁴¹

An exchange between Hoss and Haynes appeared in May 1892 that reminded everyone that Hoss remained an active opponent. Haynes printed commentary about the MEC General Conference debate on women’s admission as delegates on May 12 that wondered if the MEC

³⁹ R. N. Price, “The Country, Not the Party,” TM August 18, 1892 p. 7, (reprinted from *Holston Methodist*). Galloway was in Ireland, lamenting that the statue to temperance advocate Father Mathew – who had not pressed to enactment of law – stood tragically over a nighty display of drunken behavior.

⁴⁰ Fuller discussion in Coker, *Liquor*, 106-107. The discussion appeared in the May 25, June 15, 22, 29, and July 6, and 13 issues (1893) of the *Tennessee Methodist*.

⁴¹ “Church Government,” TM, April 30, 1891 p. 2. by Rev. J. E. Harrison of Murfreesboro, Tenn., affirmed three principles: the rule of the majority (shown in General Conference power), public officers are public servants (even the actions of bishops can be overturned by General Conference), and government by the people (equal voting rights for laity and clergy in General Conference – “the MECS is not in much danger of becoming priest-ridden.”

would “swiftly sweep” in a change to its constitution. Declaring that Haynes had fired “The First Gun” of revolution against the constitution of the MECS, Hoss attacked him for calling for women to have voting rights in General Conference. Hoss called Haynes un-American and proceeded to accuse him of being a continental revolutionary out of step with the “common sense of all English-speaking peoples.”⁴²

Haynes’s response entitled “A Blank Cartridge,” said that Hoss had been hunting for something to accuse Haynes of since the paper started. To Hoss’s exaggerated outrage and lecturing, Haynes wrote of Hoss, “our learned brother, who is oracular and ex cathedra or nothing.” Noting Hoss’s dramatic reference to Haynes’s use of alliteration, Haynes riffed “alliteration seems to annoy the amiability of the ardent advocate of allegiance who conducts so curiously the connectional tripod on the curving Cumberland.” Haynes charged, “He *seems* to fear that the Editor of the METHODIST conceals arrant anarchy ‘neath the apt alliteration’s artful aid,’ and he hears the crashing of constitutions and the rumbling of ruinous revolutions, and his eye catches the gleams of lurid lawlessness leaping lustily in mid heaven.” Then Haynes asked directly why Hoss would decry Haynes’s supposed radicalism. Haynes charged “it serves just now a needed purpose of diverting attention,” whereby for those who did not know Haynes, it would “serve to break the influence of other statements of the METHODIST.”⁴³

Hoss’s follow up June 9 was laden with cleverly-worded charges of intellectual, moral, and spiritual vice in those he argued with, including the indication that Haynes was hiding his gender liberalism. Haynes may have been hiding it or he may have been trying to avoid an escalation of the brewing feud. He may also have understood that the issue would distract from

⁴² “The First Gun,” NCA, May 26, 1892 p. 9.

⁴³ “A Blank Cartridge,” TM, June 2, 1892, p. 1.

the wider points he hoped to press. Haynes again addressed the topic but ignored Hoss's demand that he reveal his opinion on woman delegates to General Conference. Hoss's front page on June 9 rebuked censoriousness and fault-finding, while featuring four separate items exposing MEC flaws. In August, he was baiting the 'St. Louis' as he had Haynes, this time demanding to know its position on union with the MEC. At his worst, Hoss tried to provoke newspaper fights, especially fights that would allow for criticisms of northern Methodist radicalism. He often branded fellow MECS clergy and editors with a standard list of charges then criticized them for their supposed fifth-column enmity toward the MECs. Hoss did play an important role in establishing a theoretical framework for MEC-MECS ecumenical relations, in part, by showing hopeful ecumenists just how difficult the process of reunion would be.⁴⁴

The tone of the debate grew harder during 1893 as the 'critics of criticism' became more aggressive. In turn, the defenders of the right to criticize, including Haynes, became more defiant. One remarkable protest came from "Backwoods Preacher" writing from Almatville, Tennessee. "Backwoods" wrote that "you know it's democratic to suppress everything that can't be answered. That's democratic, but the Methodists didn't use to do things that way." He said "prudent' . . . used to mean" avoidance of "anything that would defile you. But it's got to mean

⁴⁴ "A Blank Cartridge," NCA June 9, 1892, p. 1. St. Louis feuding, "An Inexact Critic," NCA August 18, 1892, p.1, and two items of NCA September 1, 1892, p. 1, and two more items, NCA December 1, 1892, p. 1, and NCA "A Rejoinder," December 29, 1892, p. 9. . On the disloyalty of MECS clergy who criticize their own church, NCA September 29, 1892, p. 1. On women as emotional, illogical, NCA August 25, 1892, p.1. Attacking Haynes and the 'St. Louis,' "The Little Rock Conference," NCA December 22, 1892, p. 9. The standard list of treasonous sins in Hoss's opinion were to be soft on 'mush-headed' women, soft on negroes' incompetence, unsupportive of The Democracy, soft on hating Yankees/MEC, soft on bashing the Yankee MEC woman-led WCTU, soft on bashing the Yankee MEC mush-headed woman-founded holiness movement, and soft on Episcopal prerogative. These equaled the same thing, i.e., to be an enemy of Hoss's MECS. Hoss's biographer named his book *Elijah Embree Hoss: Ecumenical Methodist*. It is true, Hoss was an active participant in many ecumenical exchanges, his selection sufficient evidence that the MECS took a very cautious approach toward making ecumenical progress with the MEC. More importantly, Hoss outlined correctly the necessary grounds for organic union, in particular, actual fraternal, co-equal relations wherein both 'hands would be visible.' There were many MECS clergy who enjoyed feuding with the MEC, and apparently many more in the MEC who likewise scored points for themselves by this means. But no one in the MECS did more than Hoss to delay the advance of fraternal practice.

now...to preachers, don't you say anything about the whisky traffic; if you do the old moneybag member will be around at Conference and have your head cut off—have you taken down from your big station and put on Post Oak Circuit.” “Backwoods” wondered “why can't other preachers tell the truth as well as Sam Jones?” He then admitted “if I did like some of the preachers in the premise, I would act like them in the conclusion. If I voted the whisky ticket I would at least not say anything against a thing I helped to perpetuate.” “Backwoods” said “I like to see a fellow consistent.” He declared “they call a preacher a crank if he tells the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God. I kinder like the name. A crank in use means something, and if the church don't need moving I'm no philosopher.” He addressed Haynes, saying “Hope you won't take any offense at me if I have broken your city rules. You must just attribute it to my want of culture. I am out in the hills, started from the hills, and am holding my own first rate. Will be ready to move at Conference if only money bags don't like my style.”⁴⁵

On March 16, Hoss published a paragraph on ‘place seeking’ accusing an anonymous preacher of hypocrisy because he had complained of politicking for bishop even though some of his friends had approached Hoss on his behalf, the only person whose friends ever approached Hoss. Haynes objected in “Having Eyes and Seeing Not” on March 23—the papers were published on the same day of the week—that Hoss had trivialized a serious topic and had cast aspersions on all whose concerns about place seeking were well known, as the suspicion and ridicule would likely be easily transferred to them. Haynes asked “is this the process by which the Advocate would deliver us over to an evil which has flooded the [MEC] and whose rising tide in our own Church all who have eyes and will use them do plainly see and deplore?” On

⁴⁵ ‘Backwoods Preacher,’ “Almaville, Tenn.,” TM, January 12, 1893, p. 4.

March 30, misquoting Haynes, Hoss answered “With Our Compliments,” writing that the *Methodist* was “indulging in a spell of the blues;” Hoss said “we are sorry, really sorry, not to be wiser and better than we are...but do not scold us in bad English. It hurts our feelings. We trust that the Methodist will be able to see the end which this innocent paragraph ‘is calculated and was designed to accomplish’” On April 6, Haynes wrote a single sentence comment, top left: “A man is sometimes charged with having ‘the blues’ when he only has ‘the facts.’”⁴⁶

Haynes reprinted an article by W. T. Poynter lamenting Bishop Hendrix’s reply to MEC Bishop Foster. A Missourian expected to lead the MECS to warmer relations with the MEC, Hendrix had been less gracious and ecumenically-minded than Poynter and Haynes had hoped. Haynes offered to print any Hendrix response to the criticism. The *Memphis Christian Advocate* quoted Haynes’s comments with a one word commentary: “My!” To this Haynes wrote, “An Unfinished Paragraph Finished,” saying (in the voice of his critics) “The IDEA that *anybody* should see *anything* amiss at *any* time, *anywhere* in *anything* that *any BISHOP* under *any* circumstances may do or say!! Horrors!!! Treason!!! Down with the Rebellion!!!”⁴⁷

On April 13 Hoss replied to Haynes’s mention of facts, asking anyone with evidence of ‘rings’ intended to control Church offices to send it along for Hoss’s condemnation. Simony was a heinous sin, said Hoss, yet “the mere vulgar itch for notoriety is nearly as bad.” Hoss then accused Haynes – anyone reading both papers would know the entire paragraph was aimed at Haynes – of having accused “the average itinerant preacher” in the MECS with place seeking. April 20, Haynes answered both the question of union with the MEC and Hoss’s intimation that

⁴⁶ NCA, March 16, 1893, p. 1. “Having Eyes and Seeing Not,” TM March 23, 1893, p. 1. “With Our Compliments,” NCA March 30, 1893, p. 1. TM April 6, 1893, p. 1.

⁴⁷ (From Poynter) “An Unfinished Paragraph Finished,” TM, March 30, 1893, p. 1.

Haynes was a vulgar yellow journalist. Haynes published a forum on union including commentary from bishops Granbery and Fitzgerald, as well as Bishop Hurst of the MEC. Haynes, decidedly pro MEC-MECS union, declared that editors seeking popularity and promotion in both churches had scored points toward that end by “fresh exhumation of malodorous bones.” He undoubtedly had Hoss in mind, who had implied the MEC did not care about union on March 30, lectured James Mudge of the MEC on the virtues of MECS Bishop Joshua Soule on March 30, had devoted his top center editorial to long quotes of others’ comments on Confederate generals on March 16, and criticized the MEC *Northwestern Christian Advocate* for not condemning a lynching in Iowa on April 6. The week after Haynes’s rebuke, on April 27, Hoss wrote a short piece about banning honorary degrees unless the recipients could “write ten consecutive sentences of good English,” and a long and humorous jeremiad against unworthy colleges entitled ““John Smith, President of Blow-Hard College.””⁴⁸

Having expressed his frustrations about matters academic, Hoss returned to sectionalist form on May 4. The lengthy “Love Licks” spent two thirds of page one decrying the injustice of MEC criticism of lynching in the South. Two other items on page one accused the MEC of racial hypocrisy and lawless General Conferences. Hoss argued with three MEC editors on one page, plus scolding British clergy for overplaying their honorary degrees: “it is safe to say that any American minister attaching D.D., or LL.D., to his signature would be promptly laughed out of countenance.” Per the conventions of the time in *America*, top left on the masthead could be found “E. E. Hoss, D.D., Editor.” He whispered that all reformers “setting the universe right” were spiritual hypocrites, and insinuated hypocrisy against Haynes again on May 25th.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ “Plain Talk,” NCA April 13, 1893, p. 1. “Our Discussion,” TM April 20, 1893, p. 1. NCA, April 27, 1893, p. 1.

⁴⁹ “Love Licks,” and various, NCA May 4, 1893, p. 1. On May 25, Hoss said “it behooves the professional reformer to be consistent. The man, for example, who sets himself up as the special champion of the Lord’s Day can scarcely

On May 25, Haynes praised statements by Bishop Haygood urging laity to take the lead in raising connectional collections. On June 1, Haynes wrote of Haygood's "High Steeple and Its Official Staff," heartily affirming the bishop's call for greater discipline on worldliness and concern for the focus on moneyed men. He also reprinted large sections of Haygood's paper on page one. But Haynes noted that the same picture had "been drawn by others whose only reward for their pains has been to be dubbed 'dyspeptics,' 'pessimists,' 'cranks,' and 'old fogies,'" and that they had 'bad livers' or a case of 'the blues.'" He also noted that Haygood blamed large church pastors for failure to discipline. While Haynes agreed there were such cases, he echoed the widespread clergy complaint that bishops often moved pastors doing exactly what they should through the influence of complaining members, the same rich and powerful men Haygood mentioned. Haynes longed for "an assurance that henceforth the preachers who faithfully executed discipline would be sustained by the appointing power." Haynes boldly said that keeping "pure, spiritual men" in place in such powerful churches could bring the low and high church positions together, for "just here is a fruitful and needy field for the exercise of the very high prerogative with which we have invested our bishops."⁵⁰

be justified in the sight of his own conscience unless he practices a strict conformity to the Fourth Commandment. The religious editor who denounces the Sunday newspaper is bound to confine his own labors within six days. Let us all begin by reforming ourselves, and then we shall find it an easier task to straighten out our neighbors." NCA, May 25, 1893, p. 1. For contrast in ecumenical attitude, on May 18, 1893, the NCA ran a report on p. 9 from the Southern Baptist Convention that quoted Bishop Fitzgerald's incredibly warm-hearted, humorous, and brief speech.

⁵⁰ "Bishop Haygood on the Situation," TM, June 1, 1893 p. 1. For earlier Tennessee Conference complaints that bishops had allowed a 'back door' wherein lay members could influence the bishops' appointment see reviews of T. A. Kerley's sermon "Relation of Pastor and People," that was also printed as a tract by the publishing house, T. J. Duncan's review, NCA June 6, 1889 p. 14. "Relation of Pastor and People: A Sermon by Rev. T. A. Kerley," by J. M. Wright, NCA, June 27, 1889, p.7. "Relation of Pastor and People," by B. F. Haynes, NCA July 4, 1889 p.20. The sermon also addressed disagreements regarding the appointment of Methodist clergy and the proper roles, duties, and rights of laity, bishops and preachers in that regard. See also "Itinerancy and Episcopacy," by D. C. Kelley, NCA August 22, 1889, p. 5, "Itinerancy and Episcopacy: Second Paper" by D.C. Kelley, NCA August 29, 1889, p. 14, "Episcopacy and Itinerancy: No. III." By D C. Kelley, NCA October 31, 1889 p. 4, and "Episcopacy and Itinerancy No. IV," by D. C. Kelley, NCA November 14, 1889 p. 5.

The June 1 issue of the NCA there were two items by Haygood. Page 3 found him defending the “natural and social order” by keeping women from voting as part of a complaint against conferences endorsing outside organizations. Haygood’s target was WCTU, as Candler had been warring against the North Georgia Conference endorsement of the organization. On page 5, Haygood said much “curious” writing had appeared in Church papers of late arguing “let a faithful pastor enforce discipline; off goes his head next Conference.” Haygood declared that “such writing” was neither discussion of polity, nor an argument about an office, but “an attack upon persons – only ten of them.” If such statements were true, Haygood said they should be made only once every four years to the General Conference Committee on Episcopacy, and the bishops charged with either a moral failing for colluding with worldly people or for “imbecility” since the bishop had been duped by them. Haygood told those who firmly believed such charges they should acquire proof, bring charges (again, only once every four years), and they should sign their names to public statements they make outside that only proper means. He concluded that, “a man of high honor,” who believed this to be true and was not willing to “complain’ in the disciplinary way, would probably quit a Church to which he could not be faithful without being degraded by its chief officers.”⁵¹

On June 8, Haynes reprinted in full Bishop Fitzgerald’s “Episcopal Methodism at the Forks of the Road” that warned of a drift toward congregationalism in both mainline Methodisms due to pre-conference machinations by wealthy urban congregations. Fitzgerald noted complaints about “so-called ‘giraffes’ who feed in the high stalls of the favored charges,” perhaps especially pastors of such charges who sought or accepted transfer to such appointments

⁵¹ Haygood, “Conference Indorsements,” p. 3, and “Concerning Discipline and Bishops,” p. 5., NCA June 1, 1893. NCA June 8, 1893, p. 1 a notice appeared with Hoss’s approval that Bishop Hendrix would take three months off every year for study.

within other conferences. In the same issue, Haynes boldly published a symposium composed of responses to Fitzgerald's argument from ten current or former presiding elders from the Tennessee Conference, including Haynes's own reply. Taken together, the Tennessee presiding elders entirely rejected Fitzgerald's claim that the threat came from "congregationalism," since congregations were not voting. Rather a few laymen were influencing, and secretly so, often without the knowledge of the rest of the congregation. They further rejected the claim that preachers of any kind had anything to do with this 'evil.' Only the bishops were to blame, and only the bishops were responsible to solve the problem. T. J. Duncan punched hard, answering 'how we got there' with "by 'the administrators' [the odd term Fitzgerald had used to refer to bishops] yielding to the clamor of a few misrepresentatives. One dozen men in a congregation of a thousand, decreeing that one pastor must go and another come. 'The administrators' saying 'Amen.' Nine hundred and eighty-eight members 'submitting' 'for the good of the Church.' (?)"

The bishops had created the 'giraffe class' by their own doing, and now complained of its existence. Duncan demanded that any pastor of a church over six hundred who made \$2000 or more a year who had arrested, tried, and expelled any member in the past twelve months for worldliness to send his name to Haynes. The worldliness of urban churches, the existence of a (supposed) giraffe class of selfish and ambitious men who should have stayed in their own conference, were the bishops' doing. Worse – these episcopal misdeeds created a situation where faithful laity at 'High Steeple' were "dominated by blatant worldlings until they do not expect to be heard in the councils of the church." Duncan declared "Nay, my good Bishop, 'four millions of living Episcopal Methodists' are powerless to answer. They do not transfer men. They do not make the appointments. 'Administrators' and their gratuitous advisers have wrought this evil. Let 'the administrators' and their *legal* advisers [the presiding elders] undo it." T. A. Kerley

answered the question ‘how we got there’ by declaring “*the who* will largely explain *the how*,” and noted that bishops only ignored presiding elders when rich churches were involved.⁵²

Haynes’s own rebuttal agreed with the dissent, but took a more sympathetic approach toward the bishops’ situation. He declared it was not congregational democracy or a combination of itinerancy and congregationalism threatening the church as Fitzgerald claimed, but rather but an unmethodistic mixing “of itinerancy and autocracy.” “Our system cannot and will not bear much longer the unnatural and illogical strain put upon it of grafting on an Episcopal itinerant economy an aristocratic feature.” It was “the banker, the capitalist, the wealthy manufacturer or merchant,” seeking influence, “nearly always the worldly element.” Haynes said if the bishops thought the system needing mending they should have sought to do so legally instead of acting “without the warrant of law.” Bishops faced “the too onerous burden which we impose upon them.” The current law burdened “good but fallible men” with duties only the infallible could meet, and he proposed that the cabinet be given more responsibility by requiring consultation, banning “so hurtful” ‘vest pocket’ appointments by requiring all appointments be made in open cabinet. Such reforms would “relieve” bishops and the church of the “unhappiest mistakes of so common occurrence.” Haynes said some bishops past and present had also asked the cabinet to vote on appointments, and said this was “possibly a wise step.” These reforms would also place presiding elders in the situation of having to meet “face to face the charges and the men.” Haynes echoed W. R. Peebles’ suggestion that laymen be added to the cabinet. Haynes declared it “unjust to put upon the bishops all blame for mistakes and infelicities in appointments so many of which, under our present system, they cannot avoid

⁵² Bishop O. P. Fitzgerald, “Episcopal Methodism at the Forks of the Road, TM, June 8, 1893, p. 4. Reprinted from *Zion’s Herald*. TM, June 8, 1893, p. 2-3.

making.”⁵³

Off conference transfer, pastor of McKendree, and preacher of such skill that R. N. Price called him “the Chrysostom of our Zion,” Samuel Augustus (S.A.) Steel, bitterly protested against Haygood’s “High Steeple” in the NCA on June 15. Haygood had howled at “trial by newspaper” over complaints about anonymous bishops without specific charges. Steel declared Haygood guilty of the same, having cast aspersions on every pastor of a large urban congregation. Further Haygood sought to “hide himself behind the Committee on Episcopacy.” “If recreant pastors are to be tried by the newspaper,” Steel demanded, “let recreant Bishops appear at the same tribunal. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander – even though he wears a miter!” On page one of that same issue, Hoss delivered a characteristic shot at Steel: “When a brother who has been transferred divers and sundry times, and who is known to keep an eye on every good appointment, writes an article pitching into the Bishops for creating a class of giraffes, he must be set down as a little absent-minded.” Two paragraphs above, Hoss said it was an odd “fact” that those who complained about the system most benefitted the most from it. “We have a theory of our own about it, which we do not care to propound just now.” Hoss did not introduce Steel’s comments with his charges where they appeared on page five: his charge was against an anonymous person, but everyone understood he meant Steel.⁵⁴

Haynes aggressively responded to Steel’s protest and Hoss’s shot at Steel’s character in June 15th issue of the *Methodist*. Haynes reprinted Haygood’s June 1 article, and both NCA items from the 15th in full. Stating that Hoss was referring to Steel, Haynes asked what transfer

⁵³ “The Forks of the Road,” TM June 8, 1893, p. 1.

⁵⁴ S. A. Steel, “Concerning Discipline and Bishops,” NCA, June 15, 1893, p. 5. NCA, June 15, 1893, p. 1. “Letter from R. N. Price,” TM January 4, 1894, p. 1.

frequency had to do “with the validity or invalidity of the arguments and facts [Steel] employs in an article?” He asked, “Who is responsible for the appointment of these preachers to “High Steeple Churches... who reappoints them from year to year, and holds them there?” Lastly, Haynes asked was “anonymity any greater sin in a common preacher than a bishop?” Then Haynes responded to Haygood’s hints that his critics were dishonorable cowards saying that if the bishop would furnish the names of non-disciplining pastors, he would be “promptly furnished with the names, dates, churches and facts by the other side in substantiation of their charges.” Haygood backed off, and his “exoneration” of Steel appeared the next week. But Haygood reiterated his view that saying “High Steeple preachers” was equal to saying “John Doe;” but the bishops “are persons.”⁵⁵

On June 15th, T. J. Duncan’s “Letter from Texas and Arkansas” appeared. Duncan reported on a Sam Jones ““for men only”” service in Dallas where 2000 men committed themselves to Christ. Duncan gushed over the warmth of his fellowship with “ministerial brethren” on the trip and reported that “their praises of the Tennessee Methodist are long and loud....The truth is,” Duncan said, “the establishment of that paper was an inspiration. The reasons given why it is so joyfully hailed in western homes are inspiring.” Many western Methodists were Tennesseans, said Duncan, who were “intelligent and broad. They do not believe that a religious journal should be bound up over two or three ideas... yet they are neither fanatical or heretical.” Duncan reported “they simply demur to the idea that they are compelled to exclude freedom of thought and speech. Your symposiums are inspiring to them,” since it was “refreshing and instructive to read what the other fellow has to say.” Duncan solemnly declared that the paper’s backers in Tennessee “have but little idea of the far-reaching influence it exerts,

⁵⁵ “Concerning Discipline, Bishops and High Steeple Pastors,” TM June 15, 1893 p. 1. Haygood, “In Exoneration of Dr. Steel,” NCA June 22, 1893 p. 9.

and the hold it is taking on the Church.” Duncan noted the original opposition to the paper, including the suspicion that it had neither money nor brains to succeed. But “our brethren from east to west are beginning to say that they are anxious to hear from ‘the Hub’ matters of information ‘good to the use of edifying.’ A smothered press! ‘Angles and ministers of grace defend us!’” Duncan declared “we have seen some of its evils in the past. God grant that we may never witness it... again.” Authors from the Memphis Conference and “Georgia” noted the impact of the paper as well, with “Georgia” declaring that some Methodist preachers “can read, and even think; some also have memories; some call no man master, and are ready to contend... for freedom of thought, liberty of expression...freedom of the press... I doubt the propriety... of having *dead* men on the tripods of the Southern Methodist Church.”⁵⁶

Haynes meanwhile protested the “very mischievous” sentiment that bishops could not be criticized by religious editors. A paper that “set itself for the defense of the bishops, right or wrong, and aims to reflect only their views or such as they will endorse, has prostituted a high and sacred trust to the basest uses.” Haynes declared he would have to part with his “self-respect and manhood and integrity” to accept editorship of a church paper under those rules. Such a paper becomes “repressive, timid, narrow, reactionary...” Haynes declared “what a travesty... does such a journal present?” The “freeness and fullness” of discussion were the “only safe basis

⁵⁶ T. J. Duncan, “Letter from Texas and Arkansas,” TM, June 15, 1893, p. 4. The paper was reported to “have a large circulation throughout our bounds,” by J. C. Hooks of the Memphis Conference, TM, June 22, 1893, p. 4. “Georgia,” “Congratulatory,” TM June 22, 1893, p. 7. W. R. Peebles reported that the TM was “very much in favor with the preachers of this Conference, as evidenced by many kind words and a largely increased subscription list,” “Northwest Texas Conference,” TM, December 7, 1893, p. 2. Bishop Hendrix claimed that one fourth of the clergy and one sixth of the membership of the MECS were in Missouri, Texas, and Arkansas, NCA January 24, 1895, p. 10. Children got into the paper too. Maggie Crouch wrote to the paper “My mamma takes the *Tennessee Methodist*, and I love to read the little letters so much. I am 8 years old. I live in the country. We have had so many roses this spring. I have three little brothers. We go to Sunday school every Sunday. I will not write anymore as this is my first letter to you.” The response: “What a happy little girl you must be, Maggie, with ‘the country, roses, little brothers, and Sunday school.’ Ed.” TM, June 22, 1893, p. 6.

for wise and helpful legislation.” Claiming that bishops were “public” men who should be accountable to the press just as political figures were, Haynes condemned a “tongue-tied and column-locked Church press,” and noted Fitzgerald’s call for change. Haynes asked pointedly “shall we seriously address ourselves to the problem... or with the apathy of death shall we resent every disturbance of our false security and every protest against the flood-tide of worldliness in the Church as the impertinent interference of disgruntled and disloyal men, and politely invite them to find more congenial environments outside Methodism?”⁵⁷

That week, Hoss denied rumors that he was weak on prohibition, and also that MECS bishops had more power than the MEC bishops had, even declaring that the MECS would “not tolerate for a moment” the “personal administration” MEC bishops practiced. He further decried the “drift” toward democracy, saying “a little extra conservatism” was needed in the face of those pleading “for the breaking of bonds and the termination of oppression.” Hoss declared “it is well to have a safe hand at the brakes.” Hoss waited until July 20 to answer Haynes’s statement about obsequious Methodist papers by simply denying any such papers existed. Hoss continued firing shots at the *Methodist* throughout the late summer. By October, Hoss said “we are informed by a number of friends that reports adverse to the editorial management of this paper are afloat in the Church,” refused the suggestion that he reply, and accused his critics of immoral conduct.⁵⁸

Over the summer, Bishop Hendrix came under fire for his stated reasons for moving a Virginia pastor, H. C Cheatham, who said he was moved because of lay complaints about his preaching against worldliness. Hendrix denied that he had removed Cheatham for that reason by saying that if Cheatham were a brave man he would have preached what he thought best while

⁵⁷ “On Criticism of the Bishops,” TM June 29, 1893, p. 1.

⁵⁸ NCA, June 29, 1893, p. 1. NCA, July 20, 1893, p. 1. NCA, October 5, 1893, p. 1.

accepting the fact that he would likely be moved at the end of the year. It was a staggering admission from a bishop who seemed to have no idea that he was conceding the entire case to his critics. Both sides seem to have agreed on the following order of events: a preacher preached against things Methodist preachers were supposed to preach against according to the Discipline and the most recent episcopal address, leading a few laity to complain about the harshness of that discipline, leading a bishop to move the preacher somewhere else. The only difference in Hendrix's claim was that preachers who preached against sin should be man enough to expect the bishop will move them. Hendrix's act was justified by the claim that an honorable preacher would accept that it was just. Hendrix's defense suggested that he genuinely believed in episcopal infallibility. Many thought the case proved otherwise, just as Haygood's attack on preachers had. So, too, had Fitzgerald's suggestion that preachers and laity were to blame for the specter of "congregationalism," and Hargrove's abuse of Kelley and his conference. To dissenters, it seemed the bishops were putting on a clinic on fallibility. R. N. Price charged Hendrix with introducing a "new kind of martyrdom," wherein, instead of the world, the church and "the appointing power" inflicted the pain. S. A. Steel declared "the dogma of episcopal infallibility has received its death-blow," and boldly announced he would obey God, not Hendrix, for "after the Conference and the cabinet comes the judgment."⁵⁹

Appealing to Luther and Wesley, Haynes's "Our Radical Need" blamed prayerlessness

⁵⁹ H. C. (or H. R.?) Cheatham, "A Serious Question Raised," TM May 18, 1893, p. 3. E. R. Hendrix, "A Correction," TM, June 22, 1893, p. 1. Protests against Hendrix's justification in insinuation of cowardice appeared July 6, 1893 p. 2 from Cheatham "Bishop Hendrix's Correction," and C. L. Chilton of Auburn, Alabama, "Bishop Hendrix's Admission." "The Question of Discipline," (from R. N. Price), TM July 13, 1893, p. 1. S. A. Steel, "Preaching Against Sin," TM July 20, 1893, p. 2. Steel's thoughtful, kind, and bold article included the following, "it has been a long time since Bishop Haygood was a pastor. His views on this question are theoretical rather than practical." For an example of the infallibility doctrine in words, see the fawning by J. Wofford Tucker of Sanford, Fla., "Brother Cheatham and Bishop Hendrix," TM, July 20, 1893, p. 2. Steel's criticism and Tucker's 'glorying in men' were consecutive articles that appeared on the same page of the *Tennessee Methodist*. Tucker's argument seems to be that if an error were admitted, it would mean that an "unworthy man" had been elected bishop.

for the symptomatic troubles facing the church. Haynes said, “we are attempting to run the Church by our own strength and wisdom, and upon worldly plans and policies. We trust to money, to organization.” Haynes said “while it is all right to discuss” problems, even essential, “mere criticism will never remedy the troubles.” Haynes wondered if the MECS should suspend all operations and preaching for a month or three while every preacher spent that time in secluded and searching prayer, “shut up alone with his conscience and his God.” That same issue of July 13, Haynes introduced and printed E. M. Bounds’s “An Open Letter to Bishop Fitzgerald” that linked episcopal lack of support for pastors to the genuine threat of spiritual collapse: “we have fallen into what looks like an arbitrary, irresponsible aristocracy.” Still an editor of the NCA, Bounds declared “our venerated system lies at the feet of a self-appointed junta. Against this perversion, our sense of right, our manliness, and our devotion to the system cry out.” The anomalies started, said Bounds, with vest pocket appointments wherein pastors who performed some service for bishops were “taken care of,” but eventually led to the “current, widespread, and demoralizing” impression that those pastors who did right would “not be supported by the authorities.” In turn, Hoss rebuked his own assistant editor for his slur on episcopal prerogative. Haynes defended editors’ dissenting speech because religious papers, “in a preeminent sense, occup[ied] the position of watchman on the walls of Zion,” and quipped that, contra “The Optimist’s Dream,” watchmen were not supposed to wake people with cries of “peace.”⁶⁰

⁶⁰ “Our Radical Need,” TM July 13, 1893, p. 1. E. M. Bounds, “An Open Letter to Bishop Fitzgerald,” TM July 13, 1893, p. 2. “The Optimist’s Dream,” TM August 24, 1893, p. 1. Hoss had declined to publish Bounds’ essay, he claimed, because he had also refused to publish Fitzgerald’s original letter. E. E. Hoss, “A Personal Note,” TM, August 3, 1893, p. 1. Hoss attacked the Assistant Editor saying that Bounds was nowhere to be found, adding “when he finds it convenient to return from his extended vacation...” Bound’s defense noted that physicians had told him to seek mountain air and denied that he had ever taken vacation, E. M. Bounds, “A Personal Explanation,” TM September 7, 1893, p. 2. See also “Coming Over,” TM, August 31, 1893, p. 1 where Haynes notes that Editors Kirkland, Armstrong, Bennett, Boswell, and DuBose were debating against him on the issue of how widespread

As annual conference season was beginning in October, Hoss strangely wrote of “Tennessee Methodism.” He said “we are occasionally asked in all seriousness by friends at a distance whether it is really true that Tennessee Methodism has degenerated as much as certain recent discussions would seem to imply.” Hoss followed with a formal, correct, and tepid denial of the impression he had labored so long to create. In the same issue, Hoss printed Joshua [?] Harrison’s lengthy defense of the connectional paper and attack on the *Tennessee Methodist* and other journals (all unnamed) that pushed subscriptions beyond the formal bounds of the annual conferences that supported them. Conference papers that circulated beyond their restricted bounds were “disloyal.” By implication, any person who took a paper not from her or his own conference was fomenting “disaffection.” Harrison preferred that “one mind” would prevail and shape denominational ideas, rather than “many minds,” a policy that hinted at the illegitimacy of conference and conferencing at all. Harrison did not address the question of what those who were criticized by that one voice should do in response. Were they to be denied the right of self-defense or even free thought in a ‘one mind’ church? Under Fitzgerald’s more open and ‘connectional’ editorship of ‘the connectional,’ there had been less handwringing about “loyalty.”⁶¹

In October 1893, Keener was presiding bishop for Tennessee. Meeting in Lebanon, the conference elected delegates for the 1894 General Conference. Haynes was elected leader of delegation with 125 votes on the first ballot. It took more ballots to complete the clergy

certain sins were in the MECS. R. N. Price agreed with Haynes, “Keep the Church Pure,” TM September 7, 1893, p. 1. The entire September 14, 1893 issue of the *Tennessee Methodist* responded to his optimistic critics with extensive commentary from Haynes. Haynes writing of the 1893 financial collapse and its effects on Nashville, “An Earnest Word,” TM August 17, 1893, p. 1.

⁶¹ “Tennessee Methodism,” NCA October 12, 1893, p. 1. Joshua [?]. Harrison, “The Journalism of Our Church,” NCA October 12, 1893, p. 3. The middle initial is unintelligible. No geographical location was given for the writer.

delegation of H. B. Reams, W. R. Peebles, J. M. Wright, J. E. Harrison, W. J. Collier, and last, D. C. Kelley. T. A. Kerley and T. L. Darnell were alternates. All were ‘116’ Kelley supporters, a fact that opponents from other conferences held up as significant (only one ‘25er’ had been elected four years before). John E. Harrison, acting editor in Haynes’s post-conference month-long absence for vacation in Salt Lake City, said of Haynes “the vote he received – 125 – is the largest, perhaps, ever cast in this Conference for a delegate to the General Conference. Dr. McFerrin, eight years ago, received 111 votes on first ballot.” The 1893 Report of the Temperance Committee declared that they would “support no party or man at the ballot-box committed to the whisky power.”⁶²

Hoss’s speech to the Tennesseans on “the claims and policy” of the NCA “defined the attitude of the paper toward local Conference organs.” Declaring in “very strong language” his opposition to politics in the NCA, he boasted that he had allowed both sides of the “silver question” to appear in its pages. Hoss reported from Holston Conference that “the Rev. B. F. Haynes, of the Tennessee Methodist, as energetic as a steam engine, mixed with the brethren, and pushed the subscription list of his paper.” Haynes’s Holston report was more detailed and informative, and appeared a week earlier than did Hoss’s fluffier report.⁶³

In his Lebanon speech, Hoss had “gravely declared” that “the church press has no right to criticize the administration of our chief pastors.” Haynes wrote that this “monstrous claim”

⁶² Carter, *History*, 268. “Conference Journal,” TM October 26, 1893, p. 4. “Tennessee Conference,” TM November 2, 1893 p. 4. Reams received 107 on the first ballot, W. R. “Buck” Peebles 93, J M Wright 87, and J. E. Harrison 83, on the second ballot. W. J. Collier received 81 on the third ballot, and D. C. Kelley 64 on the fifth ballot. “Our Delegates,” TM November 2, 1893, p. 1. Court spokesman John W. Boswell of *Memphis Christian Advocate* had waived the flag of conference radicalism. John E. Harrison punched back at Boswell, TM Dec 21, 1893 p. 4. Boswell’s slight was enough for T. J. Duncan to write – FROM LOS ANGELES – defending the Tennessee Conference for its choice in delegates to General Conference, TM December 21, 1893 p. 2. A list of all General Conference Delegates, NCA April 19, 1893, p. 3.

⁶³ “Tennessee Conference,” NCA, October 26, 1893, p. 2. “The Holston Conference, NCA October 26, 1893, p. 9. TM, October 19, 1893, p. 1.

approached “infallibility,” and complained of ““personal journalism”” that consisted of “tame and insipid” news gathering with occasional excursions “into some ancient cemetery to perform the ghoulish feat of exhuming the malodorous bones of buried hate and bitterness” or feats of “intellectual legerdemain.” Having named Hoss a monster, ghoul, and sorcerer (on October 26), Haynes quoted Charles Parkhurst of the MEC, whose editorial lamented the “subserviency” of the Methodist press. Parkhurst asked “if anything needed curing in the Church, from the highest official to the lowest member, do you think John Wesley would be silent?” “If an editor today,” Wesley would “thunder and thunder and thunder again against every species of wrong until it was righted.” Despite the more defiant tone of Haynes’s writing in 1893, the paper had a reputation for openness. One correspondent wrote “knowing the liberality of the *Tennessee Methodist* to both sides, I beg space for the following criticism...”⁶⁴

Hoss, too, had his aggressive characterizations of Haynes. Among the ““pressgang”” attending the Board of Missions meetings in Kansas City in May, the NCA noted “Rev. B. F. Haynes, of the Tennessee Methodist, one of the alertest newsgatherers in the Church, was also present, and busy as a bee.” But Hoss hit hardest in November, saying Haynes was “one of the alertest members of the press gang” who possessed “many of the qualifications of a first-class editor.” Hoss said “no grass grows under his feet,” and he was “at the head of the list” as “a traveler, solicitor, newsgatherer, and general organizer.” Declaring Haynes was “like Paddy at the Donnybrook Fair,” Hoss characterized him as a foolish street hustler and brawling immigrant “with a blackthorn club” who had been trying to start a fight with Hoss for weeks. His contributors writing in the *Methodist* were “anonymous scribblers.” Hoss said he was

⁶⁴ “A Marvelous Discovery,” TM October 26, 1893, p. 1. J. A. Wesson, “Sam Jones Criticized,” TM October 26, 1893, p. 2. The Charles Parkhurst quoted was likely the editor of *Zion’s Herald* in Boston, not the Charles Parkhurst who was a Congregationalist pastor in New York.

disinterested in fighting such a fool, then proceeded to mention irrelevant disputes and carefully redacted Haynes's words in order to suggest dishonesty on Haynes's part and cast him as having insulted bishops, other editors, and every mountain man in Hoss's East Tennessee. Hoss denied as "quite without foundation" that he was a toady. Yet he declared "we are by no means ashamed to admit that we set store by the deliberate judgment of the men whom the Church has singled out to occupy the posts of leadership." Then he confessed, "such men ought to have more than common understanding and more than ordinary consecration. If they are lacking in these qualities, it is as much of a reproach to the Church that elects them as it is to themselves." It was necessary that they be confessed as superior. The entire structure depended on an infallible aristocratic hierarchy. When Hoss and other Court advocates used the word 'disloyal,' they often meant 'impudent.' Hoss boldly declared that no bishop had ever attempted to "control or regulate" him, as if Haynes had blamed bishops for Hoss's perceived servility. Hoss ignored influence, all that would be necessary to control a fawning editor. Hoss closed by accusing Haynes of "malignity." One accusation he made was entirely accurate: "The moral guardianship which Brother Haynes has assumed over the whole Episcopal bench implies the possession upon his part of very superior faculties of discrimination. He may be perfectly competent to discharge the task. It is at least certain that no doubt on that score has ever entered his own mind." Indeed, Haynes had such confidence and such competence, just as Kelley, Duncan, and Steel believed they also had. This same confidence every bishop had displayed before election, including the supremely-talented Hoss, who certainly wrote as if he also possessed extraordinary Olympian understanding. Much of the debate circled around this often unstated difference. None of the MECS bishops were made talented, competent, or confident by their elections. They entered the episcopacy that way, a fact that those not so honored had not forgotten. Bishops were not 'the

talented,' but the chosen from among the talented.⁶⁵

Hoss's offensive included more thinly-veiled calls for a downsizing of MECS editors, including one that listed the papers and dividing them into "classes." Hoss treasured the two owned by the General Conference, tolerated the four owned by annual conferences (the *New Orleans*, *Wesleyan*, *Southern*, and *Texas*), and despised the fourteen "that belong to individuals and are simply indorsed by the Annual Conferences in whose interests they are published." Hoss's "simply" insinuated 'merely,' just as his "individuals" insinuated 'not Methodist,' and obscured several facts. For example, many of these papers were actually stock companies, 'owned' by multiple investors who were generally MECS clergy from those conferences. Further, of the papers owned by an annual conference, three of the four served multiple conferences, and those papers were among the oldest and longest standing. But most ominously, Hoss had nominated for extinction more than two-thirds of the Methodist press, and indicted various conferences for fostering a 'problem,' namely, a growing press for a growing denomination, a 'problem' only for men like Hoss whose 'thrones of power,' as prominent editorships were often labeled, were being minimized by the democratization and expansion of Methodist free speech. Hoss complained frequently, at times angrily, of lack of space when protests arose that he had not printed or printed in a timely manner, other's writings. The solution was a growing press. But a quick analysis suggests a narrower target. The states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia all had one Methodist connectional paper each. Mississippi borrowed Louisiana's. North Carolina had two. But Tennessee had three, four if one counts the NCA itself. 20 percent of the

⁶⁵ NCA, May 18, 1893, p. 9. "Not Controversial," NCA November 2, 1893, p. 9. Haynes's reply, "The Great Connectional and the Bishops," TM November 9, 1893, p. 1. Hoss substantially repeated the charges in "The 'Tennessee Methodist' Again," NCA November 16, 1893, p. 9?.

official MECS press was in Tennessee alone. Twelve of the twenty Methodist papers were true “conference papers” that served a single conference. Eleven of those twelve were on Hoss’s bad list of “simply indorsed” papers. Three of those eleven were in Tennessee. And two of those three—the *Holston* and the *Tennessee*—were low church papers, one of them from his home conference, and the other publishing directly under his nose in Nashville. Hoss likely chaffed at the idea that he was the most important editor in the MECS, but did not even have sway in his home state and home conference.⁶⁶

Understanding he had been Hoss’s target while Haynes was on vacation, and finally having had enough, on December 7 Haynes wrote a stunningly bare-knuckled editorial devoid of ambiguity, elusiveness, or whispering. It was little short of wholesale condemnation of Hoss’s editorial term. He began by saying “we delighted to call” Hoss the “‘genial Doctor’ while his Irish anecdotes lasted, but when they gave out he returns to his normal state and becomes highly passionate, using such ugly words as ‘malignant.’” Haynes had carefully avoided controversy with Hoss “because of this unfortunate weakness of his temperament,” and had overlooked “many a personal paragraphic arrow, tipped with the venom of death and aimed at our heads through the columns of the *Advocate*.” Not wishing to respond in kind or “stir the passion of a man who is so completely its victim,” Haynes yet declared “these paragraphic thrusts against individuals have formed one of the most conspicuous and deplorable features of his editorial work.” In their most recent dispute, Haynes contended that Hoss knew he was caught in a blunder by urging a gag rule on criticism of bishops but had neither the “candor” nor “courage”

⁶⁶ “Methodist Journalism,” NCA November 30, 1893 p.1. Haynes rejected the echoing call of the *Arkansas Methodist* to reduce the number of papers down to only 10, all to be owned by the publishing house, “Better Reasons Wanted,” TM December 21, 1893, p. 1. Hoss declared the merger of the papers for the Western North Carolina and North Carolina Conferences to create the *North Carolina Christian Advocate* “A Good Move,” NCA March 15, 1894, p. 9. Hoss complained – as connectional ministers have long done – of the stacking of all the Annual Conferences together at one point in the year (autumn then), making it impossible for those who represented connectional ministries to attend more than a few each year. NCA August 20, 1894, p. 1.

to get out of it. He preferred instead to “injure” Haynes among the many thousands who read the *Advocate* but not the *Methodist* with the impression that Haynes had misrepresented Hoss. Haynes said Hoss “rests serenely in the confidence that the calumniators of the Tennessee Conference have succeeded in their work of prejudicing the church at large against us; a work they have systematically pursued for several years and sometimes by methods which all good men condemn even in corrupt and worldly politicians.” Hoss had used the great connectional “first and chiefly to represent, support, and defend the bishops; secondly, to stir up afresh the dead and dying bitterness between the two great bodies of Methodism; thirdly, for a ‘faithful’ personal column; fourthly, to furnish some church news, etc.” Declaring that calling for accountability was not a “malignant...war against the bishops,” Haynes said Hoss was devoting his speeches at annual conferences “almost exclusively to the Tennessee Methodist and its Editor, where we have no right to reply.” Calling this speech “stale,” Haynes said he intended to give Hoss some “fresh material” and made a series of charges. First, Hoss had employed a disgraced minister from another denomination to conduct a department in the *Advocate*. Second, Hoss had taken employment for pay in other work for the Publishing House, in violation of the General Conference’s election. Third, Hoss had been paying a member of his family out of the appropriation for contributors, and lastly, Hoss had used contributor appropriations to buy editorials for the first page; Haynes asked “what such matter is to be properly called – whether it is plagiarism or something else?”⁶⁷

The tone of the *Methodist* warmed considerably in the months following. In retrospective and editorial policy statements, Haynes declared he would continue to stand his ground against

⁶⁷ “The Editor of the Nashville and His Monstrous Plea Again,” TM, December 7, 1893, p. 1. For another defense of the paper from whispered charges of disloyalty to Methodist polity and doctrine, see “Get it Straight,” TM, December 21, 1893 p. 1.

criticism and public worldliness. The *Methodist* would strive to be “the best family religious paper” possible. Its subscription list had grown constantly from its first issue, Haynes said, weathering the economic downturn and warfare from open enemies. Haynes held that “many of the leading men in all sections of the Church” believed the *Methodist* was “a necessity” and was “doing a greatly needed work.” Announcements begging patience with the billing department appeared, and subscriptions were pouring in at a rate of “several hundred weekly,” with an ensuing boom in advertising. Haynes defiantly promised to continue commentary on matters “social, economic and political” and ignore “criticism’s critics,” who had failed to disturb “our equanimity or our purpose,” and had not “produced in us fear or regrets or evoked from us resentments.” Haynes declared, “we only pity them,” and claimed “the thoughtful” could see through their amusing and “petty performances.” Haynes and the *Tennessee Methodist* were well, and would press on.⁶⁸

Praise, defense, and criticism of the paper continued. The warmest praise increasingly came from places further away where individuals were not indicted by the Tennessee Conference ban and damaged reputation. The fairest, calmest, and most irenic—if cheery—commentary came from R. N. Price. Older and at an emotional distance from the heat of warring in Middle Tennessee, Price had the advantage of previous experience with episcopal rough management at the hands of Bishop John Early during the 1860s. Price said the Kelley-Hargrove dispute was “not a war between children of God and the sons of Belial; but a family quarrel in the household of faith.” A regular reader of the *Methodist*, in January 1894 Price wrote a glowing affirmation of Haynes’s editorship, declaring “you are certainly publishing a capital sheet...that grapples

⁶⁸ “Prospective and Retrospective,” TM January 4, 1894, p. 1. The paper also moved to new offices at 211 and 218 Union Street “between College and Market...directly opposite Steif’s Jewelry Store.” Booming subscription growth TM March 8, 1894, p. 1, gaining new advertisers from that growth TM March 15, 1894, p. 1. “Governing Principles,” TM February 15, 1894 p. 1.

with the great moral and social issues of the day.” Price contended “you deserve no censure for attempting a connectional circulation...[for the paper] represents principles” not restricted to one conference or state. The *Methodist* was “progressive on temperance and prohibition issues, far ahead of any religious paper in the South.” It was also “progressive...[on] church polity.” Price averred “we need an independent organ, in which church measures can be freely discussed, and in which the acts of officials are reviewed, when it is necessary to review them.” “An editor should be something more than a parrot,” said Price. Noting “the will of a Methodist bishop has tremendous weight in it,” Price asserted it required “courage” and “self-denial” for a travelling preacher “to differ with a bishop in any respect, for he has the livings of the preachers in his hands.” Bishops being “nothing but men...liable to make mistakes...must take their chances in the matter of criticism along with other public men.” Price, noting he himself was “a short term man,” agreed with Sam Jones that the bishops should face re-election, saying “the fewest of men fail to become arbitrary in a lifetime office.” Price reacted to the charge that the Tennessee Conference was, or had, “an old sore.” “The sore,” Price said perceptively, “is the result of a wound.” The upside of the “wound” inflicted on the Tennesseans was that “it has set some men’s tongues and pens free,” and “caused men to feel about the foundation principles of our ecclesiastical polity as they have not done before.” Despite the high church or “aristocratic” and low church or “democratic” sentiment, and the lines between being strictly drawn, “liberalism is slowly but surely on the increase.”⁶⁹

⁶⁹ R. N. Price, “Personal and Otherwise,” TM September 6, 1894, p. 2. R. N. Price, “Letter from R. N. Price,” TM, January 4, 1894, p. 1. Price also defended the Tennesseans’ delegate choices, noting that on every conference worthy men were excluded. He also said “the fact is we ought to have fewer and better papers; but this is the land of the free and the home of the brave, and the tallest poles knock the persimmons.” Warm and unique praise for TM from Missouri, TM January 11, 1894 p. 2. Support from “Elihu” on “The Question of Criticism,” TM April 12, 1894, p. 2-3. Severe attack on Haynes reported right before General Conference TM April 26, 1894 p. 1. Haynes reporting on sin in the church, atheism, those who stop attending church from observations during a trip to Chicago

The directness of the Hoss-Haynes feud stopped abruptly after Haynes's December 7, 1893 bombshell. For months, Hoss did not mention Haynes's name again in the *Advocate*, and rarely mentioned the paper. Hoss had mocked and underestimated Haynes's investigative skills. Hoss could not defeat Haynes directly through the *Advocate*. It would require other means. One of those means were editors of other papers, who printed reports of Tennessee Methodists' supposed actions that must have been reported to them from someone in Nashville.⁷⁰

Yet Hoss's warring continued, and the *Advocate* remained the crier for silencing dissent. Hoss was helped in this effort when J. W. Boswell became assistant editor of the NCA in July 1894 after E. M. Bounds resigned in disgust, having served out his term. Hoss specialized in defending bishops, denied that any had ever moved a man because of worldly influence, and no doubt enjoyed the detour into debates over biblical and historical "orders" and "offices" off topic from his assertions of gag rules and infallibility. As opposed to Hoss's single voice approach, Haynes published an entire symposium answering the question "Our Episcopacy: Is it an Order or an Office?" Articles appeared from J. J. Tigert, Walker Lewis, W. F. Tillett, E. B. Chappell, and R. N. Price. Hoss responded to R. N. Price writing in the *Methodist*, debating episcopacy and orders, an unusual acknowledgement the paper existed. But even Hoss realized that Haynes was not the only Methodist who felt Hoss showed a 'mercurial' temperament. Hoss wrote: "it has not been the habit of our life to hold any tepid convictions. What we believe at all we believe thoroughly. It is likely, therefore, that we sometimes seem to show undue feeling. If so, we sincerely beg pardon. There is no consideration that would make us willing to be guilty either of

TM March 8, 1894, p. 1. Symposium on connectional boards and reducing expenses TM April 19, 1894 p. 1, 2.

⁷⁰ Examples from the *Southern* and the *Texas*, "In Season," and "Our Bullworks and the Texas," TM, April 26, 1894, p. 1.

a lack of charity or a lack of courtesy.”⁷¹

Labeled by Haynes “the oracle on the curving Cumberland,” Hoss spent much of 1894 defending himself from widespread charges that he was the bishops’ toady. Favorite methods—bandying words and clever phrasing—were on display. He noted but did not quote a paper from the MEC entitled “King Georgeism in the MEC” that stated that bishops and a class of influential laymen constituted a group called “the nobility.” Hoss used this to attack the MEC’s apparent autocracy and the hypocrisy of MEC complaints of MECS bishops’ heavy-handedness. He denied that the MECS had the slightest hint of episcopal abuse of power. A former church history professor, Hoss denied he was a “high churchman”—a term with early modern Anglican associations—despite the fact that he knew his critics meant he was for Methodist autocracy, not that he was an Anglican. One of Hoss’s favorite techniques to defend himself from charges of toadying was to accuse the accuser of calling him an Anglican, then loudly defend the seventeenth century ‘low church’ position against Anglican “sacramentarianism” and high-churchism. Despite this pretense, none of his critics confused him with any Roundheads. Haynes briefly introduced and then quoted the paper from M. M. Parkhurst in full.⁷²

In the fall of 1893 in Tennessee, Bishop Keener transferred prohibitionist and episcopal critic T. J. Duncan to Los Angeles Conference. In Georgia, holiness advocate A. J. Jarrell was transferred from Savannah, Georgia to the St. Louis Conference. In July 1894, Kelley-supporter

⁷¹ NCA, February 1, 1894, p. 1; Hoss claimed no bishop has ever moved a preacher because of a single worldly family, NCA April 12, 1894, p. 1. On episcopacy and orders, offices, NCA April 5, 1894, p. 1, NCA May 3, 1894, p. 1. Symposium on Episcopacy, TM, April 12, 1894, p. 4. “A Brief Rejoinder,” (It composed almost the entire front page), NCA September 6, 1894, p. 1.

⁷² “Something Stranger Than a Mistake,” TM July 12, 1894 p. 1., “We are Perplexed,” NCA May 31, 1894 p. 9., see also NCA, February 1, 1894, p. 1; On Hoss’s low church Protestantism versus Anglican high-churchism (Hoss took over page 8 in Bound’s absence), NCA June 14, 1894, p. 8, and June 21, 1894, p. 8. M. M. Parkhurst, “King Georgeism in the Methodist Episcopal Church,” (reprinted from the *Western Christian Advocate* in Cincinnati) TM, June 21, 1894, p. 2.

and *Methodist* contributor John E. Harrison was transferred from pastor at Pulaski to the West Texas Conference, and Haynes was appointed to fill Harrison's term at Pulaski. But the biggest bombshell came not with a punitive transfer but with the forced location of Sam Jones.⁷³

In December 1893, at the North Georgia Annual Conference, Bishop Haygood refused to allow evangelist Sam Jones to continue in a conventional nominal appointment and continue his evangelistic ministry as an itinerant elder of the MECS. Haygood gave Jones a choice, to put himself in Haygood's hands, presumably for a regular pastorate, or locate (resign) the ordained ministry of the MECS, and travel as a lay evangelist. At first, Jones accepted this from his old friend and elder brother in the faith that Jones still admired and trusted. Most Methodists believed that Jones was uniquely fit for the travelling role, and poorly suited for regular pastoral work in some county seat. But Haygood sought to delegitimize Jones. Jones had for years received an appointment as agent or fundraiser for an orphanage. "Nominal" might be unfair to Jones; when the orphanage had a need, Jones supplied it, often while hundreds of miles away. Jones, the orphanage, and the conference were apparently happy with the arrangement. But Haygood was not. Jones soon changed his mind, and issued strong critiques of Haygood and the bishops until Haygood's death in January 1896. While a North Georgia event, it sent shock waves throughout the South and the wider Methodist world. Many low church advocates read it as another official statement from another rough MECS bishop throwing support behind sin and wickedness. Most observers believed Haygood was enforcing a wider episcopal policy against dissenting clergy. R. N. Price declared the bishops made a "mistake when [they] sat down on Sam Jones." "Nine-tenths of the people" were with Jones, Price said, who has "more influence

⁷³ TM October 12, 1893 p. 1, "Georgia Letter," NCA October 26, 1893, p. 3., NCA July 19, 1894, p. 8. "In Answer to Inquires," TM August 30, 1894 p. 1.

with the masses than any bishop in the church.” D. C. Kelley demanded an answer to a simple question. Who forced Sam Jones to locate... was it his brethren of the North Georgia Annual Conference or the Bishop?⁷⁴

The debate over evangelists or “modern evangelism” had been going for years. Haynes, who took a moderate and cautious position on the issue, said there were three camps on evangelist question, that is, “suppressionists,” who wanted to “kill it out right,” the “repressionists” who wanted it dead without “blood on their hands,” and the “regulationists” who wished to discriminate between good and bad evangelists, the former receiving support and blessing, the latter to be shunned.⁷⁵

The debate involved several different issues. Contrary to later Methodist memory, few of those writing against evangelists at the time mentioned holiness doctrine as a feature of their criticism, including critics who also wrote against holiness doctrine. In later years, they became linked in the Methodist mind as ever more holiness clergy sought or were forced to become lay evangelists. Actual complaints included the fact that some pastors were annoyed by evangelists’ claims that few pastors were efficient at soul-winning or that pastors were not also evangelists.

⁷⁴ Kelley on Jones location, TM January 11, 1894, p. 4. R. N. Price on Jones location, “Letter from R. N. Price,” TM, January 4, 1894, p. 1. For how Jones felt about his location and the hypocrisy of bishops and Jones’s calls for subjecting bishops to reelection, TM December 14, 1893 p. 4.

⁷⁵ TM, March 15, 1894. p. 1. For Haynes on Jones, see Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 49-50 and TM June 9, 1892 p. 1, where Haynes says the charge of imitators was exaggerated by some preachers who had, in fact, been inattentive to naming the sins of powerful public men. For the wider debate, see NCA, September 22, 1888, p. 9 (?), “The Sam Jones Camp-Meeting.” Also, NCA October 27, 1888 p. 9 “One Good Thing” and item under “Personal” anticipating his meeting at Durham, N.C., “that famous head-quarters of the nicotian weed.” For a defense of evangelists that addressed all the major objections, “Evangelists: Or, ‘What’s in a Name?,’” NCA October 17, 1889 p. 14 by Henry Partridge of Tallahassee, Florida. See also “Highways and Hedges,” by J. S. Keen NCA October 16, 1886 p. 17 for both support for “regular evangelists” (an office) and an explanation for why the Methodist Church eventually lost the competition with the Baptists. Keen claimed the “independent evangelists” were servicing large urban churches when other denominations, especially “Calvinists” were sending their best missionaries to the rural areas of the South. “Dr. Lovick Pierce on Protracted Meetings” NCA February 2, 1889, p.7 by “An Old Methodist.” “Letter from ‘Sam’ Jones” NCA March 21, 1889, p.9; An example of poignant pro-Sam commentary, NCA June 20, 1889 p.8, and a mixed but ultimately positive comment on the same page NCA June 20, 1889 p. 8; A balanced piece trying to be both pro-pastor and pro-evangelist and describe their relationship, “Modern Evangelism” by L. Pulliam, NCA, June 27, 1889 p. 13.

Some were frustrated by claims that pastors did not rebuke sin in rich or powerful men in their communities. Some were annoyed when they were surprised to find half of their congregation off to a nearby town to hear Sam Jones. No doubt some—perhaps especially bishops who were burdened by the expectation that they would always play the leading role—begrudged Jones’s fame, success, general popularity with common people, and sway within the MECS. It would be hard to overstate the ubiquity of Sam Jones news in the papers of the time and the wide swath he cut through the religious world of the New South. No one could compete with it. Reports of most episcopal sermons did not include news that half the most sinful, sharp-dealing, wife-beating wicked men in town had rushed forward in repentant tears to give their lives to Jesus or that there were 500 new members in the Methodist churches in town the next Sunday. Nobody built auditoriums for when bishops came to town. At certain points and certain places in the South in the 1880s and 1890s, modest county seat newspapers were full of three topics: the price of hogs, the doings of Methodist ministers on the respective local district, and anything and everything they could get their hands on from, or about, Sam Jones. Many claimed they loved Jones, but despised his less talented imitators. Two other items played a prominent role, when need arose to justify his location. Jones used common or ‘vulgar’ language that some thought too rough for the pulpit and some thought sounded too much like the speech of African Americans. And Jones made money, a lot of it. Randall Stephens says that Jones made \$30,000 a year, and when he died in 1906, left an estate worth \$250,000.⁷⁶

⁷⁶ Randall J. Stephens, ed., *Sam Jones Own Book* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2009), xvi. Fitzgerald said Jones was “of close fiber, antiseptic, and when ignited makes a lively blaze.” NCA, November 10, 1888 p. 1. On the inadequacy of “dependence on professional evangelists” (in the context of a general call for “missionary zeal,” NCA March 28, 1889, p.8, “City Evangelization.” More on Jones, “The Union Gospel Tabernacle,” NCA September 5, 1889 p. 8. “The Only ‘Sam’ Jones” – praises him somewhat but attacks his imitators, and ends with “with thousands of our readers we pray that his consecration may equal his gifts.” NCA, October 13, 1888. p. 8. “The Only ‘Sam’ Jones”; Positive reports came from far and wide: for example, NCA, March 14, 1889 p.13 “Letter from California.” The NCA reported that one San Francisco newspaper had made the

It was obvious that Haygood was not the only bishop displeased with the Jones phenomenon. In the fall of 1893, Bishop Keener blamed the Tennessee Conference for Jones's harmful influence. Keener's address to new candidates for ministry lashed out at the Tennessee Conference and Jones, saying "I don't want our pulpit lowered as it has been in this part of the country for many years. You have no right to countenance or encourage a man who would dare to use in the pulpit hoodlum talk for which you would reprove your boy using. You have submitted to it here in Tennessee silently, and you have suffered by it." "You have even built a temple to it," said Keener, an allusion to the Union Gospel Tabernacle, later known as the Ryman Auditorium. Keener continued, "The Church is sick and tired of it. We have been patient until the thing has become insupportable. I think I see signs of improvement. I think we shall come back to sobriety and to purity and to propriety of speech in the pulpit."⁷⁷

But the coarse language 'taste' critique was mostly just an example of the widespread sense among bishops and many elite clergy that Jones was a threat to their credibility and

"semi-facetious" proposal to "tar and feather the plainspoken Georgian." The NCA remarked "We have a notion that Brother Jones would not be a passive recipient of such an application." NCA, April 4, 1889, p.9. Effusive praise for Jones and Sam Small, "The Georgia Evangelists in Toronto Canada," NCA November 20, 1886 p. 14. See also NCA December 4, 1886 p. 8, and an entire page of Sam Jones commentary NCA January 12, 1889, p. 8.

⁷⁷ "The Tennessee Conference," TM October 26, 1893, p. 1. Future Bishop Atticus Haygood criticized and delegitimized evangelists in support of the "regular ministry" of pastors, "He Gave – Some Pastors," by Atticus Greene Haygood, October 10, 1885 p. A slightly more positive episcopal view: "Bishop Granbery on Evangelists," from *Raleigh Advocate*, NCA April 17, 1886 p. 14. For a more positive view in advance of General Conference, "The Evangelistic Office," (three articles) by Leo Rosser, NCA April 3, 1886 p. 6, April 24, 1886 p. 6 and May 8, 1886 p. 9. For debates during General Conference, NCA May 22, 1886 p.16. Jones preached at General Conference and was introduced by O. P. Fitzgerald "Sam Jones Before the General Conference," May 29, 1886 p. 17. Fitzgerald reporting on General Conference's refusal to create an office of Evangelist with his usual compliment "conservative," "The Late General Conference Reviewed," NCA June 12, 1886 p. 8. For support for evangelists and creation of office, "Brother Moore's Opinion on Evangelists," by R. Abbey, NCA September 4, 1886 p. 3 and "From East Texas," NCA December 4, 1886 p. 3. For argument that one evangelist should be appointed per Annual Conference, see "About Several Things," by R. N. Price NCA March 1, 1890 p. 5 followed by "[This was deferred, but is too good to be lost. – ED.]" For support for evangelists as fulfilling a distinct Biblical role with a task distinct from that of pastors, and the authors since that most pastors and "the first men of the Church," see "Evangelists," by H. Armstrong of Roston, Arkansas, NCA June 4, 1887 p. 4. John E. Edwards of Virginia reported that Bishop Duncan gave "a timely vindication of Methodism" against "'Evangelists,' so called" who "came in for a sharp arraignment." "Dr. Edwards in Raleigh," NCA June 4, 1887 p. 13.

authority, thus, a threat to the MECS itself. Laity did not seem to feel this way. What made the evangelists debate different from the debate over autocracy was the fact that large numbers of regular pastors were on the same side with the bishops. The conference rights protest had been about the rights of clergy subject to episcopal appointment. But evangelists like Jones were receiving an exceptional appointment—like that of editors and college presidents—that removed them from the normal fears of episcopal appointment. Itinerant clergy were feeling pinched by bishops and laity, and lay fandom for Jones did not always foster pastoral morale. Add to that the denunciations of some pastors by some evangelists, and the evangelist issue became a place where a partial Court-Country alliance was possible. Conference rights were supposed to be about the disciplinary rights of clergy against episcopacy. But this was co-opted to restrict the formal creation of an office that already existed by custom, but not by law. By refusing to allow the custom to remain, or even to codify and regulate the office, they effectively banned it. The original protest of conference rights was extended to a general mood of protecting pastoral turf.

Haynes's *Methodist* published articles on various sides of the issue. Hoss's *Advocate* mostly published criticisms of evangelists. Haynes moved from general criticism of evangelists to a more supportive tone, but probably supported the 'regulationist' position. Haynes quoted W. T. Bolling from the *Advocate* who blamed bishops for creating a massive demand for specialized evangelists when bishops moved faithful pastors preaching against sin because worldly laity complained, then "Rev. Mr. Policy will be brought in to enjoy four years of pleasant association with the Church at Sodom." In advance of General Conference, Hoss printed multiple articles asking 'what do the evangelists want, and why have not they told us?' Meanwhile, Haynes printed a symposium from evangelists answering that question.⁷⁸ Hoss published his and others'

⁷⁸ "The Much Discussed," TM June 8, 1893 p. 1. Symposium, TM April 26, 1894, 1-2. See also TM May 3, 1894, p.

attacks on Jones – many of them of a personal nature about his speech, supposed lack of intelligence, education, or literary qualifications. Hoss called him “Mr. Jones” after his location.⁷⁹

At General Conference in Memphis in May of 1894, Haynes reacted to aspects of the episcopal address. The bishops’ statement on modern evangelism was lengthy and “characterize[ed] it as a system of guerrilla warfare. The tone and spirit of their deliverance on this question is that of a very pronounced opposition.” The bishops proposed what came to be known as “paragraph 301” that would allow pastors to refuse to allow evangelists to preach in their area, and make a breach of this right of refusal punishable, which in the case of local preachers would have threatened their license to preach and/or resulted in expulsion from the denomination. The measure failed in 1894, but passed in 1898. The debate in Richmond in 1886 had been whether to create an office of evangelist that would be normalized and regulated. By 1898 in Baltimore, full bans were in place. Practical application of the law, especially in rural

3. See also “Evangelists and Pastors” signed “Pastor” – a defense of pastors from the charge that “not one in 10 were efficient as soul winners,” TM July 16, 1891. Early on, Haynes was more critical: “much harm has come to our Zion by the performances of many so-called evangelists. Much violence has been done a refined sense of propriety, and injustice to worthy co-laborers in the gospel by wholesale denunciation,” TM, June 18, 1891 p. 1. Haynes supported the article of T. J. Duncan, “Every Pastor an Evangelist to His Own People,” June 18, 1891 p. 2. A running debate appeared in the *Tennessee Methodist* after Jones’s location, with S. A. Steel on Jones’s side, S. A. Steel TM March 1, 1894, p. 4, S. A. Steel, “Sam Jones and His Opposers,” TM March 15, 1894, p. 1., R. N. Price’s support for Steel, TM March 22, 1894, p. 1., a response to Steel, TM April 5, 1894, p. 2., a vicious attack on Steel by Edgar Glenn TM April 12, 1894, p. 2, Steel’s reply to Glenn TM April 19, 1894, p. 3., Jones’s brief, hilarious, and dismissive reply to Glenn TM April 26, 1894, p. 1., Glenn’s hateful response to Steel, TM May 3, 1894, p. 4. Gilderoy attacked Jones mercilessly, TM January 4, 1894 p. 2.

⁷⁹ NCA, January 11, 1894 p. 9. Other criticism from Hoss, “Shall We Have Evangelists?,” NCA June 8, 1893 p. 1., NCA February 8, 1894 p. 9, NCA March 22, 1894 p. 1, NCA January 18, 1894, p. 1. See also NCA, January 25, 1894, p. 3, and NCA February 22, 1894, p. 3. Jones’s response, NCA February 1, 1894, p. 9. Bishop Galloway writing of criticism of ministers, NCA January 18, 1894, p. 3, and of ministerial ethics NCA April 29, 1894, pp. 2-3. For earlier Hoss commentary, “Evangelists – Good and Bad,” by E.E. Hoss, NCA December 26, 1889 p. 13. Affirmative response to Hoss by Dr. E. K. Miller of Mexico, Missouri urging “legislation to put a stop to these ‘evangelistic tramps.’” NCA January 18, 1890 p. 6. A response from George G. Smith asks Hoss and other for the names of any evangelists who are “ungodly, vulgar men who claim to be God’s messengers,” “Evangelists,” NCA February 8, 1890 p. 7. For praise of Hoss and Miller, “Dr. Anderson’s Amen,” by T. H. B. Anderson, Santa Rosa, Cal., NCA March 1, 1890 p. 5.

areas, might be simple enough. But in cities this rule effectively required unanimous consent, a standard not even bishops could have secured. It was effectively a “force out” rule, as the effect was to force evangelists to seek patronage outside the denomination. The MECS would eventually follow the MEC in adopting a normalized office under the Home Missions wing of the General Missions department in the MECS, and answerable to the Annual Conferences in the MEC. But they did not do so before running off many young clergy who took the pressing of this rule by bishops for what it was—an invitation to get out of the MECS.⁸⁰

The episcopal address was notable for its tone on several topics that year. Concerning prohibition, Haynes – who gave his own speech at General Conference on the importance of catechism – also noted the difference between the 1894 episcopal comments and the 1890 resolution of the General Conference. Haynes said if the 1894 General Conference followed the lead of the bishops, “we will move forward by backward steps very rapidly.” On politics the bishops were much more conservative—or whichever bishop wrote it, probably Haygood or Keener, although they all signed it—than was the church as a whole.⁸¹

A debate ensued over discouraging the circulation of papers “that detract from the circulation of our own connectional and conference organs.” Determining which papers were a

⁸⁰ “General Conference,” TM May 10, 1893, p. 1. TM, May 10, 1894, p. 4. DuBose, *History of Methodism*. (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1916), 126. For the Address of the Bishops, NCA May 10, 1894 pp. 2-3, 9. TM May 10, 1894, p. 1, 4.

⁸¹ “General Conference,” TM May 10, 1893, p. 1. TM, May 10, 1894, p. 4. Haynes gave an extended speech during a debate over the need for a new catechism. Hoss had, too, arguing for caution in the choice of the author – “no man is fit to write a catechism on theology who does not know all theology” to which one delegate urged they needed an author who could also speak in plain language – but Haynes focused on the readers and users, not the authorial qualifications in grammar and historical theology. Haynes urged that no demand existed for a catechism when so little use was being made in Sunday schools of either the Bible or existing catechisms. Haynes warned “I tell you we are rearing a generation of Methodists that will not be Methodists when they are grown. You cannot hold your Church; you cannot perpetuate your system; you cannot maintain the integrity of your economy: you cannot maintain your Church, if it is not bottomed on doctrine.” Haynes lamented “there isn’t a thirst; there isn’t a hunger in the realms where hunger should exist, for catechetical instruction or catechetical instruments.” “General Conference Proceedings,” TM, May 17, 1894, p. 4.

threat was to be left to the annual conferences. Several of the speakers argued in favor of protectionism against papers started at the district level, often published at twenty-five or fifty cents a year. But Hoss had another aim. Where others debated local papers that competed at the sub-conference level, Hoss complained of papers circulating beyond the bounds of their conferences “using the machinery of the church” (annual conference meetings), a practice that Hoss called “a flagrant violation of good morals.” He declared “we have run the doctrine of free trade into the ground” in the starting of colleges and papers. Others affirmed different principles, including one who wrote that “a thing which cannot stand without a monopoly ought not to stand,” and “if you want your conference organ to displace the smaller papers, make it better than the smaller papers.” One said that old papers sustained solely by loyalty, when “a good competitor will come along...[it happens that] this old paper will get a move on itself and make...a better paper.”⁸²

Two separate committees and the General Conference as a whole addressed the Kelley-Hargrove issue that had waited over three years for resolution. The question of Kelley’s conviction came before the Committee of Appeals. The question of the official actions and personal character of Bishop Hargrove—whose wife died just two months before the gathering on February 27, 1894—came before the Committee on Episcopacy. A lengthy analysis of the committee actions appeared in T. A. Kerley’s *Conference Rights*. While he primarily dealt with the technical and legal aspects of the case, he noted that when the appeal came before the Committee on Episcopacy, Hargrove’s complaint against Haynes included the following argument from the bishop: ““whoever else might have been in order, he was not in order, and I

⁸² “General Conference Proceedings,” TM, May 17, 1894, p. 4. Committee Assignments [15 standing committees] – NCA May 10, 1894 p. 9-10. Committees were selected by conference delegations – 1 delegate per conference on each one as picked by conference delegations. Report of Committee on Episcopacy NCA May 31, 1894, p. 2.

pronounced him out of order, and you will justify my decision. He was out of order.” Kerley says of Hargrove’s speech against Haynes that the “bishop’s mind was evidently confused over this question, for he failed to make a distinction between the law in question and his ruling on the law.”⁸³

What outraged Kerley and many others most, however, were the actions of the Committee on Episcopacy itself, under Hoss’s heavy influence, and against the protest and Haynes and J. J. Tigert, both straight-as-an-arrow types who thought they sensed a cover up. Hoss made a motion that all the charges dealing with immorality on the part of the bishop be addressed together, declaring “there is no captiousness in this motion.” An outraged Tigert opposed Hoss. The committee under Hoss’s influence—Hoss had promised a detailed review, “a definite and sacred promise, squarely violated” said Haynes—refused to address any of the charges specifically; it passed Hargrove’s character and conduct ex-officio, despite its duty to examine charges against that character and conduct. Future bishop James Cannon of Virginia charged that the committee “shirk[ed its] responsibility,” and that its report was adopted by the “‘high church’ party and the timid brethren” who were “ably assisted by the presiding bishop Haygood, who railroaded the matter through with haste that did the episcopal office no credit.” Judge J. P. Strother of California (Pacific Conference) had moved that the report should be recommitted because the “committee had failed to do its duty.” A signed protest was given that made it into the official journal, but was not printed by the official periodicals devoted to reporting the actions of the conference. Unlike the committee on episcopacy, the appeals committee weighed the case, and reversed the ruling against Kelley. But it did so with a mere one sentence report, without specifying on what grounds it did so, whether by fact or by law. No

⁸³ Kerley, *Conference Rights*, 275, 276. Death of Mrs. Hargrove, TM, March 8, 1894 p. 1.

one learned anything from the entire fiasco, except for those who had been punished, and those who had protested. They learned episcopal power in the MECS was omnipotent, and that any movement toward accountability would be fiercely resisted. Hargrove had been allowed to argue his case at length “and in such passion and with a spirit of revenge or retaliation calumniate and abuse all individuals and bodies that have in any way had to do with his trouble.” The *Fort Worth Gazette* reported that Hargrove “had almost precipitated a sensation by the manner in which he spoke in his defense. The greater part of his speech was a personal assault on Dr. Haynes [such that] one committeeman arose and said the bishop should apologize for what he had said.” Haynes ended his comments before the committee by saying that without censure “we will have established in our theory and practice the doctrine of Episcopal infallibility.” R. N. Price—along with Haynes, Strother, Cannon, and Kerley, among others—believed the Committee on Episcopacy had “dishonored” themselves and the General Conference. Price declared, “I am ashamed.” W. R. Peebles declared the case “settled judiciously” and declared himself “content.” W. D. Kirkland—who had been secretary of the Committee on Episcopacy—said that Haynes was Hargrove’s “persecutor” in an editorial that Haynes felt was so full of mockery that Haynes declared that when Kirkland recovered “his truer and higher self” he would be “humiliated at the memory of these lines.”⁸⁴ Hargrove was only indirectly censured for his “irregular” episcopal actions that Haynes called “the usurpation of the rights of the Conference

⁸⁴ On Hoss’s promise, Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 138. Kerley, *Conference Rights*, 284, 301-302, 293. *Fort Worth Gazette*, May 20, 1894, 2. “A Unique Report,” TM, May 31, 1894, p. 1, and R. N. Price, “A Big Gun on the Kelley Case,” (includes full quote of James Cannon) TM June 11, 1894 p. 1, and T. L. Mellen, “That Protest Which was Spread On the Journal of the General Conference but Was Omitted from the Daily and Weekly Advocates,” TM June 11, 1894, p. 1. Price noted and rebuked an attack on Haynes from F. L. Reid of the North Carolina *Advocate*. W. R. Peebles, “Some Salmagundi From Brother Peebles,” TM June 14, 1894, p. 3. See also R. N. Price, “The Concentration of Power,” TM June 21, 1894, p. 1. (In reply to Kirkland) “A Comedy or Conundrum of Errors,” TM June 28, 1894, p. 1. There is some possibility that an editor pro-tem filling in for Kirkland wrote that editorial. Another harsh editorial from the *Southern*, this time against Price, appeared around the same time. See TM, July 5, 1894, p. 1 and R. N. Price, “Personal and Otherwise,” TM September 6, 1894, p. 2.

and the trampling under foot of the rights and liberties of the preachers of the entire church.” To Haynes, “the white washing” of Hargrove’s guilt by “the high-handed committee on Episcopacy” was a “monstrous evasion of responsibility.”⁸⁵

Haynes reprinted a supporting article from the “St. Louis,” written by a lay member from Missouri, Perry Rader, who served on the Appeals Committee. Reacting to charges from the *Memphis Christian Advocate* that the committee acquitted Kelley, Rader said the committee found that “Dr. Kelley had *never been tried.*” The records of the Tennessee Conference “showed conclusively” the express claim of the Conference to appoint a committee of trial, and Hargrove having ruled that out of order, “all the proceedings from that ruling on were extra-judicial.” Several other of the appellant’s complaints were also agreed to by a majority, and some of Hargrove’s actions they even found “absurd,” but that point alone proved decisive. The committee never even considered any question of Kelley’s technical guilt, and Rader denied that they had approved of a preacher running for office while pastor of a church.⁸⁶

T. L. Mellen, a member of the Appeals Committee from Mississippi, and author of the protest read at General Conference, rejected “Gilderoy”’s accusations against Haynes in the *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, saying he was surprised by “the moderation of the language used by Brother Haynes.” Mellen further charged that “never has one been so openly honored and rewarded” for his services as was Hoss—“the clever brother who got the [committee] to compromise their own names”—when named fraternal messenger to Canadian Methodism by the bishops. Mellen also made a new revelation when he said that letters from five bishops written before the October 1890 Tennessee Annual Conference were read to the Committee on

⁸⁵ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 118, 107-108, and 140-141.

⁸⁶ Perry S. Rader, “Some Remarks about the Kelley Case,” TM July 5, 1894, p. 1. Italics in original.

Episcopacy. These letters encouraged Hargrove in his course saying things like “‘Don’t Let Kelley escape trial!’ ‘Don’t let him speak before the Tennessee Conference. His influence is too great.’” Mellen then noted that five, plus Hargrove, equaled six, a majority of the bishops, thus “affirmance was assured” when the same five sat in judgment of Hargrove’s actions at Wilmington in 1891. Mellen echoed the complaint against Haygood for “railroading through [the committee’s] report.” Mellen denied Gilderoy’s claim that the matter was “settled for all time,” saying “Hargrove’s official character and administration [were] tainted for all time, and forever subject to the most unfavorable inferences.” A. M. Rader of Missouri echoed Mellen’s judgment, but wondered further how the five bishops could have had their characters passed. Price marveled at Mellen’s revelation, and declared “let us hope it wasn’t so” for “it was bad advice” and “a blunder.”⁸⁷

Haynes reprinted from the *Raleigh Christian Advocate* an article on criticism that Haynes declared excellently stated his policy and supported his own conduct through the *Methodist*. The Raleigh author—unnamed by Haynes, probably at the author’s request but “taken from the editorial page”—while urging avoidance of “a perpetual snarling,” warned of “an ignoble truckling to authority and office.” “Some men, and we fear some editors,” said the *Raleigh*, “do not know how to escape the one evil, while sedulously steering clear of the other. Their policy has two main features – laudation and suppression. No opportunity is lost to bestow large and more or less indiscriminate praise upon ‘all that are in authority,’ from bishops to the smallest connectional officers.” In contrast, the “main maxim of writing” ought to be “‘Nothing

⁸⁷ T. L. Mellen, “Notes,” TM August 16, 1894, p. 1. A. M. Rader, “The Episcopal Committee,” TM August 23, 1894, p. 1. Rader asked “where has a bishop the right to put any man on trial?” R. N. Price, “Personal and Otherwise,” TM September 6, 1894, p. 2. Price was by this point president of American Temperance University in Harriman, Tennessee.

extenuate, nor set down aught in malice.”⁸⁸

When Hargrove died in 1905, Bishop Galloway—often considered the best speaker among the bishops—delivered a eulogy that did more than defend Hargrove from criticism. Galloway denied there had ever been criticism at all: “in all his public career...he was never suspected of being dominated by motives unworthy...not for his strong right arm would he have used official position to promote a friend or oppress a supposed enemy...he was never jealous of episcopal prerogative.” Such was episcopal prerogative that when the existence of formal charges before the General Conference that precisely charged unworthy motives went up against an episcopal claim, that claim inherently trumped. Personal insults were one thing, but this insulted the intelligence. It is possible that the prohibition-favoring Galloway intended to bury prohibitionists’ hatchet with the anti-prohibitionist Hargrove. But denying past conflict offered neither resolution nor prevention of future troubles. What sort of honor to Hargrove this was supposed to be is unclear; did it enhance his honor that untrue things were said of him on his behalf?⁸⁹

Haynes’s experience in the Hargrove and Hoss trials between October 1890 and October 1894 shattered his confidence in the ‘best men’ of the MECS. Haynes could not believe what he was seeing, perceiving, and sensing. The sense of betrayal he felt was not merely a personal

⁸⁸ “The Just Limits of Criticism in the Church Press,” TM July 5, 1894 p. 1. The *Raleigh* article is indeed an excellent statement of the conduct of internal criticism. For an example of exaggerated praise for a bishop (from the *Texas Christian Advocate*), see “Our Bishops,” TM July 12, 1894 p. 1.

⁸⁹ Galloway, (*Methodist Review*, October 1905, 627-638). 635, 637-638. Much of Galloway’s address focused on the secret and hidden depth of Hargrove’s personal faith, noting that Hargrove thought testimony about one’s own religious experience was inappropriate. The “conference rights” protest had little to do supposed heresy or lack of personal piety on Hargrove’s part, but rather his public and official actions as bishop. It would be entirely possible for Galloway’s testimony to the meekness and depth of Hargrove’s religious experience to be true, and also the criticisms of his official acts to be true. Indeed, Hargrove’s actions in October 1890 may have been out of character, and it would be reasonable enough to imagine a dutiful, proud man more versed in processes than verbal sparring, who lost his temper, acted in such a state, and then, embarrassed, defended his mistakes to the hilt. But the infallibility and denial defense simply made it impossible for any bishop to be accountable for their personal or official conduct and there is little evidence Hargrove thought bishops should be accountable in any meaningful way.

betrayal, but a betrayal of the passionate reforming and perfecting ideals of Methodism as he understood them. Methodists of Haynes's generation inherited high notions of the transformations genuinely possible in the lives of real people. As he looked out upon his Jerusalem, this watchman on the walls of Zion cried out in outrage. He knew Methodists could be other than they were, and believed they knew this too. Haynes's protest cannot be understood without an appreciation for the high regard in which he held the Methodist tradition and his fellow clergy. But the disconnect between his high expectations and the actions and decisions of his peers threatened to overwhelm him. Never before had such a spirit of punishment and rejection of Methodism's native croakers and jeremiads come over the connection. Their cries for revival and reform had sometimes been merely tolerated, and sometimes not always appreciated. But they had been understood as part of the rhetoric of Methodism. Yet this time, the calls not only went unheeded, they were answered with punishment, derision, and mockery, while the guilty and those who covered for them were defended, lauded, promoted, and praised. A wrong turn had been taken. That his fellow Methodists, especially those who knew him well, could not follow him in this course must not have prevented them from understanding the pain of his lament. In the long memory of the Tennessee Conference, Haynes's actions could easily be explained by his becoming "mixed up in the holiness movement." But his jeremiad preceded his testimony of entire sanctification. In a real sense, he was already outside "the connection," having been attacked repeatedly in print and in speeches by the editor of the connectional organ, verbally abused by a bishop privately and before a formal committee of the General Conference charged with holding bishops accountable.

The Hargrove explosion did not just break windows. It cracked foundations. NCA assistant editor Bounds predicted Tennessee Methodism would not recover from it for two

generations. Haynes began his journey out of the MECS because of it. The case destroyed Haynes' once ascendant career by Christmas 1890, and that of T. J. Duncan as well. Haynes and Hoss were spokesmen for the respective camps that emerged in response to the Kelley-Hargrove event, Hoss the Court or "High Church" high-episcopal prerogative voice, and Haynes a Country or "Low Church" defender of the right of dissent and open airing of issues. Those who sought to mute and suppress internal dissenters had successfully 'gotten' Kelley, Duncan, and Jones. There was little question Haynes was on their list, likely at the very top. But a serious impediment to getting Haynes remained in the way, namely, the protection of the Tennessee Conference.

CHAPTER FIVE

Unmethodistic Methodism

Beginning among northern Methodists in the 1830s, the holiness movement appealed to the moral and spiritual malaise of the postwar South. Methodists rehabilitated their interest in John Wesley's doctrine of "perfect love," "entire sanctification" or "Christian perfection." A stressing of sanctifying grace – with its promise of deeper piety and freedom from sin – inspired a postwar renaissance of revivalism among southern Methodists. In May 1870, southern Methodist bishops came before the delegates gathered at Memphis for the MECS General Conference to give their quadrennial episcopal address. Lamenting the worldliness of southern society and its churches, the bishops urged the faithful to renew moral and spiritual earnestness. "We fear," worried the bishops in good Country Methodist fashion, "that the doctrine of perfect love which casts out fear and purifies the heart, and is the 'measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,' as a distinct and practicable attainment is too much overlooked and neglected." This jeremiad did not fall on deaf ears and cold hearts, and by 1878, the *Nashville Christian Advocate* would rejoice in the extraordinary interest wherein "multitudes" of believers were seeking a deeper faith. Official Methodism proclaimed the new movement to be "the natural recoil of the religious mind from the rampant worldliness of the time." Warning of the threat "the world" posed to the church, the paper further encouraged Methodists to join the enthusiasm. Methodism had to either "sink to the same level or rise to a higher life." The urge for renewed vital piety coincided with greater Methodist concern about worldliness in the churches, and a broad revival of evangelical and evangelistic Wesleyan fervor that found many adherents, regardless of their

position on, or experience of, sanctifying grace.¹

By the time the holiness movement became important, the MECS was well into its century-long shift from being a bi-racial denomination with many poorer members and itinerant preachers to being a white middle class denomination of expensive, big steeple churches, wealthier members, and bishops who were more managers than the itinerant preachers their forebears had been. Holiness advocates stressed the need for the holy living and passionate worship that once defined Methodism but now seemed would soon be only a memory. Disagreements over doctrine, Methodism's present spiritual state, expanded roles for women in church and society, and the prohibition of alcohol (the last two of which most holiness leaders favored) marked the relationship between the contented Court and holiness dissenters. Many Methodists further resented what they viewed as holiness advocates' irregular practices and non-fraternal tendencies, while some feared that holiness figures were northern agents come to strengthen the northern MEC at the expense of the MECS, just as had occurred during the Civil War and Reconstruction era.

MECS leaders had already come to view the 1844 split as a result of a meddling General Conference impugning the character of a duly consecrated bishop due to an unscriptural fusion

¹ Farish, *The Circuit Rider Dismounts*, 72. Sectional rivalry and polity reform were not the only immediate legacies of the Civil War. Methodist identity had revolved around popular sentiment. Methodists prided themselves on direct appeals to the popular mind, to the free-able will and moral sensibilities of the nation. Moreover, they embraced "spreading scriptural holiness across the land" as their mission. It was in this context that the waves of postwar crime appalled Methodists and challenged them to make good on their place in society. Such chaos also renewed southern Methodists' sense of denominational identity when denominational pride and prospects were at low ebb. Religious reconstruction of the South was a moral project as much as an organizational one. It re-infused into southern Methodist identity a strong emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit and the urgent need for holiness in heart and life. This new longing for piety and church expansion in the context of crime, violence and moral decay coincided with the return of Methodist clergymen to their circuits after the dislocations of the war. For example, Tennessee Methodist preacher Jeremiah Cullom experienced a renewed devotion to seeking Christian perfection and spiritual power and eschewing the temptations of the world that the dangers and hardships of war had made seem harmless and trivial by comparison. Jeremiah Cullom Diary, TSLA . December 25, 1873. Temperance and renewed revivalism came together in Middle Tennessee after the war, perhaps encouraged by the crime waves that many locals and federals alike blamed not on lingering sectional hostilities but on moral and spiritual degeneracy.

of religion with politics. They associated radicalized political religion with the MEC generally and with the efforts of the holiness movement in particular. The southern church feared the return of what Doug Strong has called the radical “ecclesiastical abolitionism” of the MEC and related seceding churches, which Strong shows was tied directly to the prewar holiness movement in upstate New York. Strong writes that in the perfectionist mind, the immediate abolition of slavery was “only one illustration of the ‘immediate abolition of iniquity’ required” in personal and national life.² That fear of democratic reformist fervor in church and society – and the immediacy in the political implications of the doctrine of entire sanctification – would remain in the MECS throughout the rest of the century. Of the eight MEC bishops elected at the northerners’ 1872 General Conference, as many as six were “unabashed friends” of the holiness movement and its best known mid-century advocate, Phoebe Palmer. Palmer’s prayer meetings held in her New York home, often attended by bishops and other high officials, and publications that reached a wide audience made her perhaps the most influential nineteenth century Methodist theological voice along with fellow New Yorker and prodigious hymnodist Fanny Crosby. Palmer’s episcopal friends included Gilbert Haven, who actively worked for education in Africa and for African Americans in the South until his death in 1880. Another episcopal friend was Leonidas Lent Hamline, the author of the ‘Hamline Doctrine’ of 1844 that declared episcopacy entirely subordinate to the General Conference, the theory that justified the defacing of Bishop Andrew and made possible an acrimonious schism. Bishop and Mrs. Hamline were Dr. and Mrs. Palmer’s closest friends. Palmer’s theology influenced Harriet Beecher Stowe, Catherine Booth, and Frances Willard. That the “high tide” for this holiness revival in the MEC coincided with

² Douglas M. Strong, *Perfectionist Politics: Abolitionism and the Religious Tensions of American Democracy* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999). 2.

the era of southern Reconstruction also connected the two unfavorably in the minds of many in the MECS. For these reasons and others, MECS leaders associated holiness doctrines with northern vilification of MECS leadership and rejection of the MECS as a legitimate Christian body.³

The holiness movement within the MECS participated in the wider cultures of dissent that were ubiquitous in the late nineteenth century. If the advocates of the holiness revival were pessimistic about societal trends, they remained distinctly optimistic about divine power to transform human persons. Their efforts and the rebukes that followed them would provoke a disorderly theological debate itself part of the wider crisis of piety and order. That debate challenged the third core mark of MECS self-identity as compared to the MEC, namely, the MECS's theological conservatism and anxiety about cacophonous heterodoxy.

Twentieth century scholars demonstrated considerable interest in nineteenth century Methodist recollections and re-appropriations of Wesley's theology. The latter third of the twentieth century, in particular, saw an extended renewal of Wesley studies.⁴ Methodist interest

³ Charles Edwin Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 15. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival*, 109, 99, 32. Haven supported Clark College (now Clark Atlanta University) in Atlanta, named after fellow holiness advocate and MEC Bishop, David Wasgatt Clark. Haven followed Clark as president of the Freedman's Aid Society of the MEC. MEC bishops with ties to the holiness movement included Matthew Simpson, Randolph S. Foster, Stephen Merrill, Gilbert Haven, Thomas Bowman, William L. Harris, Jesse T. Peck, Leonidas Hamline, Edmund S. Janes, Thomas Morris, Elijah Hedding, and Willard Francis Mallalieu.

⁴ For Wesley and American Methodist theology, see Randy L. Maddox, "Respected Founder/Neglected Guide: The Role of Wesley in American Methodist Theology," *Methodist History* 37 (1999): 71-88. See also Maddox, "Holiness of Heart and Life: Lessons From North American Methodism," *Asbury Theological Journal* 51.1 (1996): 151-172. For John Wesley's theology, see Randy Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1994), Kenneth J. Collins, *Theology of John Wesley: Holy Love and the Shape of Grace* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2007), and, more concisely and with more attention to social and political contexts and aspects, Jason E. Vickers, *Wesley: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: T. T. Clark, 2008). Wesley's doctrine of "Christian perfection" ("entire sanctification," "perfect love," "holiness of heart and life," "second-blessing," "fullness of the Spirit," etc.) – the idea that a greater level of purity was possible in this world than Reformation leaders had allowed for – was a central aspect of his religious program, and one many later Methodists would disavow. See also John Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1965), and for the standard account of Wesley himself and his relationship to 18th century British Methodism, Richard Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodist* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995).

in the founders has encouraged studies of American Methodism and the holiness movement.⁵ Only recently, however, have southern historians noted the energies of the holiness controversy within Methodism. Christopher Owen said the “ideological wrangling” over holiness in the 1890s reached a “ferocious crescendo” in the MECS, unlike what occurred in black Methodist denominations and MEC in the South. Edward Ayres characterized the holiness revival of the 1890s as the most intense manifestation of populist style protest against a general postwar modernizing and embourgeoisment process, a protest occurring in several denominations. Randall Stephens holds that the southern-ness of the southern holiness movement is to be found in its southern upcountry dissenting flavor, noting that the southern holiness movement shared with southern Populism “an upcountry tradition of republican dissent.” Stephens says that holiness did best in “the southern upcountry” regions he describes as “suffused with the republican ideology of the upcountry yeomanry,” and made few inroads in ‘the Black belt’ regions where slavery had been strongest.⁶

⁵ Standard overviews of the holiness movement include the internationally-attentive Melvin E. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 2nd (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1980, 1996), and Charles Edwin Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936* 2nd (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1974, 2002). For the southern wing of the movement, see Randall J. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2008) and Briane K. Turley, *A Wheel Within A Wheel: Southern Methodism and the Georgia Holiness Association* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1999). The standard history of the theology of Christian perfection in Methodism is John L. Peters, *Christian Perfection and American Methodism* 2nd (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Press, 1956, 1985). For a shorter history of the holiness movement in American Methodism, see Timothy Smith’s section “The Holiness Crusade” in Chapter 24 “The Theology and Practices of Methodism, 1876-1919” 608-627 in Emory Stevens Bucke, *History of American Methodism, Vol II* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964). A more popular telling appears in Ferguson, *Organizing to Beat the Devil*, 265-285.

⁶ Owen, *Sacred Flame of Love*, 172. Ayers, *The Promise of the New South*, 398-408. Stephens, *Fire Spreads*, 64-67. Stephens says that the holiness movement did best in Tennessee, north Georgia, upland South Carolina, northeast Texas, and the “western half of Kentucky.” An exception was Mississippi, which became a stronghold for African American holiness. Stephens undercuts a rural v. urban interpretation, noting that saying the southern holiness movement was mostly rural or that most southern holiness preachers in the MECS served rural pulpits does not mean much, given the ubiquity of rural appointments. Stephens notes that at the turn of the century, “16,500 of the 19,800 white southern Methodist churches were rural. Of these rural churches, 15,000 had once-a-month preaching.” Professionalization then required a minister serve in the financially strongest quarter of the MECS

Scholars have thus appropriately noted the holiness movement and the reaction to it by “Methodists.” But what has been less well noted is the extent of the theological debate over sanctification and the proper roles for Wesley and “primitive Methodism” in the MECS during this period. Taken with MECS crises over the core mark of spirituality and politics, and MECS wrangling over itinerancy and free speech related to the core mark of high episcopacy, together these debates amounted to a broad and divisive crisis of piety and order over the identity of the MECS in broad terms.

The complex theological debates over these matters in the MECS involved many different persons over at least a twenty year period, and delved into psychology, theology, epistemology, and ethics. While a necessary summarizing of such a debate is not easily done—delineations of the various camps often occupied space in local papers—the disputants are definable in several groups. The debate hinged on whether or not a spiritual transformation that could rid the soul of intentional sin and rebellion against God, filling the soul with “perfect love” for God and human persons, was possible in this life. In other words, the debate involved the theological credibility of the prayer in the popular hymn *Rock of Ages*: “be of sin the double cure; save from wrath and make me pure.” The second question involved when and how that transformation might be possible. A third question – not always mentioned in accounts but perhaps decisive – was whether or not a possible transformation should not only be sought but expected and should testimony to that transformation be made. That question—especially as it

churches in the South. 305 n.34. Historians of southern holiness have also noted the dissenting theme, Robert Stanley Ingersol, “The Burden of Dissent: Mary Lee Cagle and the Southern Holiness Movement,” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1989), and J. Lawrence Brasher’s study of his grandfather, *The Sanctified South: John Lakin Brasher and the Holiness Movement* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994). Also a Duke Ph.D. dissertation, Brasher’s study of a north Alabama MEC preacher does not, of course, set that dissent within the MECS. Like Ingersol’s study of a woman preacher (also from Alabama) Mary Lee Cagle, Brasher’s study focuses on an individual nearly controversial by definition. See also John M. Giggie, *After Redemption: Jim Crow and the Transformation of African American Religion in the Delta, 1875-1915* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

related to the issue of testimony or bearing witness—vitaly moved the issue out of the theoretical or speculative realm, and pressed into the active realm of worship and prayer, preaching and catechizing, that is, the working public witness of the church to the world.⁷

Of the various groups, one—typically of Calvinist or Reformed Protestant views—held that entire sanctification was not possible in this life but occurred at death, in contrast to Catholic views that achieved entire sanctification and justification after death in purgatory. The Calvinist view made glorification equal to entire sanctification. Because it was not possible, it was, of course, not to be sought, expected, or borne in testimony, although believers were to seek as much growth in grace as possible before death. A second group—the “Zinzendorfian” or Moravian view named for Moravian pietist leader Count Nicolaus von Zinzendorf—held an opposite position that it was possible and occurred in regeneration or the new birth, or, in other terms often used in this debate, the first crisis or first blessing. Believers were born again and utterly remade. What remained to be done was a life of rejoicing service tied to growth in maturity, not any later great cleansing, transformation, or healing of a sin-sick soul. This position did, of course, urge a seeking, expectation, and testimonials to the thorough cleansing of the soul from sin in regeneration.⁸

Three other positions remained, each with Methodist advocates who believed themselves to hold true or faithful positions on the topic. One group held that regeneration accomplished much but that through growth in grace a progressive sanctification might eventually, for a small

⁷ “The Holiness Movement,” *Roanoke Daily Times*, June 7, 1896 pp. 1, 6.

⁸ Many anti-holiness Methodists such as Bishop Keener and J. M. Boland criticized the “residue theory” – the idea that sin remains in believers after conversion. Many of these also complained that holiness doctrine deprecated regeneration at conversion. Generally, these are Zinzendorfian in doctrine. Getting born again was entire sanctification, for them, followed by a long process of growth. Even the “Battle Hymn of the Republic” suggested an un-Calvinistic optimism about the transformative aims of Christ’s atonement for sin: “As He died to make men holy...” a formulation that stressed sanctifying grace, not just forgiveness or propitiation or a covering of sin.

number, possibly result in entire sanctification. This position enabled these to claim that they believed or upheld entire sanctification, but for this group it was to be affirmed but largely ignored, for the low likelihood made the question irrelevant. For them, the Christian curriculum vitae was simple: get saved and then grow, a position functionally identical to the Calvinist position. For the already born again, growth was the thing to be stressed. In contrast, holiness advocates generally held that while the new birth (or “initial” sanctification) was important, sin remained in believers, and could only be undone by the second blessing of entire sanctification. While that came only through a crisis of consecration, faith, and receipt of the divine gift, it was followed by rapid growth beyond that ‘entire’ sanctification. Most holiness advocates believed the second blessing should be sought soon after the new birth as it prepared one for a life of service and rapid growth in grace. Entire sanctification, then, was not an achievement of laborious growth toward some endlessly deferred and trivialized dream, but a readily available gift of God that if sought in consecration and faith, might be received even now. Justifying grace and sanctifying grace were gifts received, not wages earned by some achievement. Just as persons ‘believed their way in’ to the new birth, so, too, they ‘believed their way in’ to perfect love. In regeneration, a spiritual life was begun to be deepened and made powerful through entire sanctification.

A third group, small in number, largely agreed with holiness advocates but stressed both process and crisis as means toward entire sanctification, while affirming both the possibility and the likelihood of this transformation for those who sought the gift. This third group affirmed a high view of regeneration and held out the hope and eager anticipation of receipt of a second blessing, preceded and followed by growth in grace. Most holiness movement adherents’ deemphasizing of the new birth and growth preceding entire sanctification is explained by the

flash and thunder of the intense polemics in which they were engaged by denying Calvinists urging growth toward an unreachable goal and denying fellow Methodists urging either that they were already sanctified via a Zinzendorfian first crisis or urging calm and steady growth in grace toward a very unlikely goal.⁹

But most fundamentally, Methodists were divisible into two groups. One was a loose coalition formed of those who viewed post-new birth sanctification as largely a side issue and believed that steady growth was the norm, whether toward an impossible (Calvinist) or unnecessary (Zinzendorfian) or very unlikely—but in each case trivial—goal of entire sanctification. The other group believed that post-new birth sanctification was a vital, normative, and readily available gift for all who would believe. Relative contentedness with the spiritual state of Methodism fit well with the steady and unhurried piety of the former group, just as a growing conviction that Methodists had lost the vital piety of earlier days energized holiness advocates' anticipation of a divine remedy for persistent corruption. B. F. Haynes, who testified to an experience of entire sanctification occurring sometime between the summer of 1894 and early 1895, thereafter affirmed the holiness gospel of “a second definite work of grace” of entire sanctification. A majority of elite Methodists who instead pressed progressive growth rejected this emphasis on a second crisis. Against ‘mere’ progressive sanctification, Haynes stated that

⁹ The standard holiness movement definition: “Entire sanctification is a second definite work of grace wrought by the Baptism with the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer subsequent to regeneration, received instantaneously by faith, by which the heart is cleansed from all corruption and filled with the perfect love of God.” Peters, *Christian Perfection and American Methodism*, 162. The modifiers “entire” and “perfect” were readily misleading. The gift of perfect love as understood by Wesley and most adherents was neither absolute nor incapable of improvement. It did not provide maturity or infallibility and did not prevent mistakes in judgment, speech, actions, or even attitudes, perhaps especially attitudes influenced by faulty judgment or information. It did not erase memory or personality. It could also be lost (and restored). Some interpreters made a distinction between the later Latin terminology and the original Greek, wherein the latter denotes a perfecting perfection, rather than a perfected perfection. Further, entire sanctification was not an achievement or a wage to be earned. One believed and trusted to ‘enter in’ to the blessing of sanctifying grace, just as one believed and trusted to enter in to justifying, regenerating, and adopting grace. It did, adherents believed, enable the love of God to abide in the hearts of believers, which in turn enabled believers to love both God and human persons.

while “this life is a life of growth....we are to grow *in* holiness or perfect love, but we cannot grow *into* it.”¹⁰ That is, growth precedes and follows the second crisis, but it cannot replace it. Haynes believed that “sanctification removes every obstacle within us to the Spirit’s doing His utmost in, with, and through us.”¹¹ Like many holiness adherents, Haynes distinguished between purity and maturity, claiming that perfect love addressed purity while time and growth provided maturity. Holiness adherents did not teach that the sanctified were free from temptation or mistakes in thought, judgment, or behavior.¹²

The extent of holiness advocacy within mid-century elite circles in the MECS has been obscured by its later widespread absence. There was in fact an extraordinary diffusion of the different views among the very elite of MECS lore. Georgia Methodists and the editors of the NCA from 1866 to 1902 illustrate this. Georgian and Bishop George Foster Pierce was a Zinzendorffian who saw no need of any second blessing. His father, the renowned itinerant Lovick Pierce affirmed entire sanctification and lamented that “having ceased to seek after...we of course ceased to profess it; and ceasing both to seek after it and to profess it, we of course do not preach it and enforce it on others.” At 93 years of age, Lovick was even asked – via resolution – to address in the 1878 General Conference in Atlanta on the topic. He was unable to do so, and instead wrote a book whose title confirmed his view and attitude: *A Miscellaneous Essay on Entire Sanctification Showing How it was Lost from the Church, and How it May and*

¹⁰ B. F. Haynes, *Beauty for Ashes*. (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1912). 6, 61. “Beauty for Ashes” was reprinted by the same press in 1927 with a new title, “The Beauty of Holiness.” See *Preacher’s Magazine* ad with explanation, Vol. 2, No. 11 (November 1927).

¹¹ Haynes, *Beauty for Ashes*, 28-29.

¹² Haynes, *Beauty for Ashes*, 65. The appeal was simple and direct: “Can you thus trust Him to take charge of and run you? It is turning loose and taking hold – turning yourself loose and taking hold of Him.” 72.

*Must be Regained.*¹³

Bishop G. F. Pierce was Bishop A. G. Haygood's mentor, and Haygood also served a neophyte apprenticeship under Lovick. Haygood waited until both Pierces were dead to deliver his 1885 sermon *Growth in Grace*. Aiming to turn back the holiness revival, Haygood affirmed "religious development" through an "interminable process" that he said "only a madman" or those in "ignorant" denial would fail to acknowledge. In an excellent statement of liberal Calvinist opposition to previous Methodist teaching on sanctification, including that of both the Pierces, Haygood rejected "a priori" reasoning, affirmed the natural and universal law of experience and growth, and appealed to "God's two books – his book of nature and his book of inspired words." Haygood asked "is it not always true that the more cultured one is the more modest he is?" For Haygood, theology that minimized "the most stupendous event" of regeneration was "an audacious folly and a fatally unscriptural invention of men" violating the natural and universal law of growth and "contrary to the teaching of Christ and his apostles and... full of spiritual peril to all who [were] misled by it."¹⁴

Haygood's colleague and fellow Georgian, Bishop Joseph S. Key, disagreed. He preached a sermon in 1887 to the Georgia Holiness Convention, *Heart Purity, and Our Reasons for Urging It*, which was taken down by a secretive stenographer who sold it to the same publishers that brought out Haygood's sermon two years before. Appealing to the zeal of Paul and Wesley, Key announced, "I affirm to-day, with all possible emphasis, that salvation from all sin received now by faith, is the distinguishing doctrine which differentiates Methodism from all

¹³ Lovick Pierce, *A Miscellaneous Essay on Entire Sanctification Showing How it was Lost from the Church, and How it May and Must be Regained* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1912), p. 3. For G. F. Pierce on sanctification, including statement that his dissonance with Wesley's views was known before his election to the episcopacy in 1854, George G. Smith, *The Life and Times of George Foster Pierce* (Sparta, GA: Hancock Publishing Company, 1888), 186-190, 664-665.

¹⁴ Atticus G. Haygood, *Growth in Grace* (Macon, GA: J. W. Burke & Company, 1885), p. 4, 9, 10, 16, 22, 8.

other churches.” Without it, Methodism was “indefensible” and in danger of divine “displeasure and abandonment.” Key worked through the supporting testimony of Wesley, Francis Asbury, Adam Clarke, William McKendree, and the full-throated appeals for the importance and secondness of sanctification in the episcopal and pastoral addresses of the 1824 and 1832 General Conferences before warning “God can easier raise up a new church than revive a dead one.” Calling for Methodists to “return to first principles,” Key encouraged holiness advocates to bear opposition with patience and humility, and recognize satanic efforts at “misrepresentation and perversion.” The bishop counseled “be loving, brethren” as “nothing wins like love.” Key reminded them that they were “witnesses,” and quoted Wesley’s admonition to preach perfection amiably, not harshly so that it might “excite only hope, and joy, and desire.” Noting that Wesley and the earlier Methodist bishops had known “men are justified before they are sanctified,” Key appealed for charity from those who believed they received the blessing at conversion. “Heart-purity we must have,” Key pleaded, for being “converted but consciously not sanctified, how can we reach your blessed attainment if not by another and subsequent work of cleansing?”¹⁵

Among the NCA editors, T. O. Summers was a firm and unambiguous articulator and

¹⁵ Joseph S. Key, *Heart Purity, and Our Reasons for Urging It* (Macon, GA: J. W. Burke & Company, 1887), pp. 1-2, 10, 12-15. Turley, *Wheel Within A Wheel*, 121. Affirmations of Key’s irenic and pastoral appeals for the old piety appeared in the *Advocate* upon his election: “Bishop Key is also a hearty believer in the Wesleyan formula of scriptural holiness, and in this as in all other views and doctrines of his Church is, and ever has been, firm, discreet, and conservative.” NCA May 29, 1886 p.13. Key was elected bishop in May 1886. He spent all his time as pastor and presiding elder in Georgia and was the only bishop to be an active and specific holiness advocate. He settled in Texas for his episcopal career, perhaps because of reports like the following that follows a longer commentary on how weak the Methodist church was in that part of Texas and how great the need was for more preachers for the area. Reporting from a small “frontier” district (San Saba District) gathering near Waco, Key wrote of the preachers that “They preached and prayed and talked as though they believed lost men were redeemed by the blood of Christ – that salvation was a reality – and the time is short. To such men heart-purity and entire sanctification came like a breath from heaven. They yearned for it, and sought it like hungry children. We bowed together in the altar and reconsecrated ourselves to God; we met at the tent and talked and prayed for full salvation. Some ‘believed and entered in’ – all sought – none opposed. In these ends of the earth, the old Wesleyan experience of ‘perfect love’ is indispensable.” “Bishop Key in Texas,” NCA October 16, 1886 p. 14.

defender of Wesleyan doctrine of possibility via a second crisis. O. P. Fitzgerald was an optimistic but doctrinally-inattentive and doctrinally-disinterested cheerleader for greater experience of holiness, who ended his term mostly concerned with calming the dispute over the topic. E. E. Hoss was a warrior against Summers, Wesley, and the holiness advocates. In just fourteen years, in other words, the *Advocate* went from firm defense of an old Wesleyan orthodoxy to pummeling any advocacy of that view. In Hoss's editorial world, Methodism's doctrine of Christian perfection had become the mere second blessing theory of 'sanctificationists.'¹⁶

Indeed the attacks on Wesley and older standard formulations became more drastic in the MECS wing of the debate than they were in the MEC. For conservatives of varying stripes, the reaction against the holiness movement led to doctrinal overstepping which in turn provoked criticism and opposition. J. M. Boland's widely-influential 1888 Zinzendorffian attack argued that the doctrine of sanctification was *The Problem of Methodism*. Wesley's formulation received an explicit and satirical critique. In 1890, Vanderbilt graduate Joshua H. Harrison argued that any effort to maintain or restore the original features of Methodist doctrine constituted an *Unmethodistic Methodism*. Boland loved Harrison's book, especially its attack on the "residue theory" that sin remained in believers after regeneration.¹⁷

¹⁶ Summers' defenses of the doctrine lacked the sense that other positions could possibly be considered true to Methodism. Hoss's writings were just as confident that older formulations had no place in Methodism. But Hoss attacked adherents of an opposite position in ways that Summers – who served under G. F. Pierce – did not. Other more quasi-official support for the second blessing doctrine came from the popular catechetical primer and defense of Methodism by North Carolinian Hilary T. Hudson, *The Methodist Armor*, 2nd (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1889). Hudson's *Armor* declared "It is a work commencing *in* and carried on *after* conversion. It is a *second* blessing, in harmony *with*, yet separate *from*, and subsequent *to*, the work of conversion." Hudson also said "All agree, then, that *holiness* – perfect love, sanctification – is absolutely necessary as a qualification for heaven." 109.

¹⁷ J. M. Boland, *The Problem of Methodism: Being A Review of the Residue Theory of Regeneration and the Second Change Theory of Sanctification; and The Philosophy of Christian Perfection* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1888). Joshua H. Harrison, *Unmethodistic Methodism: The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Light of To-Day*.

But Harrison did more than propose a revisioning of Methodist doctrine. His proposal virtually denied any concept of standards. Methodism did not need change. Methodism *was* change, absolutely malleable in the hands of its best men. Methodist doctrine was a “spirit,” not a body of teaching, and “revision” of its doctrines “constituted the essence of Methodism.”¹⁸ Harrison also envisioned a use of the term ‘primitive’ that had very different connotations than those generally employed in Methodist circles. Rather than inspirational touchstones of originating piety, early Methodism – including the Articles, and the cherished hymns of Charles Wesley – was unevolved and childish, to be tolerated and suffered, and recalled as “obsolete” “swaddling-clothes” never to be worn again. In Harrison’s imagined Methodist future, the very faith of John and Charles Wesley represented an “unmethodistic Methodism,” and its re-appropriation in the present was a fundamentally heretical act.¹⁹

(Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1890). Boland on Harrison, NCA, March 21, 1891, p. 20. On MECS greater assault on traditional Methodist theology, see Smith in Bucke, *History of American Methodism*, Vol 2, p. 623.

¹⁸ J. H. Harrison: “Progress in the discovery of truth in harmony with the spirit of the doctrines indicated above” (“universal salvation provided for the race, personal salvation conditioned upon faith, the agency of man in his salvation, holiness of heart and life, etc.”) “even to the revision of forms of propositions or theories, is in harmony with, and indeed constitutes, the essence of Methodism. The consensus of theological opinion on the part of the most intelligent and devout persons adhering to the fundamental truths above constitutes the body of doctrine called Methodism.” “Adherence to propositions and theories clearly out of harmony with the general mind of Methodist people is unmethodistic. To call a regression, where the aggregate of Methodist opinion has advanced beyond Wesley or Watson in the theory of holiness, is clearly out of harmony with the spirit of Methodist doctrine.” Joshua H. Harrison, *UnMethodistic Methodism: The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Light of To-Day*. (Nashville: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1890), 30.

¹⁹ “This sanctification theology that cleaves to our hymns and our discipline is to be explained and treated exactly as it is in the other writings of Methodist authors; with this difference: the Methodist thought and sentiment of to-day tolerate those rudiments of an early theology for the sake of the spirit in the songs and the discipline. Those theoretical forms are not now animated by the logical life that once gave them being. That initial life of thought that gave them form has been replaced by a broader and more liberal and accurate exegesis of Scripture, that suffers the trammels of inadequate expression for the sake of the noble life that once found little or no shackles therein. Modern Methodism infuses into these rudiments of an obsolete theology its own life.” “This doctrine of holiness as defined by many of our great Methodist authors, is the swaddling-clothes of Methodism that now walks the earth as a stalwart youth, and looks back upon its former drapery with the reverence and affection that a boy reviews the costume of his infancy, but without any desire or effort to put it on again.” Joshua H. Harrison, *UnMethodistic Methodism: The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Light of To-Day*. (Nashville: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1890), 33-34. The hymns of Charles Wesley included the following, #432 in the MECS Hymn Book of 1900, “Give me a new, a perfect heart, From doubt, and fear, and sorrow free, The mind which was

The unashamed challenge to Wesley and Methodist standards from Haygood, Boland, and Harrison—reinforced and validated as well by Vanderbilt theologian Wilbur Tillett and NCA editor and former Vanderbilt church historian Hoss—proved unsettling to the conservative self-understanding of many Methodists on both sides of the debate. For a wide group of conservatives, the impudence of these mockers and scoffers of Wesley showed that a hard turn had been taken. An explosion of outraged debate ensued. Leo Rosser's *A Reply to the 'Problem of Methodism'* declared that Boland's *Problem* contained "more errors, contradictions, absurdities, sophistries, and satire combined against his own Methodism, on the doctrine of sanctification, than can be found in any other work" of which Rosser knew, certainly including those written by non-Methodists. Rosser intended to "arrest and counteract the specious and pernicious influence" of Boland's *Problem*. The debate laid bare a long history of intra-Methodist dialogue concerning the role of Wesley in American Methodism, the power of the Holy Spirit, the extent of human religious potential (or the 'optimism of grace'), and the proper relationship between organized Methodism and American society. Deep concern for, and a deep division over, the direction of the church and society increasingly motivated holiness advocates who believed perhaps more strongly than their disagreeing fellow Methodists that they lived in a special age of the Spirit. Despite Harrison's advice to file away memory of the adorably quaint Wesleys in a museum, holiness advocates deepened their search for and application of historic sources and solutions steeped in the Methodist tradition as they understood it. American Methodism's general inattention to its earlier beliefs and practices inhibited later Methodist attempts to appropriate an older eighteenth and early nineteenth century past, itself well beyond

in Christ impart, And let my spirit cleave to thee... Oh, that I now, from sin released, Thy word may to the utmost prove, Enter into the promised rest, The Canaan of thy perfect love." *Hymn Book of the MECS* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1900), 309.

the memory of most participants in the debate. But none of the camps involved in the MECS debate were ‘anti-Methodist.’ Not even Harrison was an ecclesiastical anarchist. They were Methodists engaged in a disagreement between Methodists over the core issues of the Methodist doctrinal tradition.²⁰

But the debate, as it spun off into sub-debates from the immediate issues involved, revealed how divergent Methodist opinions had become, not just on the doctrine of sanctification but on the touchstones and sources of theological authority within the proudly conservative MECS. In a way more true in the MECS than elsewhere, the highest connectional authorities made claims about the Methodist past that were both inaccurate and out of step with the official statements of earlier authorities. MECS theological leadership at the highest levels became

²⁰ Leo Rosser, *A Reply to the ‘Problem of Methodism,’* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1889), 3. Extensive debate appeared in the NCA, for example, The Problem of Methodism ad NCA November 3, 1888, p. 20; Review of “A Reply” by Boland in NCA March 9, 1889 p.7; support for Rosser’s criticism of Boland from J. R. Bell of McKenzie, Tenn, NCA March 14, 1889 p.2; another review of some length from “Gilderoy” that includes Wesley comments NCA March 14, 1889 p.7.; A sharp critique of Boland (Boland proposing a new Methodism not the old, mentions “Dr. Bounds”), NCA, March 21, 1889 p. 3. “Dr. Boland’s Book” by L. Pulliam from Ironton, Mo. Boland was transferred to Kentucky Conference in 1889 to the Paris church, “one of the best appointments”, NCA September 26, 1889 p. 9, 13. For E. M. Bounds, NCA May 22, 1886 p. 17 where he leads religious service at General Conference. E. M. Bounds from St. Louis *Advocate*, “The Leadership of Holiness,” NCA January 4, 1890 p. 3-4. Also, “Are We Going On to Perfection?,” by W. K. Boyle, Baltimore Episcopal Methodist, NCA January 4, 1890 p. 4. The next week: “To Dr. Bounds, we respond ‘Amen!’ Let the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, be forever, as it was designed to be from the first, a great holiness association. If it is not such an institution, it can show no good reason why it should live a day longer to cumber the ground,” NCA January 11, 1890 p.1. “A Holy Church,” NCA January 11, 1890 p. 8. For anti-Rush see NCA, March 28, 1889, p.3., “Books, Authors and the Like” by John E. Edwards, Lynchburg, Va. This is a vigorous critique of Rush who is not mentioned by name. NCA, September 1, 1888, p. 8 by Boland, “Dr. Rush vs. ‘The Problem.’” Ad for book “Sanctification” by J. H. Baxter of the North Georgia Conference, NCA September 25, 1886 p. 20. NCA, April 18, 1889, p.1, “The ‘Reply’ and Dr. Edwards.” “The Critics Criticized” by Leo Rosser NCA April 18, 1889 p.13.; “Entire Sanctification” NCA April 25, 1889 p.3 by L. Pulliam; Reply to Problem ad and review, NCA April 25, 1889, p.20; “Dr. Cottrell Reviewed” NCA May 2, 1889 p.3; Cottrell “Dr. Cottrell Denies” NCA June 20, 1889 p. 17; “Wail of the Weepers” – “if I had shipped my little all on the craft of ‘Problematic Methodism’” supportive of Rosser from A. H. Sutherland, Monterey, Mexico, NCA May 30, 1889, p.17; “Rosser’s Reply to Boland” NCA June 6, 1889 p.3 (supports Rosser) by T. L. Boswell who spoke of “our standard authors” including Wesley, “Clarke, Watson, Summers...”; “South Georgia Notes” includes commentary about the non-disagreement among Conference over holiness issue from Philip Francis, NCA June 6, 1889, p.5; “Dr. Mahon’s Views” also on sanctification and sources, NCA June 6, 1889, p.14; “Texas Conference Notes” by “Wesley” supports Southern Texas Holiness Association and Hymnbook, Wesley and Bible as all supportive, NCA June 6, 1889, p. 14; T. L. Boswell of “Macon, Tenn.,” NCA August 8, 1889 p.5; “John Wesley and the Episcopal Church” NCA May 23, 1889 p.8; On the generosity and support for missions in Japan of L. L. Pickett of Dangerfield, Texas and Fitzgerald’s approval of him – “Another Missionary” NCA October 31, 1889 p. 13.

united by its repudiation of earlier standards. For conservatives, the doctrinal cacophony, confusion, schizophrenia—and the doctrinal vandalism—painfully and frighteningly revealed wildly different and deeply irreconcilable answers to rudimentary questions such as what did Wesley teach? (a historical question), what do our standards require us to teach? (a polity question), do we care what Wesley taught? (a polity question), and do we even have standards? (a polity question). As Melvin Dieter noted, the debate questioned “the theological authority of Wesley himself.” MECS self-understanding as a theologically conservative church was shaken, and conservatives like John J. Tigert sought to restore order. But most elite Methodist leaders had come to embrace views in closer alignment with other theological traditions. Doing so, they took a big step closer to a rootless, malleable generic Protestant piety that prepared the way for a twentieth century Protestant theological world less interested in the soteriological (doctrines related to salvation) emphases that had characterized the evangelical project from Luther through the revivals of Whitfield, Wesley, and Edwards to the sweep of an ascendant, powerful American establishment by 1900. While the fundamentalist-modernist debates have received more attention, Methodists did not split over the authority of Scripture, but over the non-canonical authorities of doctrine and even over the importance of soteriology itself.²¹

²¹ Dieter, *The Holiness Revival*, 256. See also Peters, *Christian Perfection*, esp. Chapter 5 “The Doctrine Modified, 1865-1900,” 133-180. The massive sifting and reshuffling of American Protestantism into an ethically-obsessed left and an epistemologically-obsessed right was beginning, a shift that would see neither embrace salvation again until mid-century, when psychology began to offer its therapeutic solutions, and evangelicals began to distance themselves from fundamentalist warring. Eventually, within the mainline Methodist left, references to Wesley as theological source were increasingly out of style until a new round of historical recovery began in the last third of the 20th century. See also debates in NCA, review of C. P. Masden, *Pentecost in Practical Life* – “when the author discusses doctrine he is feeble, when he sets forth experience he does it grandly,” NCA June 25, 1887 p. 9. Bishops using “pentecostal” language, “The Columbia Conference,” by R. K. Hargrove, NCA August 13, 1887 p. 17. “Conference Sunday was pentecostal... experiences and tears and songs and rejoicings filled the hour.” “A Strong Pulpit” including usefulness of systematic theology, NCA June 6, 1889, p.1; Fitzgerald urging conservative progress that remains in the flow of the historic truths of Christianity “Is it Wabbling, or is it Going Forward?,” NCA March 26, 1887 p.1. Similarly, Warren A. Candler urged conservatism on creeds and mocking “the fashion in our day to berate creeds and theological systems.” “Wreckers Making a Corner on Creeds,” NCA April 2, 1887 p. 8. See also NCA August 8, 1889, p. 8 and NCA August 22, 1889, p. 1. “Croaking and Croakers” NCA August 15, 1889 p.1

Yet even if the debate had not entailed a challenge to Wesley and other Methodist standard authors, the debate over sanctification would still have been difficult to resolve. For a disagreement on this point created a serious problem for Methodist's liturgical life, that is, the praying, preaching, and worshipping that energized Methodist connectionalism, that was its very *raison d'être*. Stated simply, how were Methodists of differing opinions to pray together if a Methodist's scriptural prayer "I pray that you will be sanctified wholly" might imply many different things to the others present? That prayer might elicit a query if the prayer intended that the beneficiary of that prayer would receive an instantaneous gift subsequent to conversion, or perhaps that he would become a Christian via the new birth, or alternatively, praying that she would rapidly grow in grace, or, was that a request that he would die soon and thereby be perfected in the article of death?

On this point, Fitzgerald's warm-hearted stress on geniality proved unhelpful as he trivialized the actual doctrinal and liturgical debate—which desperately needed a solution or, at least, resolution—while suggesting the real issue was behavioral and ethical. In other words, the

"There is no proper place or function for a croaker in the militant Church."; For dissenting calls for returning to/maintaining the old doctrines and spiritual power of Methodism "'We Are In The Woods'" by Wm. J. Robertson, Perry, Ga. NCA November 7, 1889 p. 13; "Brother Davis Exhorteth," by B. O. Davis, NCA November 7, 1889 p. 15. "Sanctification" by A Southern Methodist; also "The Discussion" about Boland; and "Dr. Rush's 'The Problem.'" By Boland [title not clear, nor is page number]. NCA September 15, 1888 [[page unclear]] "Sanctification" by "A Southern Methodist." NCA September 15, 1888 [[page unclear but same as Sanctification]] "The Discussion" from the editor. NCA, September 15, 1888. [page unclear, title too... "Dr. Rush's 'The Problem'" [?] by J. M. Boland. Same issue has ad for "Summers on Holiness" by J. D. Barbee, Agent saying "profitable for all devout and intelligent readers." NCA, Sept 15, 1888, p. 20. "Sanctification and Entire Sanctification" a critique of Bolling by H. B. Cockrill, NCA July 18, 1889, p.4; Demanding to know what was the official teaching of the church on sanctification, "Dr. Boling Wants Light" NCA, April 11, 1889 p.3. "Light to be Found" includes listing of standard Wesley sermons on the issue as "this is standard authority among Methodists" NCA May 2, 1889 p. 3; "Brother Boling, (sic "Bolling"), Mr. Wesley, and the Bible" NCA June 13, 1889 p.14 by Robert P. Martyn.; Response from Bolling, "Brother Martyn and Mr. Wesley," NCA June 27, 1889 p. 4; On the subtlety and danger of sin, "Unconscious Wickedness" NCA August 8, 1889 p. 1; On higher criticism of the Bible, NCA, September 19, 1889 p. 13.; "The modern thought that antagonizes Christianity will never be anything but modern. It will not survive to see another generation. It has no root in anything that has life in it." NCA October 17, 1889 p. 8. Theological debate related to creation between D. C. Kelley, Wilbur Tillett, and Dr. West with Kelley criticized by the author, "Cosmogony, etc.," John B. Stevenson, NCA April 17, 1886 p. 13. Criticism of the modern critics, NCA May 14, 1887 p.1.

debate itself evidenced some kind of personal failing in the brotherly spirit of those engaged in the debate. If only everyone would start loving everyone else, disagreement would dissolve into blessedness. This position assumed that disagreements were inherently scandalous, or at least that doctrinal debates were, and had the tendency to undermine the personal credibility of those on all sides who were most engaged in those discussions. While it was certainly true that tempers were not always in calm equipoise (although perhaps no hotter than seen in other debates occurring at the same time), Fitzgerald was making a poor contribution. Having nothing to offer to the doctrinal discussion, he went beyond his role as a referee and increasingly took a harder position on the very idea of debate.²²

In 1885, Fitzgerald had been more open and hopeful. “The Doctrinal Unity of Methodism,” he claimed, “was one of the good signs of the times because it has been reached not by coercion or suppression, but by a crystallization of its formularies by men with freedom in

²² Fitzgerald’s “A Few Words on Holiness” revealed his general approach. “The essence of holiness is love – love to God and love to man. If this mark be lacking, the profession of it is a delusion. Holiness is the one thing that distinguishes a Christian from other men. An unholy person is not a Christian. Christians differ in their attainments, but no Christian can continue in the actual and conscious favor of God who does not purpose in his heart to perform every known duty and to claim all the blood-bought blessings of the gospel. The Methodist Church is a holiness association, or it is nothing. Its avowed mission is to ‘spread Scriptural holiness over these lands.’ It exists for no other purpose. If any belonging to its ministry or membership forget this, let their pure minds be stirred up by way of remembrance. This should be done by pastors and teachers in the Church in the discharge of their regular duties as such. In all teaching concerning holiness it will be wise to adhere to Scripture terminology. The Holy Spirit never uses a misleading word. Holiness is a state to be attained, a blessing to be enjoyed by every disciple of Jesus, not a riddle to be guessed at or a question to be wrangled over. The flowers of paradise bloom in its path. All its ways are the ways of pleasantness, and all its paths are peace.” “A Few Words on Holiness,” NCA, October 3, 1889, p. 9. On the Holy Spirit, “The Witness of the Spirit,” by Wilbur F. Tillett followed by the editor’s affirmation, NCA May 8, 1886 p. 8-9. A “young preacher” responded asking Tillett to publish an article on ‘sanctifying faith’ “or on what we are to believe in order to attain sanctification.” NCA May 22, 1886 p.4. For more on Vanderbilt’s Theological Faculty see *Dimensions in Theology, Doctrinal and Practical* by the Theological Faculty of Vanderbilt University (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1890) and the review in NCA February 15, 1890 p. 7, where the reviewer characterizes Vanderbilt as “our chief school of the prophets.” On holiness – “the metaphysics of holiness bewildered an entire convention. The humble experience of it puts heaven into every trusting heart. Eschew the metaphysics and seek the experience in the present tense, beloved.” NCA, April 11, 1889, p.8. “The deep things of God are revealed to him who sinks into the depths of humility, not to him who climbs the misty heights of speculative theology;” and “Doctrinal difficulties seldom disturb those who keep the straight path of practical Christian service. Light shines there all the time.” NCA October 24, 1889 p. 8. Similarly, “the baptism of the Holy Ghost means, most of all, power – power to be employed for the glory of God and the salvation of men. When you pray for this baptism, forget it not.” NCA October 31, 1889 p. 2.

their souls, open Bibles in their hands, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit upon their souls.” But even Fitzgerald’s strained optimism in the late 1880s could produce the following statement: “the perfect love that casts out fear is a present experience to some of the Lord’s people. What is it to you? Your answer to this may date a brighter day in your Christian life. You cannot afford to dismiss it lightly from your mind. To reject a proffered grace is no less dangerous than to disobey a known command.”²³

Still Fitzgerald did not often write about holiness as an affirmative doctrine. His instructions to teach and enjoy a Christian experience without any reference to Christian doctrine related to it indicated how little Fitzgerald, a church editor for decades, had thought about the doctrinal aspects of the question. He simply did not have much to say in relation to doctrine. Most of what he wrote on the topic changed the subject. As the doctrinal debate broke out, Fitzgerald changed the subject to experience and personal conduct, a move that suggested that doctrine – or at least doctrine related to sanctification – was not something worth debating. Most “non-holiness” Methodists who addressed sanctification doctrine were reacting to perceived excesses or errors in holiness advocacy. There seem to have been few positive, affirmative statements on the topic that were not from advocates of the second blessing view. Even holiness adherents found it hard to write non-polemically as the debate evolved. Methodists fell into two broad camps on this issue. The smaller camp, were those who were interested in the topic, the “going deeper” crowd that had always been a small minority. The other group, much larger in number, were just not particularly interested in that aspect of Methodist doctrine. It was perhaps understandable that the latter group readily viewed the former as hyper-critical zealots intent on a takeover, a natural way for a bored when not annoyed majority of elite clergy to respond to a

²³ NCA January 10, 1885 p.1. NCA, August 29, 1889 p.1. Fitzgerald commented that some preach holiness “specifically,” while others “sprinkle it all through” their sermons. NCA October 24, 1885 p. 1.

vocal minority pressing for widespread change. The *Advocate's* rebuke of both groups noted this difference but stressed the behavioral divide and denied the importance of actual unresolved doctrinal differences: "The censoriousness of one class of persons who speak and write on the subject of Christian experience, and the flippancy of another, equally repel the souls that ought to be led to the shining heights of holiness by teachers who walk humbly with God and love their fellow-men."²⁴

To be sure, many like Fitzgerald would give positive affirmation to others' deeper

²⁴ NCA December 11, 1886 p. 8. Fitzgerald wrote of "The Holiness Question" saying "The holiness question is always in order in a Methodist pulpit or a Methodist newspaper. Holiness is Christianity and Christianity is holiness. When the pulpit and the press of Methodism ignore holiness, they ignore the gospel. Thus far all Methodists agree. But when we come to the controversial aspects of this question, there seem to be wide differences of opinion. The number and character of the communications on this subject now on our files indicate this in a way that strongly impresses the editorial mind. What to do with them all is a difficult matter to decide. No disrespect is intended to anybody when we say that though many of these communications are the productions of men of high standing in the Church, men noted for their good character and good sense, there is in them little that is new. Our brethren are thinking over the thoughts and saying over the words that have been thought and said by our great masters of polemics of former generations. Some of our younger writers make the mistake of assuming that what is new to them must be new to all the world. So it happens that we have on hand a number of well-written articles presenting substantially the same points, and yet each writer believing and claiming that he has discovered the true method of solving all the difficulties and settling all further controversy concerning Scriptural holiness. These parallelisms of thought would astonish some of our sprightly and ingenious correspondents if we had room and inclination to print their several communications. In kindness to them, and in mercy to our readers, we forbear. If good and wise men differ in their interpretations of what St. Paul and St. John said on this question, we cannot wonder that they differ in their understanding of what John Wesley has said thereon. Nor is it strange that brethren of the most candid natures and purest intentions get lost in the logomachal labyrinth before they know it. Wherefore, beloved, let all concerned be patient with the editor and with each other, and claiming in the present tense all that is offered in the present tense, go on rejoicing in a present, free, and full salvation. Then the vexed holiness question will be a blessed holiness experience." "The Holiness Question," NCA December 12, 1889 p. 9. Positive statement "Our Church" five summary points including "everywhere there are signs of vigor...the spiritual state of the Church is hopeful...a good degree of doctrinal unity exists in the Church...Christian education is gaining among us...God is with us of a truth." Further, asserts that "Southern Methodism is alive and on the march," and that "the old-time power is not gone, nor is it going. Our pulpit burns with pentecostal fire," Fitzgerald affirmed, and "Our Church is still a revival Church." Under "doctrinal unity" he acknowledged that "a stiff breeze of controversy now and then sweeps over the body," and "a timid soul might be disturbed with apprehensions of friction and possible schism." "But the great body of our preachers and keep," said Fitzgerald, "keep the middle current of Methodist theology, and while a few are busy threshing the straw of old controversies, the majority are advancing on the lines of practical evangelism." Appealing for "self-restraint, prudence, and patience," he said, "They shall prosper who love Jerusalem and pray for her peace. Let every Southern Methodist covet this blessing," Fitzgerald pleaded. He concluded his optimistic appeal with "And this is best of all, if we may say it truly – GOD IS WITH US." NCA, July 4, 1889 p.1, "Our Church." Regarding revivals, Fitzgerald opined that "a genuine revival clears the channel of Church-life of the strifes that impede its flow. The so-called revival that does not bring this to pass is not genuine." NCA August 1, 1889 p.1. Fitzgerald: "Keep up the revivals and camp meetings." NCA January 1, 1887, p.1.

experience, but others responded to holiness advocacy the way one might respond to chatter about a sport for which one did not particularly care; if uninterested, it does not take much to have had one's fill. Ultimately, it was this widespread inattention and apathy on the doctrinal and experiential aspects that both created the space for a booming recovery and ensured its rapid decline. The MECS understood itself as a doctrinally conservative church. But if many clergy had never experienced this topic as important or vital, if it had long ceased to be more than a minority interest, and when brought up, the debate went in every direction at once, with radically incoherent competing opinions expressed, it seemed there was not actually anything to *conserve*.

Denial became the order of the day in the late 1880s. Fitzgerald expressed his folksy wisdom, writing "Christianity, in its experiential and practical aspects, is not a complex but a simple thing. When it becomes a riddle to us it is because we leave the experiential and the practical and go to theorizing or chopping logic."²⁵ But humor mixed with warning also found expression, as Fitzgerald said "the friction in Methodism appears only when there is friction in the men who administer the system. If the navigation does not suit you at any time, stick to the ship. Not every Jonah is swallowed by a friendly whale."²⁶ Vanderbilt New Testament

²⁵ NCA, October 13, 1888 p.1. Humor from Fitzgerald's NCA August 15, 1889 p. 1 on "thanksgiving service reform"); "The indiscriminate use of the word 'splendid' has taken all the splendor out of it in some circles," NCA December 19, 1889 p. 8. Also, "A Silly Falsehood," where Fitzgerald rebukes a rumor that Vanderbilt had a department of dancing. NCA December 26, 1889 p. 9. The optimism of the *Advocate* under Fitzgerald: "doctrinal fermentation usually clarifies in a revival. Good men and women who differ in terminology agree in experience," NCA, March 2, 1889, p.8. Methodist confidence: "it is truly refreshing to hear so much of the success of the gospel, and we feel a pardonable satisfaction when assured that Methodism is doing her share in the great work. It will never be otherwise so long as we are true to our doctrines and faithful to our methods." NCA, November 24, 1888, p. 8. "The Difference" between "the true ecclesiastical reformer" and the "ecclesiastical iconoclast." "The Difference," NCA, October 10, 1889 p. 9. Fitzgerald on atheism and "rose water theology," "Fourth of July Sermon," NCA July 17, 1886 p. 6-7, 14. Fitzgerald with common sense pastoral advice, especially to younger preachers, see comments in *NCA*, September 29, 1888, p.1 and p.8, and *NCA*, October 13, 1888 p.8. Another example, "The hearer who complained that the preacher was "too old-fashioned" merely showed that he had lost his relish for the old gospel whose 'fashion' never did suit a worldly mind," NCA July 25, 1889 p.1. Also encouragement "To Young Preachers-Chiefly" to be inspired by but do not copy others NCA January 19, 1889 p.1.

²⁶ NCA, November 10, 1888 p. 1. The editors of the *NCA* made appeals for harmony in the summer of 1889, saying "the man who is thoroughly at peace with God is not likely to be at war with his brethren," as "the divine touch

professor Gross Alexander meanwhile rejoiced that “a more homogeneous ecclesiastical community does not exist on the American continent.” When Alexander declared the MECS “at peace with herself...and singularly free from dissensions and disturbances within...[having] never been disturbed by...[a] serious doctrinal controversy,” one might have wondered if he was seriously behind on his reading of MECS newspapers. Alexander was more focused on the polity debates, and added “there is at present some little breeze of discussion among the newspapers concerning the criticism of bishops and their official acts, which is all right and proper...but it hardly touches the constitutional aspects of the subject, and there is no real demand for any essential change.”²⁷

within is a pacificator and a help to the blessed silence which is the best peace-preserver.” They went on to say “to be true to Christian principle without breach of brotherly love is always possible where the principle is clear, the brotherly love genuine. Good men differ in ideas, but agree in spirit. Let us all try to be good men.” NCA, June 13, 1889 p. 8. For an appeal for doctrinal and ecclesiastical unity, see NCA July 4, 1889 p.1 “Our Church.” In the same vein, the editors of the NCA urged “until we can discuss honest difference of opinion concerning all debatable questions of Church doctrine, polity and administration without asperity of temper and personalities, it would be better to put in the time in praying rather than in controversy. The greatest of all is charity.” NCA, November 14, 1889 p.8.

²⁷ Gross Alexander, *A History of the M.E. Church, South* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1890), 137-138, 140. American Church History Series, 1894. See also NCA February 9, 1889 p.8 “Among over a million of Methodists a breeze of doctrinal debate may be expected to spring up now and then, but our people were never more unified in opinion and policy than now, and the old ship sails on, guided by her chart, with the Pilot aboard.” Contra Alexander, see “Trial for Heresy” by Jno. J. Tigert, NCA, January 12, 1889, p.14 that was about discipline and what it means to be a Methodist minister related to answering what they were bound by or not. W. T. Poynter of KY replied to Tigert: “and though he seemeth to speak ex cathedra, he is not the prophet of Methodism.” On theology: “a progressive science.” “Professor Tigert on Heresy,” NCA, January 26, 1889 p.4, a strong case of “dissent” to be sure. Tigert replies on February 9, 1889 NCA p.4 calls Poynter “radical and revolutionary”; “Heresy-Once More” by Poynter NCA March 9, 1889 p.14.; T. L. Boswell replied to Jewell about Tigert debate – includes significant commentary on sanctification and Zinzendorfianism and “established standards of doctrine”, even lists them, NCA March 21, 1889 p. 3; Tigert responds again same issue, “Trial for Heresy: Bishops and Other Clergy” by Jno. J. Tigert, NCA, March 21, 1889 p.4; L.L. Nash responds NCA April 11, 1889 p. 2; For a scholarly caution regarding a too liberal use of the word heresy, noting “it is not a small thing to characterize a man as a heretic, or his religious opinions as heretical,” see “What is Heresy?,” by R. N. Sledd, NCA October 17, 1889 p. 15. “Shall I take a Course in Theology?” NCA August 8, 1889 p.3 by “Ich Dien” (“I serve” in German); On sanctification debates, “How is This?” by G. W. Graves of Texas NCA July 4, 1889 p.14; “The Doctrinal Standards of Methodism” by W. P. Harrison, Book Editor, apparently set off a considerable debate as evidenced by the comment in the NCA: “The brethren who are piling in their views on the question of ‘Methodist Standards’ will please be patient.” “The Doctrinal Standards of Methodism,” NCA June 20, 1889, p.3-4, by “W. P. Harrison, *Book Editor.*” Comment NCA August 29, 1889 p. 8. A lengthy response to Harrison, “The Doctrinal Standards of Methodism: The Other Side,” by T. J. Dodd, NCA July 25, 1889, p. 3-4. A harsh rebuke of Dodd, “Dr. Dodd’s Blunders” by Jno. J. Tigert, NCA August 8, 1889, p.5.; For Dodd’s irenic if defiant reply, “Dr. Dodd Again,” NCA August 22, 1889 p.13; Another

For reasons at least partially related to the personalities in charge of Methodist voicing, the doctrinal debate was quickly moralized and spiritualized. Fitzgerald's need for peace and lack of interest in doctrine played a large role in the devolution of a doctrinal debate—a debate about how to pray—into a debate about whose behavior was better. That turn to ad hominem usage proved essential, opening the door for disciplinary responses that proved particularly unfortunate. The episcopal strong man types were at the forefront of the crackdown of holiness adherents in the MECS. Keener began the formal response at the South Carolina Annual Conference in the fall of 1889, and Duncan and Hargrove made their own well-planned moves at holiness adherents from the episcopal seat at annual conferences.²⁸

view, "Doctrine and Opinion," by John C. Shackelford of the South-west Missouri Conference, NCA August 8, 1889 p.14; Dodd's reply, "The Doctrinal Standards of Methodism: The Other Side, Again Considered," NCA September 12, 1889 p. 3-4. "Why some persons dislike systematic theology," NCA February 9, 1889 p.8; On Evil/Theodicy/Providence, "Short Meditation on the Providence of God," NCA July 11, 1889 p.1, probably in reference to Johnstown Flood that received other notice and sympathetic commentary that summer. "God and the Future," NCA December 26, 1889 p. 8. See also "'Turn On the Light'" NCA April 4, 1889 p.2 on entire sanctification, "Wesley and Methodist theologians" as correct sources by Elias Robertson of San Antonio, Texas; "Summers on Holiness" ad June 6, 1889 p. 20; Frances Willard supporting Boland's *Problem of Methodism* and showing strong interest in "holiness of heart" NCA June 6, 1889 p. 20; Against liberalism vaguely "Seek After New Truth – Hold Fast the Old" NCA January 19, 1889 p.8: some "set themselves up as pioneers of the perishing hosts who are journeying through the wilderness of an orthodox and traditional belief to the promised land of a large and liberal Christianity." A. P. McFerrin on Justification by Faith, "Inquiring Friends" NCA November 10, 1888 p. 14. E. E. Hoss disagrees with him sharply in "Faith and Works" NCA December 8, 1888 p.13; A. P. McFerrin's reply NCA January 19, 1889 p. 3; brief comment that OPF is happy about debate NCA February 2, 1889 p.9; "Not to Destroy but to Fulfill" NCA December 1, 1888 p. 8; On Wesley, Fletcher and Asbury on Sanctification, "An Old New View," by Crawford Jackson, NCA October 24, 1889 p. 4. Bold statement of the value of Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke and Watson, NCA October 13, 1888 p. 8. "The brother who seemed to think that disagreeable manners were an element of Christian perfection got his notion from the wrong book," NCA, December 8, 1888, p.8. "The Fathers – Their Work," NCA, October 13, 1888 p. 8. See also "Burnby's Soteriology" NCA December 15, 1888 p. 3-4 by Jno. J. Tigert, Vanderbilt University, and NCA November 17, 1888 for lengthy discussion about theory of atonement in particular, approvingly quotes Summer's definition of atonement; "The Pierces" book review NCA November 3, 1888 p. 9; Sermon by L. L. Picket NCA November 3, 1888 p. 17; For more evidence of appeals to Wesley during polity debates, "Who is Chairman of the Board of Stewards," by T. A Kerley, NCA February 22, 1890 p. 5. "Ways in Which Church Membership Is Cheapened," NCA, January 10, 1885 p.1. NCA "Intellectual Growth in the Ministry" NCA November 3, 1888 p. 2; In the context of a pastor who wants to do better next year "his self-dissatisfaction is a gracious state. The touch of penitence precedes the touch of power," NCA, November 10, 1888 p.8.

²⁸ For example, "Bishop Keene's [sic] Bombshell," *New York Times*, December 1, 1889; On Duncan's rough personality and Hargrove accusing holiness preachers of immorality by "violating [their] covenant with the church," NCA December 6, 1894, p. 10. An especially harsh account where a conference, led by Bishop Keener, displayed a "spirit of war," against holiness preachers, whom Keener "severely roasted," "War on Holiness Folk," *The*

But it was Haygood, before his consecration to the episcopacy, who began the systematic attacks on the movement both in print and through appointing power beginning as soon as Bishop G. F. Pierce was dead in 1884. Pierce, long resident in Georgia, had influenced other bishops' appointments in his home state. It is not clear how widespread such an approach was, but it does not seem to have been universal. In Georgia it seems to have become the convention. At Pierce's death, Haygood took that role of 'shadow bishop' for himself, directing affairs and appointments despite not being a bishop until 1890. Indeed, his influence over Georgia Methodism may actually have declined when he was elected, for his first assignment sent him to California. When Pierce was being considered for the episcopacy in 1854, delegates came to him concerned about accurate rumors of his deviation from Wesley's doctrine. Sufficiently assured, Pierce was elected. But he did not take steps to undermine holiness advocacy, and it seems likely the only assurance Pierce could have given was that, as bishop, he would not act to oppose holiness advocates. Though the strong-willed Pierce did not agree with them, he would not use episcopal power to oppose of their efforts. The holiness leaders in Georgia were safe as long as he was bishop. Beginning in 1884, Haygood began his offensive, using the pulpit and press to mock and undermine the holiness position. Despite the fact that he was just a nominal assistant pastor, not a presiding elder, he also directly influenced the appointments of holiness leaders. He first had bishops concentrate the leaders into a single district (Gainesville), then encouraged complaints against them that they had "captured" the district. After his election, he worked with Hendrix to transfer an aging A. J. Jarrell from Georgia to Missouri against Jarrell's will, a move that proved a particular hardship and saw Jarrell's health collapse. Jarrell died in

Commercial Appeal [Memphis], December 24, 1895, p. 2. Bishop Hargrove claimed he received perfection at regeneration, forbade starting holiness associations, and "powerfully antagonized" holiness doctrine, "The 'Second Blessing,'" *The Commercial Appeal* [Memphis], November 17, 1895, p. 1, and same paper, "New Minister for Memphis," November 18, 1895, p. 8.

1896. “With their most aggressive leaders intimidated,” Haygood pressed his campaign.

Haygood’s generally sympathetic biographer, who was particularly critical of holiness advocates whom he struggled to understand, reports that Haygood in the 1890s was “a sick, defeated man” experiencing “spiritual descent.” He devoted the years between 1884 and 1896 to crushing the holiness movement. Haygood sought “to destroy Holiness respectability.” Haygood devoted his last book, *The Monk and The Prince*, to an extended allegorical slur on holiness personhood (“lampooned,” Harold Mann says; a “verbal flogging” says Gregory Schneider) by arguing that Lorenzo de Medici (an honest sinner) was a more devout person than was Savonarola (standing in for holiness advocates). The effort was not well-received, but had the effect of squelching doctrinal preaching and intimidating preachers into “intellectual timidity in the pulpit.”²⁹

Indeed, according to Mann, Haygood was moving in an opposite direction. Mann reports that Haygood actually de-converted in 1880 “having ceased to be an Arminian,” when he succumbed to “an impersonal and non-theistic view of life.” But Mann suggests his faith had never been deep. Mann maintains that Haygood had willed himself to be converted at fifteen only “in order to please his grandmother and the pastor.” At eighteen, he decided to “become a preacher—with as little seriousness as the decision he made to grow a beard,” both decisions being made to please his older friend Young Allen. By 1881, president Haygood’s lectures on the “evidences of Christianity” were written “in an effort to convince himself of the truths he so

²⁹ Mann, *Haygood*, 166, 160, 161, 165, 166, 209. Gregory Schneider, “Connectionalism versus Holiness: Contrasting Bases of Identity for Leaders of Late-Nineteenth Century Methodism,” in *Doctrines and Discipline* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999): 131-160, 148. Mann argues that orthodox Christianity follows Augustine against Pelagian notions that human persons do not need God’s grace. While Methodists (Arminians) have often been charged with Pelagianism, the charge is a special feature of Calvinists’ anti-Wesleyan polemics. Nor do Methodists believe that any person – saved, sanctified, or otherwise – is capable of being beyond the need of divine grace. Mann charges that holiness advocates were speaking in tongues. Mann further has Lovick Pierce teaching Haygood to deny second blessing holiness. Mann takes the concentration of holiness advocates in one district to be evidence that they were plotting to “influence conference appointments” in furtherance of “their domination, political and doctrinal.” In a “doctrinally ignorant age,” Mann tells us Boland encouraged holiness preachers’ “do it yourself” theology. 161, 163, 162, 163, 164.

eloquently taught others,” Mann held. By the late 1880s and early 1890s, Haygood could write a book entitled *The Man of Galilee* that left open the question of the divinity of Jesus. A poor manager of his personal finances, Haygood wrote Rutherford B. Hayes asking to borrow money during this period; his book writing also was a means to generate much-needed money. In 1892 he discovered that he was “blacklisted by a credit agency in Atlanta.” Haygood had apparently borrowed money widely from many southern Methodists, at least one of which mortgaged his own home to aid the bishop, and lost that home when Haygood did not repay the debt on time. From 1893, he was Candler’s financial ward.

Mann notes that Haygood’s late writings for the NCA were “often irrelevant when not irrational,” part of a tragic decline from his earlier educational and intellectual achievements. Sick and in pain since contracting dengue fever in Mexico City in 1892, the bishop began medicating himself with alcohol in the summer of 1894. He missed a preaching appointment that year, was seen staggering in public in 1895, and apparently presided over the Arkansas Annual Conference in the fall of 1895 in an incapacitated state. The last event so horrified Candler that he considered resigning the presidency of Emory College in order to distance himself from his “impious episcopal ward” who had become “an embarrassment.” Haygood died on January 19, 1896. It seems likely that both Haygood’s and Candler’s reputations were saved by his death, as friends carefully protected Haygood’s reputation and made sure that little was known of his decline. Upon his death, Fitzgerald absolved him. He declared that Haygood’s efforts to show the “ugliness and unreasonableness” and “invincible ignorance and prejudice” bordering on “willful perversity” of those who believed what Lovick Pierce and J. S. Key believed was the result of Haygood’s virtuous, “courageous,” and “magnanimous” impatience. Reading between the lines, Fitzgerald acknowledged Haygood’s harsh methods toward fellow Methodists, and

pleaded for their “patience.”³⁰

Haygood would not have understood his actions to have begun any war. He likely viewed his efforts as a necessary and defensive counterattack against the myriad of dissenting and destructive voices in the 1880s MECS. As has been seen, he disliked the same prohibitionists, northern Methodists, episcopal critics, evangelists, and suffragists that Hoss, Hargrove, and Keener disliked. The vigor of his early campaign against holiness adherents, however, may have provided a model for the more uniform and systematic efforts against all such dissenters that erupted in the 1890s. The real war began when the Zinzendorfian John Christian Keener took over as senior bishop with the death of McTyeire in February of 1889. McTyeire was not a holiness adherent, but he was kindly enough toward some of them that they viewed him as an ally, or at least a protector. Already seventy when the younger McTyeire died, Keener held power from 1889 to his retirement in 1898, a period that coincides with a distinctively rough period in Methodist history. The May 1890 election of Hoss to NCA editor, and Haygood to the episcopacy, completed the slate of anti-holiness, anti-prohibition, anti-women’s leadership, anti-evangelist, and anti-free speech leaders, now free to deride, degrade, and exile their opponents.

Hoss began his editorship by declaring himself against the Prohibition Party, against preachers in politics, against women doing almost anything outside the home, against the Episcopal Church, and against any criticism of Methodist bishops’ prerogative. He also declared himself against the holiness movement and announced his critical distance from the teachings of

³⁰ Mann, *Haygood*, 203, 198-199, 100, 202, 206, 209, 210. See also Turley, *Wheel Within A Wheel*, 116, 113, 118, 144-146. O. P. Fitzgerald, “Bishop Atticus Greene Haygood, D.D., LL.D.,” *The Methodist Review* (May-June 1896), 170-171. Schneider says Haygood and MEC Bishop John H. Vincent experienced “a *rejection* of the traditional revivalistic doctrines and experiences that holiness advocates sought to revitalize.” “Connectionalism Versus “Holiness, 138. Schneider is right, except that those doctrines and experiences were not just historically, but in the 1880s and 1890s, the doctrines and experiences of Methodism. It is not that Haygood was out of step with the holiness movement. He was out of step with Methodism. Vincent, and perhaps a few of the MECS bishops, also practiced “a beatification of the culture of professionalism” with education as foundational to “prestige claims” and the demand for “honor and deference.” 154.

Wesley. Hoss scoffed “while we have the greatest respect for Mr. Wesley, and regard him as one of the greatest and best men that ever lived we have never for one moment thought ourselves bound to swallow all his opinions with our mouth wide open and our eyes shut.”³¹

Hoss accused holiness adherents of “cool, deliberate Phariseism” for praying that bishops fighting “against the cause of Bible holiness” would get sanctified. Hoss labeled holiness adherents “fanatical” and “unscriptural and un-Methodistic.” They were “militant and aggressive,” and while Hoss said, “shrinking as we do from all controversy,” he announced the “time had come to speak out in no uncertain terms.” But Hoss did not provide an affirmative view. He hit the importance of regeneration and growth in grace, but largely by way of criticizing holiness deemphasizing of these themes. Two weeks later, assistant editor E. M. Bounds provided a positive, affirmative, and balanced piece on the topic. A month later, Bounds wrote and added snippet: “’come now, and let us reason together, says the Scriptures – not to compare arguments, but to seek the cleansing power.” Two weeks after that, Hoss published a detailed full page denunciation, in small font and heavily laden with scare quotes, of the work of holiness advocate Beverly Carradine. Ostensibly a self-defense, Hoss’s ‘reply to his critics’ was an excessive thrashing of a man who had not, apparently, criticized Hoss’s previous article. After waylaying Carradine, Hoss used what was left of page one to attack conference papers.³²

Not even Hoss could match the vitriol of John E. Edwards of Virginia. Edwards reported that Bishop W. W. Duncan gave “a timely vindication of Methodism,” praising the bishop for taking “a position on our old platform of doctrine, and challeng[ing] the counterfeits and

³¹ “Inquiring Friends,” NCA July 5, 1890 p. 7.

³² NCA March 29, 1894 p. 9; “Holiness – Two Views,” NCA October 3, 1891 p. 1.; NCA June 7, 1894 p. 1; [Bounds] “What is it?,” NCA October 17, 1891, p. 8, and NCA November 14, 1891, p. 8. “Christian Holiness: An Answer to Our Critics,” NCA, November 28, 1891, p. 1. See also NCA October 18, 1894, p. 1.

travesties of the present day.” The “old platform” included “repentance, faith, regeneration, adoption and the witness of the Spirit,” but not Christian perfection as distinct from regeneration. Edwards declared that “as long as we have cranky fanatics among us we will all have to bear with it as best we can.” Edwards mocked holiness appeals, saying “‘Why,’ exclaims some masculine ‘Sister Phebe’ [sic], don’t you believe...” Edwards declared “Our preachers compromise themselves by getting ‘Sister Phebe,’ or any other erratic crank, to hold ‘holiness meetings...’” Edwards was already engaged in another controversy where he recommended simply expelling members without due process.³³

In a particularly graphic missive, Edwards misquoted Bishop Key’s *Heart Purity* sermon, thereby refuting a claim Key had not made. Edwards gravely boasted that the “controlling element in southern Methodism will, in due time...exterminate this fungus growth and excind [sic] this excrescence from the body of our church.” Presumably, Edwards’s purging scalpel would have cut the cancerous Bishop Key out of the MECS too. It was notable that Edwards claimed the anti-holiness position was the older, traditional position. This was quite different from the views of Hoss, Tillett, Boland, Harrison, and even R. N. Price, who acknowledged, even celebrated, the novelty and progressiveness of their positions. At various points, anti-holiness rhetoric charged that holiness advocacy furthered novel doctrines, at other points, that it represented an unevolved old way no longer reasonable in a modern age. As it had been with the Hargrove-Kelley controversy, Price’s anti-holiness testimony was, characteristically, both fair and candid. He sprinkled his history with five sketches of those who believed in the “blessing of

³³ “Dr. Edwards in Raleigh,” NCA June 4, 1887 p. 13. John E. Edwards, “A Word on An Old Subject,” NCA June 20, 1889 p. 14. For praise of a minister for his combative nature, see obituary of J. B. McFerrin (1807-1887), NCA May 14, 1887 p. 8. Candler distinguishing between a “overzealous ‘crank’” and a “two faced man,” noting “the definitions of the word ‘crank’ vary greatly,” NCA August 6, 1887 p. 8. Mark 9.38-39 as the measure of a “theory of Christian experience,” NCA May 21, 1887 p. 8.

perfect love as taught by Wesley and believed by early Methodists.” His complements to them still reflected the common critiques made against holiness adherents. Despite his holiness advocacy, John M. Crismond “was not a sanctification crank.” Another, Bishop Key, whose “piety was deep and uniform....enjoyed the blessing [but] did not make it a hobby.” John Reynolds “sought and attained its power,” and “led a life that was consistent with his profession thereof.” B. T. Sharp was not “a crank,” and “never divided the Church where he labored.” James Knox Polk Ball was “pure in heart and life,” and Price suggested the Holston Conference had never seen “a more harmless and a more consecrated man.”³⁴

Doctrinal differences or even such polity-oriented complaints are insufficient to explain the intensity of much anti-holiness MECS polemics, however. While an actual major doctrinal and historical debate lay behind the holiness controversy, gender, racial, and sectional connotations also played a significant role in anti-holiness rhetoric. Stories of women preachers and holiness evangelists “from the North” who travelled in mixed gender groups and “fraternized” with blacks appeared not infrequently in secular papers. Court opponents utilized the same criticisms against holiness advocates they used against ‘low church’ polity dissenters and there is good reason to believe that, in each case, that language was intended to suggest ties to radicalism of northern and MEC origin. As with radical prohibition and republican calls for the reformation of an autocratic episcopacy, holiness advocacy was associated with the MEC, and in particular, associated with racial and gender radicalism within the MEC. As prohibitionists had Frances Willard, so holiness advocates had Phoebe Palmer as the leading face of the movement. Moreover, there was strong correlation between holiness adherents and

³⁴ Turley, *Wheel Within a Wheel*, 121-122, 129. Turley says of Edwards that his “deeply-rooted prejudice” against the holiness adherent Key “clouded his objectivity, and, it would seem, his integrity as well.” 122. Price, *History of Holston Methodism*, Vol 5, 109, 535, 171, 517, 317.

prohibition third party advocacy. The war era MEC leadership that came South with the message of perfect love came often in the person of vigorous critics of the southern cause and traditional southern notions of gender or racial norms. Briane Turley has argued that anti-holiness leaders' primary point of contention with the various holiness associations "derived from the organizations' close ties with northerners." Warren Candler among other leaders "explicitly argued that the northern church (MEC) was using the Holiness movement as a major weapon in its arsenal against the MECS." Unable to control the fifth column holiness associations, bishops went after the leading clergy via the appointment process.³⁵

The context of sectional mortal combat—and the low church dissent already seen—provides a way to understand why Court Methodists, as Stephens notes, often "lambasted holiness 'cranks' as prideful fanatics and disturbers of denominational peace. They were, as one critic wrote, outside agitators from the North bent on driving congregants 'mad' and causing women to become 'boisterous and rough.'" Hunter Farish's chapter on postwar sectionalism recounts the intensity of MEC malice against the MECS in the 1860s and 1870s. So intense were MEC attempts to destroy the MECS—and so many MEC holiness advocates involved in them, including bishops—it must be said that MECS worries that holiness advocacy was a plot to harm the MECS were not wholly unreasonable. In some cases, those fears might even have been accurate as the correlation was strengthened by the MEC habit of welcoming holiness preachers alienated by the MECS at a time when the same holiness preachers would have been increasingly

³⁵ Turley, *Wheel Within a Wheel*, 15-16. "The Woman Preacher," *The Commercial Appeal* [Memphis], October 10, 1895, p. 5, and "A Startling Scene: Five Holiness Members KuKluxed in a South Carolina Town," *The Commercial Appeal* [Memphis], February 25, 1887, p. 3. Ferguson says "the restoration of the holiness idea to the rubric of American Methodism was largely the work of women." He further notes that Palmer's Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness – meetings led in homes by women – provided a challenge to male clergy and reminded opponents of Anne Hutchinson's transgressions of Puritan law. *Organizing to Beat the Devil*, 270-271. See also Priscilla Pope-Levison, *Building the Old Time Religion: Women Evangelists in the Progressive Era* (New York: NYU Press, 2013).

unwelcome in the MEC outside the South. There was a stronger holiness flavoring of the MEC in the South as a result. As is clear from Hoss's editorship, to be thought associated with MEC malice toward the MECS was often sufficient to deserve any ad hominem attack opponents might imagine. For many anti-holiness leaders, there was no 'offensive war' against the holiness movement. The entire campaign was a reasonable, just, and urgently necessary, act of ecclesiastical self-defense. The adherents of that movement were not mere cranks who needed to be delegitimized, but fifth-columnist northern spies or native traitors who needed to be expelled, 'excised,' and even 'exterminated.'³⁶

There were holiness advocates who encouraged this connection. The MEC congregation in Birmingham, Alabama, pastored by MEC holiness leader and ex-wartime unionist John Lakin Brasher, was renamed after MEC Bishop Matthew Simpson, who declared Abraham Lincoln to be a Christian martyr and led the MEC as if it was the public relations wing of the War Department. Simpson was a key supporter of both holiness and MEC confiscation of MECS church properties. With holiness in Alabama's growing metropolis symbolically representing an arch enemy of the MECS, it is little wonder that the columns of the *Alabama Christian Advocate* would evidence a strong anti-holiness position throughout the controversy. Brasher would later be the officially sanctioned annual conference evangelist in Alabama, a fact that reinforced several points of tension within the MECS. While Turley notes that uptown Methodists in their "fashionable churches" found the revivalist and holiness preaching "style... too provincial" and "their morality too antiquated for their more progressive sensibilities," Brasher was chosen for evangelist because even non-holiness Methodists thought the holiness leaders were good camp

³⁶ Randall J. Stephens, "'There is Magic in Print': The Holiness-Pentecostal Press and the Origins of Southern Pentecostalism," *Journal of Southern Religion* 5 (2002). Farish, *The Circuit Rider Dismounts*, 22-61. An example of MEC war rhetoric from the New York *Christian Advocate*: "'the treason-tainted Methodism of the South,' 'this degenerate, bastard Methodism,' ... 'the Southern and Apostate church.'" Farish, 44.

meeting preachers, a setting where old school approaches seemed fitting.³⁷

Complaints about the holiness habit of unsubscribing from connectional newspapers were somewhat overstated. In most cases, connectional editors were earning those cancellations by printing letters from men like John E. Edwards or making their own blanket condemnations. Even Hoss argued that the drops in subscriptions were caused primarily by the economic depression of the early to mid-1890s.³⁸ Such nuancing did little to change the intensity – or endurance – of anti-holiness sentiment in elite southern Methodist circles. For example, the 1984 official history of Middle Tennessee Methodism testily characterized Haynes as a prominent example of the schismatic troublemakers whose appearances mark standard Court-style denominational histories.³⁹

Colin B. Chapell's 2011 dissertation explores the theme of gender and self-identity among Southern Baptists, the MECS, and the holiness movement. Chapell's claims and

³⁷ Turley. *Wheel within a Wheel*, 157. Church buildings, especially in cities and prosperous regional towns, reflected a shift toward more ornate and expensive architecture that imitated the style of magisterial Protestant traditions. Turley argues that “While uptown urban Methodists grew increasingly uneasy with their revivalistic roots and embarrassed by the emotional outburst that accompanied the camp meeting religion of their [Methodist] forebears, Holiness Methodists looked to the urban Holiness conventions as a cultural-religious bridge offering a link between the New South and their perceptions of the past.” *Wheel within a Wheel*, 12. Brasher, *Sanctified South*, 57.

³⁸ NCA October 25, 1894 p. 1. See also Randall J. Stephens, “‘There is Magic in Print’: The Holiness-Pentecostal Press and the Origins of Southern Pentecostalism,” *Journal of Southern Religion* 5 (2002). Stephens writes, “Lower and middle-class communities throughout America expressed in religious terms the same discontent that motivated the Populist movement. Devotion to the new holiness periodicals ran high. Many readers announced that they would only read holiness newspapers, leaving secular and denominational publications to ‘worldlings.’ Methodist officials fumed at the exclusiveness of the new craze. One holiness believer wrote to the journal of the South Carolina conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South to announce the cancellation of his subscription. ‘Dear Brother: Please stop my ADVOCATE, as I take *The Christian Standard* and *Way of Life*,’ he bluntly stated. The Methodist editor thought this gentleman’s disloyalty incredible and rebuked him and other holiness enthusiasts who looked for spiritual sustenance outside the confines of official southern Methodism.”

³⁹ Smith, *Cross and Flame*. Smith notes the growth and musical vitality that often followed holiness preachers. Yet he describes the holiness movement in mostly negative language. Martin College experienced “a brush with a holiness preacher” (i.e. Haynes), and was “disrupted by holiness issues” several times. Haynes “abandoned” and “double-crossed” Bishop Hargrove by failing to censure Kelley for him. The holiness movement “infected” the northern MEC more than the MECS. Bishops were not anti-third party – they simply feared third party campaigns would enable holiness preachers to “justify their habit of deserting their assignments for evangelistic work elsewhere.” 253-254, 196, 252, 237, 260, 236.

disagreements with historians of southern holiness Randall Stephens and Briane Turley suggests aspects of why holiness advocacy proved provocative and challenging. Chapell notes the heavy emphasis on justification/regeneration that played an important role in the debate and in MECS anti-second blessing polemics. He contends that the MECS emphasized the new birth more than did the Southern Baptists. Chapell rebukes Stephens for ignoring the ties to gender and holiness theology, saying “the sources from opponents of the movement virtually yell that Holiness undid a person’s gender.” Chapell further critiques Turley for stressing holiness advocates fellowshipping with northerners as the key to anti-holiness thought in comparison to anti-holiness stress on “the radical nature of Holiness theology and its potential, dangerous in the minds of Methodist leaders, to undo traditional understandings of self.” The causal dichotomy between Yankee impudence and holiness theology may itself be overplayed. In the mind of MECS elites, the combination likely amounted to a single cause, as MECS anger with the MEC recalled a series of slights to the honor, spiritual manhood, and dignity of the spiritual gentry; one assertion that a bishop was spiritually lacking was as offensive as another. Chapell correctly argues that “the radical doctrines of the Holiness movement were adopted by adherents because of the transformative religious implications of those teachings. They truly believed what they said they did.” Where Stephens correctly declares that “holiness and nonholiness southerners held very different notions of authority, power, and legitimacy,” Chapell avers that holiness claims to “insider status in a group with radical theology” entailed claiming “for themselves a new southern history.” Their identity was found “in the blessings of God upon a peculiar people” and was unattached to slavery and Confederacy, or to class, racial, or biological markers. Free to “recast the image of God,” Chapell claims that “holiness adherents began to self-identify themselves, not as Methodists, but the sanctified.” While it seems much more likely that

Methodist opposition to their views produced a change in self-reference from ‘Methodist’ to ‘holiness’ more than the views themselves did, certainly holiness advocates did believe that the sanctification experience often transformed their perception and experience of denominational, social, and political trends.⁴⁰

Chapell claims that “open expressions of intense affection and love” between male holiness leaders “provided one reason why other[s]... hated Holiness theology so much – it undercut ideas of Southern manhood.” Holiness advocates described God as their “beloved” to whom they “gave [their] heart[s] fully,” language rare among SBC and MECS clergy says Chapell. Stephens argues that while from varied backgrounds, holiness adherents “were united in their identification with the poor.” Chapell notes that other groups “often hated and derided Holiness people” and stereotyped them as “delusional, uneducated, and poor,” and “ignorant, offensive, and uncultured,” habits that have led later historians to misread holiness as a movement *of* the unlettered rural poor. One very learned and eccentric MECS holiness preacher, W. B. Godbey, who claimed that a classical education was necessary for a proper understanding of Scripture, questioned the spiritual manhood of unsanctified spiritual “pygmies.” Chapell says Godbey therefore “emasculated all those who opposed the movement.” Chapell does not connect a manhood challenge to the exalted near-infallible notions of MECS aristocratic episcopacy. But it may have been such theological insults to the Court elite’s better manly right to rule, eerily familiar to the continuous MEC political, sectional, and religious attacks on MECS legitimacy, that would have most angered proud and learned men like Keener, Haygood, W. W. Duncan, Hoss, and Hendrix. Certainly they reacted vigorously to challenge from D. C. Kelley

⁴⁰ Colin Brett Chapell, “Recasting The Image Of God: Faith And Identity In The Deep South, 1877-1915” (Ph.D. diss., University of Alabama, 2011). 42-43. 43-44. 251, 231. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 145.

and Sam Jones.⁴¹

If so, it might explain the spectacular assault on holiness legitimacy unleashed through the episcopal address in May 1894, likely written by Keener or Haygood, the most articulate, aggressive, and strong-willed of the anti-holiness bishops. The General Conference met again in Memphis, as it had in 1870, but this time the bishops sought to destroy the movement they had encouraged twenty-four years earlier. The bishops condemned preachers in politics and the sins of “modern evangelists,” but their words to holiness advocates were full of special wrath. They began with a brief paragraph affirming the doctrine and its adherents that was irreconcilable with the rest of the statement, wherein the bishops utterly rejected any secondness doctrine, and bookended their address with suggestions that holiness adherents were a dangerous and arrogant fifth column who “disparage[d]” the gospel of Christ and arrogantly usurped the privileges of pastors and people. The theological language effectively declared T. O. Summers and Lovick Pierce to be heretics, even condemned Bishop Key, and baptized them as radical Yankee schismatics come once again to disrespect the southern aristocracy and destroy the MECS. The moral language declared holiness advocacy to be a polity insurrection, and a slander on Methodist saints. Just like the bombast in that same episcopal address against evangelists that denounced Sam Jones and the majority of MECS laity who loved him, and the condemnation of clergy political activity that denounced ardent prohibitionists like Bishop Galloway and the clergy of the Tennessee Conference, the anti-holiness section condemned with little nuance a widespread movement with many adherents in the MECS.⁴²

⁴¹ Chapell, “Recasting The Image of God,” 260, 266, 250, 252, 255, 272. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 62.

⁴² The opening statement: “The privilege of believers to attain unto the state of entire sanctification, or perfect love, and to abide therein is a well-known teaching of Methodism. Witnesses to this experience have never been wanting in our Church, though few in comparison with the whole membership. Among them have been men and women of

The tone was just like Bishop Hargrove's rage at the Missions Board in 1888, at the Tennessee Conference in October of 1890, and again that May in 1894 in the Committee on Episcopacy. It was the same tone Bishop Keener employed against holiness clergy in 1889, and against the Tennesseans for backing Sam Jones in 1893. It was the same tone Haygood and Hoss employed against politically-active women, northerners, the MEC, third party prohibitionists, holiness adherents, evangelists, African Americans, and any preachers who stood up to the bishop or the editor. Holiness besmirching of honored doctrines, teachers, and laity of the MECS did anger the bishops. But it took little to provoke the wrath of several of the bishops in this period. The entire address declared that the bishops were the authors, interpreters, judges, jurors, and executioners of Methodist doctrine and law. There were no standards, no venerable teachers. There was no Discipline or General Conference, no authorities living or dead who counseled Methodist doctrine, or polity, or political activity. There were only bishops. Those bishops had just declared war, not on a movement or association, but on any and all who held, professed, and taught a Methodist doctrine. In the coming years their statement "we desire the Church to profit by [holiness advocates'] earnest preaching and godly example" would prove ever more incredible.

beautiful consistency and seraphic ardor, jewels of the Church. Let the doctrine still be proclaimed and the experience still be testified." The heart of the statement: "But there has sprung up among us a party with 'holiness' as a watchword; they have holiness associations, holiness meetings, holiness preachers, holiness evangelists, and holiness property. Religious experience is represented as if it consists of only two steps, the first step out of condemnation into peace and the next step into Christian perfection. The effect is to disparage the new birth and all stages of spiritual growth from the blade to the full corn in the ear, if there be not professed holiness. Such Scriptural terms as 'saints,' 'sanctified,' 'pure in heart,' 'holy,' 'dead to sin,' 'filled with the Spirit,' and 'made meek to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light,' are restricted to the few who have reached the height of perfect purity and love and improperly denied to the body of believers; and not only to those who are new or weak in the faith, but also to mature Christians who by walking with God in blessed fellowship and by patient continuance in well-doing, ever increasing in the knowledge of God, and being fruitful in every good work, adorn the doctrines of God our Savior in all things, and are pillars in the Church. We do not question the sincerity and zeal of these brethren; we desire the Church to profit by their earnest preaching and godly example but we deplore their teaching and methods in so far as the claim a monopoly of the experience, practice, and advocacy of holiness and separate themselves from the body of ministers and disciples." Address of the Bishops, NCA May 10, 1894 pp. 2-3, 9.

CHAPTER SIX

Getting Holiness in Tennessee

On October 18, 1894, famed evangelist Sam Jones joined the editorial staff of the *Tennessee Methodist* as Co-editor with B. F. Haynes. The price also dropped to \$1. By arrangement with Haynes and the stockholders, Jones made significant investments in the paper as well, its financial need being a major reason for Jones's new relationship. While subscriptions had continued to grow, revenues from business advertising had dried up due to the depression of the mid-1890s that made credit and cash hard to acquire. Jones's ownership and editorials stopped after May 28, 1896, and his editorial presence on the first page had waned even sooner, but for business and legal reasons on Jones's end, he remained on the masthead through October 1896. The Haynes-Jones union briefly formed a Country power team, a fusion of Country Post Oak 'crank' reforming protest against Court High Steeple entitled 'worldliness' mixed with intense protest against episcopal abuse and the "High Church" Party. To their friends, it was a union of 'sham exposers' and muckrakers. But more essentially, it was a united assault on nominal religion, a doubling-down on intra-denominational dissent. The editor of the *Giles (County) Democrat* said "with the combined efforts of two such able and influential men, and the reduction in price, the paper will doubtless find its way into thousands of new homes."¹

The announcement of Jones as "co-Editor" (Haynes was listed above, and 'Sam' occasionally referred to himself as the junior editor) appeared in the October 18, 1894 issue.

¹ The offices of the *Tennessee Methodist* were located on the third floor of the Equitable Fire Insurance Building at 211 and 213 Union Street, Nashville. *TM*, January 18, 1894, 4. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 168; "The *Tennessee Methodist*," *Giles Democrat*, October 17, 1894 p. 5, and the "*Tennessee Methodist*" was "one of the best church papers in the country," also "practical," and it "exchanges with secular papers so that the editors may keep themselves informed upon questions of general interest," *Pulaski Citizen*, October 18, 1894, p. 4. Jones was off the front page by 1896, relegated generally to one sermon or letter per week.

Jones announced that “this paper has come to stay.” He pledged “it shall be as loyal to pure Methodism” as any paper was or had been, and would be “a champion for right in its criticisms of whatever tends toward paternalism or centralization of power not ordained of God.” Jones added that it would avoid personalities, and that he would love the individuals whose official acts he criticized. He also asserted that “Brother Haynes has already made this paper a potent force in Southern Methodism; and when he and I are yoked together, some of the conservative and the prudent will frequently be hollering: ‘Head them, boys, head them! They are running away!’” He called for a subscription goal of 25,000. His last line indicated his frame of mind: “But all we want the conservative and prudent to do is keep out of the way, and by God’s help we will take care of the steers and wagon.” Haynes’s editorials declared that Jones was an enemy of wrong and friend of good, announced the price drop, echoed Sam’s 25,000 subscriber goal, and warmly praised the people at Pulaski where he had been serving as interim pastor for three months. He published a positive—and invited—sketch of Bishop W. W. Duncan, and the address of Vanderbilt Chancellor Kirkland in full.²

The next week E. E. Hoss responded in the Nashville *Christian Advocate* by threatening to shut down conference newspapers. The report of his address to the Tennessee Conference declared Hoss was “set for the defense of the polity of the Church as it is, and not as some people want it to be.” The report of his remarks added, “He despises controversy, but does not shrink from it when it is forced upon him; but he never could be induced to engage in in partisan controversy, or use the NCA for his own personal vindication.” The NCA announcement of Jones’s new role meanwhile appeared in small print on page ten. Two weeks later Hoss repeated his call for a general meeting of editors. Those editors, wrote Hoss, “lacked concert and unity”

² TM, October 18, 1894, p. 1.

and needed agreement on “general lines of policy.” Three weeks later, J. W. Boswell, Hoss’s new assistant editor, wrote a lengthy criticism of “competition” focused entirely on newspapers and he proposed an “Editorial Convention” to be held in Nashville in January or February 1895. By December Hoss declared “it is a common trick of unfair debaters to seek to injure antagonists in public esteem by labeling them with epithets that provoke hatred or contempt.” He was referring to those who labeled persons “a mossback” or “a Bourbon,” and who were, thereby, violating Christian ethics.³

In November, Jones’s lengthy letter “The Model Bishop” appeared, and though largely a conventional rumination, he added that “God never called an autocrat to be bishop,” and wondered if some had not missed their calling as czars or emperors. A bishop must be guided by something other than “the impetuous haughtiness of his will and the autocratic, dictatorial methods of his life.” He also jabbed, “he pays his debts.” The located Jones concluded with “my appointment at the next annual conference will not be affected by what I have said.” On the same page appeared a rebuke of Hoss by “Y,” reprinted from the *Central Methodist*. “Y” noted Hoss’s “threat directed against its little contemporaries to the effect that if they do not behave themselves better our great Church Organ will proceed immediately to extirpate the whole race” via an NCA price drop, an imitation of the “questionable methods of business men.” “Y” asked, “who gives Dr. Hoss the right to say” that a paper cannot seek wider circulation. Other papers had grown “by virtue of intrinsic excellence... [as] the people know a good thing when they see it, and they should be their own judges as to what paper they shall take.” “Y” added that if any rivalry existed between the NCA and the “little” papers, it was the NCA’s fault. “If the editor” of the NCA, “Y” continued, “thinks he can satisfy the heart and mind of the Church by

³ “To Be Considered,” NCA, October 25, 1894 p.1., “Tennessee Conference,” NCA October 25, 1894, p. 9. NCA October 25, 1894, p. 10. “Competition,” NCA November 29, 1894, p. 8. NCA, December 13, 1894, p. 1.

multiplied columns of matter descriptive of his personal trips to other cities; of his dinings and drives and general entertainments; he need not be surprised if other wide-awake editors make inroads into his territory.” Rather than “petty” quarrels and threats “to starve [other papers] out of the field,” the connectional editor should “elevate the *Advocate*.” That course, unlike Hoss’s current one, would be “eminently honorable and fair.”⁴

Jones distinguished between independentism that opposed organization, that is, “anarchy and communism,” and the sort of independentism he favored, “the spirit of manhood that asserts itself and says: I will no longer submit to your methods and rascalities.” Jones said the “*methods and tricks and rings*” religious and political organizations so often employed resulted in the rebellions they so often condemned. Jones did not hesitate to name names. His article “Our Advocates” reviewed the whole field of Methodist journalism. The NCA—“the general ecclesiastical high-cock-alorum of all the Advocates”—was “readable but not racy, loyal but not lively.” Others received higher praise such as “Dr. Lafferty” of the “old Richmond Advocate,” and Palmore of the St. Louis, “a live man” who ran “a live paper.” While Jones teased a few of the editors for their obsession with “loyalty,” he affirmed the whole group as valuable to the spiritual good of their readers.

Haynes, too, could give complements to Court figures, as when he reported that Haygood’s address to ministerial candidates of the Virginia Conference was “one of the best we

⁴ “Sam Jones’ Letter: The Model Bishop,” TM November 15, 1894, p. 4. “Business Competition,” TM November 15, 1894, p. 4. See also D. C. Kelley’s “Methodist Review,” TM December 6, 1894, p. 2 where Kelley compares Bishop Soule to James I of England, and Charles V and Philip of Spain. “Such men are sources of danger to human liberty.” Kelley wanted bishops who were “men who served rather than ruled.” For Jones response to Hoss on evangelists that included a very clear and accurate assessment of Hoss’s method and treatment of opponents, Jones, “Isn’t It Funny,” and Jones, “Dr. Hoss and Local Preachers.” TM October 3, 1895 p. 1. Perhaps an example of Hoss v. Jones warring, a half-page ad for a fraudulent book entitled “Hot Shots” appeared in the *Advocate* – a reprinting of Jones’s earlier “Sermons and Sayings of Sam Jones” book – published without Jones’s approval. Jones “Hot Shots” in NCA October 17, 1895 p. 15. For refutation of this book by Haynes and Jones, see TM January 30, 1896 p. 5. Ad for Jones’s legitimate book *Thunderbolts* published by Haynes’s publishing co., NCA May 7, 1896, p. 13.

ever heard delivered.” Haynes dined with Dr. and Mrs. M. W. Humphreys – he a University of Virginia professor, she L. C. Garland’s daughter of long friendship with Haynes, whose father had called Haynes a liar and conspirator four years before. He shared their hospitality with Vanderbilt’s W. F. Tillett, a critic of the holiness movement. Subscriptions jumped, and Jones responded to the charge that ““no one cares what the *Tennessee Methodist* says,”” with the wry comment, yet “*how many people want to see what it says.*”⁵

When Court leader J. D. Barbee said that those who “eat the bread of the church” should not criticize its leadership, Country protests rang out. Haynes quipped that “man shall not live by bread alone.” Recalling politicians taking bribes, he noted that clergy who were critical in their humbly-placed youth but were now silent in high office call this loyalty. “Mistaken, brother;” he wrote, “it’s only a case of ‘eating the bread of the church.’” Hoss’s gripes about competition so annoyed Haynes he wrote two editorials about them on November 29, 1894. Haynes labeled Hoss’s doctrine “high prerogative with a vengeance.” He compared Hoss to Julius Caesar – ““on what meat hath this our Caesar fed”” (the rest of the line alluded to was: ‘that he is grown so great’), and “thus assumes such vast authority over the conscience and judgment and the pocket book” of 6000 preachers and 1.3 million members. Haynes declared the other Advocates welcome in his territory. Haynes said Hoss’s novel policy of building a “Chinese wall” and “fearful maledictions...might have done in the dark ages,” but violated the spirit of the age, the spirit of brotherliness, and the spirit of connectionalism. Hoss’s policy embraced “a new species of connectionalism—a kind of machine-connectionalism” rather than “the good, old fashioned

⁵ Jones, “Organization Vs. Independentism,” TM November 22, 1894, p. 1. Jones, “Our Advocates,” TM November 22, 1894, p. 1, “Editorial Correspondence,” TM November 22, 1894, p. 1. Jones, “Snap Shots,” January 3, 1895, p. 1. For a cartoon of Jones running the devil out of town, see TM March 26, 1896, p. 2. See also on the mixed mind of bishops with Keener and Wilson against them, Jones, “Interpretations,” TM January 16, 1895, p. 1. Spiritual soul-winning power not manifest in those who oppose evangelists, details several evangelists (e.g., “Claud” Chilton), including Jones’s own relationship with Haygood, Jones “Is it Order or What?,” TM September 19, 1895, p. 1.

connectionalism of our fathers.”⁶

A distinct new controversy erupted when S. A. Steel—newly elected connectional editor of the new youth paper, the *Epworth Era*—made comments noting that bishops and whisky dealers shared opposition to Sam Jones. Haynes and R. N. Price thought Steel’s comments unwise but took great amusement at the raging condemnation heaped on Steel by Court critics of criticism who had spent years pushing the idea that connectional leaders were not to be criticized. Jones fully understood the humor. He quipped that Steel was like “a sofa in a park – everything that comes along seems to be sitting down on him.” But Jones’s editorial of December 6 about the connectional officers in Nashville provoked its own protest. Jones used words to describe what would have been best captured in a political cartoon. At the publishing house, D. M. Smith was a businessman, while his partner J. D. Barbee was a “cyclone, funnel-shaped and full of wind.” Jones praised book and *Review* editor J. J. Tigert for his scholarship and hard work. Unlike the other “bumble bees in the hive who ‘eat the bread of the church,’” he “let other people’s business alone.” The “loyal” Hoss sat on a stump on the roadside worrying about “horses that are not branded, dogs with no collars on, men without badges, all alike give him hydrophobia...he thinks they are going to do or say something disloyal.” The “loyal” and angry W. D. Kirkland, the new Sunday school editor, had “mud on his horns and blood in his eye.” Then came Steel, with a wagon loaded with children fast charging “into the land of disloyalty,” with Kirkland now tearing after him “in the wrong direction,” while Hoss shouted “Head that horse! I knew he would run away!” Meanwhile, Barbee “unbutton[ed] his collar to keep from fainting.” Believing the wranglers had done more harm than the runaway had, Jones

⁶ TM, November 29, 1894, p. 1. “Competition,” and “Three Objections,” TM November 29, 1894 p. 1. Haynes wondered how Fitzgerald, in twelve years, had not discovered that conference papers could not circulate beyond their bounds. Haynes welcomed particularly the St. Louis and Arkansas papers and assured them the NCA had started this supposed fight on its own and bore sole responsibility for it.

concluded “I had rather be a runaway horse than a dead horse,” and joked “Let’s all sing ‘After the Ball’ and go home.”⁷

A week later Jones defended Steel and took another shot at bishops by noting that Jones had never heard whisky people say such awful things about evangelists as bishops had, calling them “vampires,” and “blackguards.” He alluded to Bishop Keener’s comment about a temple built to honor evangelists. Jones also published a sarcastic imagined dialogue between an editor and an obsequious preacher. The editor tested the preacher on his catechism: “Who are the greatest men who ever lived? A: Bishops. Q: Who are the most disloyal? A: Sam Jones, Sam Steel, and the TENNESSEE METHODIST.” Jones reported that “one of our bishops called the TENNESSEE METHODIST ‘the Police Gazette of the Southern Methodist Church.’” Haynes responded to a letter worrying that criticism of bishops would “poison” the youth saying that the paper had published more sayings and reports from bishops than any MECS paper—perhaps more than any two—and yet “one line” of criticism made that irrelevant. Jones drew direct links between episcopal appointing power and the voices of criticism coming from preachers well-motivated to keep bishops happy. T. J. Duncan sent congratulations to Haynes, and “the *Sams*” (Jones and Steel) saying “the day has passed for freeborn Americans and consecrated Christian

⁷ TM November 29, 1894 p. 1., R. N. Price, “Dr. Steel and the Era,” TM December 6, 1894, p. 1. Jones, “A Religio-Ecclesiastical Official Medley,” TM December 6, 1894, p. 1. All items on page one during the co-editorship from Jones were signed “S.P.J.” All unsigned items were from Haynes. On Steel, Tigert on holiness, disloyalty hunting, and abuse of evangelists by Haygood, see Clement C. Cary, “North Georgia Conference,” TM December 6, 1894, pp. 4-5. A holiness advocate and North Georgia MECS pastor and evangelist, Cary (1847-1922) – or Carey as it sometimes appeared – was a very frequent contributor to the paper, and most of his contributions were information and commentary, not holiness advocacy. They were broad in their range of topics, as well as candid. For Cary on the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* and Georgia Holiness Association forced to meet in MEC church in Atlanta, see TM November 14, 1895, p. 2. See also Cary commentary on incorrect Eucharistic practice, the connection between cotton and the timing of Annual Conference, complaint about W. M. Leftwich’s preaching, and a rebuke of the suggestion that a college degree be required for ordination, TM May 28, 1896, p. 2. A Tennessean unhappy with Jones’s ‘medley,’ W. L. Jackson of Centreville, Tn., “A Word From Brother Jackson,” TM, December 27, 1894, p. 8. Jackson objected to the unkind references to other preachers and to the mentioning of the music of a ball (as opposed to spiritual songs). Kirkland died in office on May 31, 1896, (Boswell) “Death of Dr. Kirkland,” NCA June 4, 1896, p. 8, see also NCA June 11, 1896, p. 8 from Hoss on Kirkland.

workers in any church to be compelled to think according to order, or think to themselves... there had to be some independent thinking aloud, or crying out of the stones among us.” J. W. Cullom of Woodford said the paper was “getting the backband marvelously close up to the hames, but I reckon we need some deep plowing.” W. W. Graves of Diana said “it is just the kind of paper we need,” while W. H. Wilkes of Culleoka said “thus far you have been true to Christianity as taught by Methodists, and true to the Methodism of the fathers. May your light grow brighter, your sphere of usefulness wider, until universal Methodism feels and responds to your love and devotion to her welfare.”⁸

MECS clergy within four years of each other in birth, Jones and Haynes were united by their protest against what they saw as the autocratic and worldly drift of southern Methodism, and southern politics. They shared populist and restorationist-style critiques of modern life and episcopal authority. Haynes remembered that they shared “abhorrence of sham,” “hatred of the liquor traffic,” and “resistance of the encroachment of a brilliant officialism upon human rights.”⁹

⁸ Sam Jones: “A Peaceable Religion,” and “A Real Incident Which Did Not Occur,” and “Bird Shot By Sam Jones,” all from TM December 13, 1894, p. 1. “A Letter Answered,” TM December 13, 1894, p. 1. The fake dialogue used a very close approximation of the name Edgar M. Glenn of Elyton, Alabama, who wrote a very sharp counterattack published as “Respectfully Dedicated to the Apostle of Organized Independentism,” TM, December 27, 1894 p. 2. For charges that many of his critics (and Steel’s and Haynes’s by extension) were saying what they thought the bishops wanted said in order to receive better appointments, “Foul Play under the Head of ‘Fair Play,’” (a response to J. W. Rush in Alabama Christian Advocate) and “Bird Shot,” both TM December 20, 1894, p. 1. T. J. Duncan, “Letter from California,” TM December 20 1894 p. 2. Most of Duncan’s letter is a detailed report of the situation in California. Several “Christmas Greetings!” from Tennessee Conference preachers were published, TM December 27, 1894, p. 4. Praise of U.N.M. Berry from “Berlin, Tenn,” said to be home to many readers of the paper, TM December 12, 1895, (page obscured).

⁹ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 145. Jones may have been more pragmatic in his politics than the more idealistic Haynes. Coker says Jones was part of a “new style of evangelicalism” that was practical and political in orientation and willing to rethink southern shibboleths. Haynes was political and willing to rethink. But some of his political writings pressed beyond what might often be considered practical. Coker, *Liquor*, 97. Coker reports that Jones “enjoyed strong support in the black community and was known for paying his black and female employees the same wages he paid the white men who worked for him.” Coker notes that when anti-prohibitionists threatened Jones’s family and dynamited his buggy, Jones’s home was “guarded by a group of African American volunteers.” Coker, *Liquor*, 48. Owen reports that Jones “expressed admiration for William Lloyd Garrison, but was also a

But they were different men in many other ways. Jones's experience had been freer and less bound to a particular order than the largely routinized path Haynes had trod. Unlike Haynes, Jones was rough and plainfolk in style, and he took greater liberties with the use of humor in argument. When Tennessee Methodists complained to Haynes about "offensive personalities" appearing in the paper, they referred to the coarse masculine language of Jones's editorials that contrasted both with Hoss's scholarly condescension and Haynes's direct and serious style. Hoss's biographers noted his scholarly combativeness, Haynes's his cultured seriousness. Those descriptors were not often used of Jones. Complaining of a defense of the *Methodist* entitled "Fair Play," J. W. Rush charged the paper with "insubordination and rebellion" in Kelley's criticism of autocratic bishops, the criticism of continued episcopal treatment of Kelley, Haynes's charges of worldliness in the church, and Jones's defense of S. A. Steel and affirmations of his own brand of independentism. Pledged to protect white Alabama Methodism from "the pernicious effects of such a weekly visitor," Rush declared "the Tennessee Methodist is a scurrilous sheet, unfit to be read in the family circle. Its language resembles too much the lingo of the negro cabin, or the dirty wit of the circus ring, or the 'vulgarity and coarseness' of the modern evangelistic meeting. It is nasty slush, malodorous, mephitic." But Rush said "this is true of only one of the editors or contributors...only this one writes in the dialect of the modern

factory-owner, disliked unions, and favored the gold standard, i.e., "sound money." It was Jones's populist style, not the actual political positions that appealed to "Populism's plain-folk constituency," Owen, *Sacred Flame of Love*, 181-182. Jones expressly rejected Populism, after rejecting Democrats and Republicans for corruption, saying "the Populist party is only more innocent because it is more infantile," Jones, "Politics," TM January 3, 1895, p. 1. Jones praised Garrison as an example of "Consecration," TM January 24, 1895, p. 1. Jones and Stuart preaching to African Americans in Atlanta (from the *Atlanta Constitution*), TM August 13, 1896, p. 2. See also Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, 173-182. Jones was strongly even stridently anti-silver, Jones, "On the Silverites," TM August 22, 1895, p. 8. Blowback outraged at Jones's support for "the Plutocratic gang," TM September 12, 1895, p. 3 and J. D. Smith, "Hard-Hearted Goldites vs. Soft-Brained Silverites," TM September 19, 1895, p. 3.

evangelist.”¹⁰

Rush added revealing charges against holiness advocates six months later. He asked why holiness preachers would be shut out of Methodist churches, quoted at length a well-thought out theory of holiness movement wickedness from a Vermont preacher in *Zion's Herald*, and then wondered how a pastor could “suffer” those who “charge bishops, presiding elders, and preachers, especially D. Ds., all to be given over to the greed of lucre and filled with all unworldly [sic] ambition.” Rush held that all churches should be “shut against such nonsense and fanaticism, and hypocritical cant and mystical ecstasy, and negro foolry, that marks so many of these Sanctificationists.”¹¹

Jones now wrote of “Loyalty,” defending himself from attacks by “dear old sister Black,” editor of ‘the New Orleans,’ who had charged that Jones, in saying there were rings and combinations in the church, had “slandered the church...more than [famed atheist lecturer Robert] Ingersoll has ever done.” Black argued that if Jones would not recant, he should resign

¹⁰ J. W. Rush, “Fair Play,” *Alabama Christian Advocate*, January 17, 1895, p. 1. Stephens cites the article but is not clear that Rush specifically refers to Jones, not Haynes, *The Fire Spreads*, 90. Rush was successful in misconstruing Jones’s words, but failed miserably in his attempts to deny Jones’s charges that Rush had said to young preachers “Boys, don’t abuse the bishops, don’t contrary them. Brag on them, as I have always done, and get the best appointments.” Rush declared he might have said such or similar words but never would have actually meant them.

¹¹ J. W. Rush, “Shut Out,” *Alabama Christian Advocate*, July 11, 1895, p. 1. The cited article was by G. F. Arms. Rush held that holiness adherents were a “schismatic fanatical, ‘I-am-holier-than-thou,’ crew.” The *Alabama* received a new editor when Armstrong left, replaced by J. O. Andrew. C. L. Chilton, “Alabama Conference,” TM January 30, 1896 p. 1. Jones was not a holiness advocate. But he had an experience in 1886, and as a North Georgia minister, knew and respected many leaders of the movement. His most famous statement on holiness had little to do with doctrine or religious experience. In 1899, Jones praised holiness adherents for the fact that he had “never seen a holiness man that wasn’t a prohibitionist from his hat to his heels. I have never seen one who didn’t vote for prohibition always and everywhere.” Jones did suggest that his sanctification experience opened his thinking on women in ministry and public life, something that Turley says made him more like holiness advocates than their non-holiness advocating peers. Turley, *Wheel Within a Wheel*, 168-169. For the connection between women in ministry and holiness advocacy in the South, Turley, *Wheel Within a Wheel*, 134-143, and Ingersoll, *Burden of Dissent*. For a bold call for “a common standard of morality for man and woman,” an impoverished woman author annoyed by the discarding and shunning of women who fall into sin, see “By A Woman,” (Nashville) “Social Purity,” TM January 3, 1895, p. 2. See also Jones, “A Sermon On Christian Womanhood,” TM December 19, 1895 pp. 2-3.

the ministry and leave the church. Jones replied by noting “the ring of twenty-fivers, and the ring of one hundred and sixteeners” in Tennessee. Jones dared “sister Black” to bring charges against him, and boldly declared, “the doors of the Salvation Army are wide open.” Hoss replied that the Salvation Army – a holiness denomination with women’s leadership that he loathed – was too disciplined for “those who find the restraints of our broad and liberal Methodist polity too much for their liberty-loving souls.”¹²

Meanwhile something critical happened. Haynes had a sanctification experience, sometime between the summer and fall of 1894, influenced by MECS holiness leader and hymnodist Claudius Lysias Chilton (1856–1914). He was the son of William Parish Chilton, Chief Justice of the Alabama Supreme Court, member of the provisional and regular Confederate Congress, and namesake of Chilton County, Alabama. Haynes described C. L. Chilton as a man of “marked intellectual gifts” inherited from “brainy men and women” and honed by collegiate and pulpit experience. Haynes also called Chilton a “most pleasing and logical reasoner,” whose advocacy was “plain, pointed...honest, logical,” his experience “decidedly bright and rich,” his sermons “imparting a wondrous measure of light and grace.” In early 1895, shortly after Jones joined the staff, the *Tennessee Methodist* ‘got the blessing’ too, becoming a pro-holiness paper, one of perhaps twenty or more in the South in the 1890s. Given the intense controversy surrounding holiness advocacy, and the extreme condemnation of it by the bishops in May 1894,

¹² Jones, “Loyalty,” TM January 3, 1895 p. 1. NCA January 31, 1895 p. 1. Jones compared early Methodism to the current Salvation Army, Jones, “Methodism and the Masses,” TM April 11, 1895 p. 1. Haynes as early as 1886 supported the Army, even being named an honorary auxiliary member by Commander Ballington Booth during travels to New York City in response to Haynes’s previous support. Haynes very positive on the Salvation Army, “Editorial Correspondence,” TM April 4, 1895, p. 1, and TM July 16, 1896, p. 1. Hoss announced that if he were to leave the MECS, it would be for the Presbyterian Church, but would not swallow predestination, “The Episcopacy of the Presbytery,” NCA June 18, 1896, p. 1. Jones, in a much more positive review of Editor Black and Bishop Galloway, “Personal,” TM August 1, 1895, p. 1. The paper was a means for individuals to make restitution for past sins, T. J. Baker, “Smithville, Tenn.,” TM August 6, 1896 p. 5.

it was a brave move.¹³

Haynes's Tennessee Conference supporters – most of whom were not holiness advocates – noticed the change. Haynes responded to queries about the change in emphasis by listing in detail twelve governing principles of his editorship, and affirmed the continuity of his aims. The paper stood for “primitive Methodism—the gospel for the masses;” it “favored the Wesleyan doctrine of holiness... as our glorious privilege in Christ Jesus;” it advocated “plain and fearless preaching of the Gospel as opposed to studied, rhetorical, hyper-classical and men-honoring pulpit efforts;” it stood for the “brotherhood and equality of the ministry” contra the “titled dignitaries of the High Church party,” and “vigorously oppose[d] the monstrous claim” of “exclusive judicial functions” for the episcopacy independent of General Conference review. The paper favored “patient, just, and prompt disciplinary action” against all violators of church law, “rich or poor, high or low,” including discipline for bishops, naming the failure of the 1894 Episcopal committee specifically. It opposed “favoritism, rings, combinations,” as violating “the spirit and plan of primitive Methodism.” It approved local preachers involved in revival work and preferred this over local preachers’ “secular pursuits.” It stood for “the most genuine and cordial fraternity” between “the different branches of Methodism,” and “whatever may logically and legitimately follow the happy establishment of such fraternal relations.” It favored state and national prohibition, and believed that “no Christian can consistently support any organization...

¹³ Haynes was influenced by Chilton's revival services at Hobson's Chapel, but the experience came quietly while reading and praying onboard a train. For Haynes's very modest sanctification account, see Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 155-160. Mrs. Lula Haynes received the blessing in 1895 through the efforts of Chilton and prominent MECS pastor in Mississippi, Louisiana, and St. Louis turned holiness evangelist in 1893, Beverly Carradine (1848-1931), Haynes Family Group Sheet. Carradine's descendants include several well-known members of the acting profession of the same last name. For Haynes's characterization of “Rev. C. L. Chilton,” TM June 18, 1896, p. 1. Stephens says there were at least 20 holiness newspapers in the South in the 1890s, *The Fire Spreads*, pp. 8-9. The name Claudius Lysias came from Acts 23. Chilton criticized the new sport of football while pastor of First MECS at Auburn, Alabama. See Andrew Doyle, “Foolish and Useless Sport: The Southern Evangelical Crusade Against Intercollegiate Football,” *Journal of Sport History* (Fall 1997): 317-340.

controlled by or conducted in the interest of, the liquor power.” It believed a “supreme and vital” duty of the church to “guard and nurture and save for God the children of the church and the country.” It believed “Romanism” was the “same hoary, hurtful, hydra-headed foe to Protestantism...[and] true, vital godliness” it had been “for weary ages.” It conceded “what no one denies,” that “individual salvation is the chief work of the ministry,” yet added “to its creed...[that it was] a divinely imposed obligation of the pulpit to inculcate the principles of Christian citizenship, the responsibility of the Christian’s ballot, and to seek the reformation of communities as well as the regeneration of individuals.”¹⁴

Haynes’s claim was that he added holiness advocacy to his portfolio; it had not deleted, undone, or weakened the potency of earlier emphases. If anything, the renewed fire inspired and clarified his commentary. But Haynes had not mentioned another characteristic of his editorship. Much more than Hoss, and even more than Fitzgerald, Haynes embraced debate as an affirmative good. He published criticisms of his own positions, even harsh criticisms of holiness advocacy and his beloved Tennessee Conference.¹⁵

¹⁴ “Governing Principles,” TM March 7, 1895.

¹⁵ Haynes complained of slander by future bishop James Atkins of North Carolina, and noted that the editor of the *North Carolina Advocate* was very slow in providing either a response or retraction from the author, “A Slimy Sample,” TM February 7, 1895 p. 1. The literary editor for the Tennessee Methodist, J. M. Wright, published a series of studies on Wesley and sanctification. Hard criticism of Wright’s defense of Wesley, J. J. Ransom, “Dr. Wright’s Untrustworthy Quotations,” TM September 6, 1895 p. 8. Wright the literary editor for the Tennessee Methodist from its founding, and was pastor of Haynes’s family church at Hobson’s Chapel when he died August 17, 1896. Haynes filled the pastorate there for the remainder of the year and urged that the salary go to Wright’s family. See TM August 27, 1896 p. 5. D. C. Kelley, “Rev. J. M. Wright, D. D.,” NCA October 15, 1896, p. 3. Haynes’s lengthy eulogy to him, “Death of James M. Wright, D. D.,” TM August 20, 1896, p. 1. See also, TM September 3, 1896, p. 5, TM October 8, 1896, p. 5. Both Kelley and Haynes remembered him as a jewel of a man, who died largely unappreciated and undervalued. A long anti-holiness item from John M. Jordan, TM June 27, 1895, p. 3. Several “anti” items, July 4, 1895, p. 2. Zinzendorffian critic J. J. Ransom was especially aggressive, going so far as to deconstruct another preacher’s testimony of his own experience. Haynes printed his running list of articles, and even his criticism of Haynes’s criticism of Ransom’s criticism of Wright. “Editorial Kindness, Etc.,” TM September 19, 1895, p. 8. Sanctification debating ran very heavy in the summer of 1895, May ff. It had been only sporadic previously. Page one was not dominated by the topic, though it became more prominent after Jones receded and Tennessee opposition grew. For Haynes printing an unbelievably rude and vicious attack on Haynes, the paper, and the entire Tennessee Conference (the author saying the Tennesseans were greedy, and behaved like

Soon after the *Methodist* ‘got’ holiness, Tennessee low church ally but anti-holiness preacher W. R. Peebles, speaking again of the paper as a young girl, said of the paper—and surely Haynes himself—“you have all the time been a sweet-tempered tho’ self-willed child; and yet withal so fair and true that it does seem to me strange that everybody does not love you.” “Self-willed” said it well. Low churchers admired and celebrated the utter reliability of Haynes’s steadfast moral courage in defense of his brethren and their noble cause. Court opponents had different names for the same qualities, e.g., stubbornness, impudence, insubordination, and rebellion. Peebles’s “sweet-tempered tho’s self-willed” named the eye-of-the-beholder quality of Haynes’s celebrated and decried editorship before and after his sanctification experience.¹⁶

Holiness advocates quickly rallied to Haynes’s leadership, and praise for Haynes’s contrast to editors like Hoss flowed. One Nashville holiness minister said to Haynes “the spirits of Wesley, Fletcher, Asbury, Pierce, McKendree, and McTyeire must hover with loving interest around your sanctum. Go on, brave, true man; loyal Methodists will bear you in their love and prayers, and coming generations will revere your name and record your noble work.”¹⁷ The

Irishmen at “a Donnybrook Fair” and like “the negroes, when first freed”), see Jas. W. Hill of Gainesville, Texas, “A Texas Tilter,” TM January 10, 1895 p. 2. A Texan responded, explaining Hill’s demeanor and inviting Haynes to come to Texas for conference, B. M. Stephens, “Brother J. W. Hill on the Warpath,” TM February 21, 1895, p. 2.

¹⁶ W. R. Peebles, “A Lively Letter,” TM January 17, 1895, p. 2. Peebles addressed his letter “My Dear Tennie,” and made it clear that many who opposed the paper did so because they had heard others talk bad about it. Those who had their own reasons generally thought the paper too “venturesome,” insufficiently restricted in its commentary. Peebles contrasted papers that speak loudly and then refused to allow the annoyed to register their complaint in the columns of the paper. Haynes did not do this, an open practice that provided a safeguard in Peebles’s view, or at least his view in January 1895. Peebles meant to criticize the closed pages of the NCA under Hoss.

¹⁷ Joseph Jamison, “We are Reading and Thinking,” TM March 19, 1896 p. 3. Jamison said Haynes was popular with many thousands of people, nationwide, who were “approving and praying for you daily,” as they believed as Jamison did that “God has brought you to the tripod for such as time as the present.” Haynes was “standing firm as a rock and bright as a beacon-light for God, truth and primitive Methodism.” Jamison contrasted Haynes with his critics, for Haynes could write of the spiritual power in revival as a fresh participant and minister while others – “modern machine runners,” sat in a “leather-backed chair writing smart things *about* religion.” See also J. F. Corbin,

change strengthened national and ecumenical bonds. Haynes reported his regrets that he missed “seeing Bishop W. F. Mallalieu,” a leading pro-holiness MEC bishop, “who called at our office in our absence last week. The good bishop left a kindly and characteristic message of love and good wishes which were gratefully received.”¹⁸

Unlike Haynes’s approach towards bishops and court leadership that mixed praise with criticism, when it came to the holiness movement at least, there were few limits to Hoss’s opposition. The NCA under his editorship was steeped in contemptuous anti-holiness attacks of nearly every kind. Indeed, scarcely an issue passed that did not include such observations, most of them of a personal nature, with charges of hypocrisy, fanaticism, stupidity, and schismatic tendencies the standard fare of the first page of the connectional paper. Anti-holiness commentary was a consistent feature of Hoss’s editorial page in the early 1890s; by the mid-90s, when the anti-holiness campaign reached its zenith, it was the dominant feature. The same habit extended to his talks at Annual Conference gatherings. When Baltimore Conference preachers expressed second blessing piety in the devotional meeting, Bishop Granbery and Editor Hoss “rebuked this in their sermons today as folly and fanaticism,” reported the local paper. To be

“How is This?,” TM March 19, 1896, p. 8. For an example of the contrast between holiness power and Court rationality, see bottom-left paragraph by Hoss, NCA May 21, 1896 p. 1, and, then Haynes speaking of “soul power” or “Heart Power,” TM July 16, 1896, p. 1. Stephens described holiness advocacy as “a potent form of religious and social protest.” Stephens, *Fire Spreads*, 67. Yet even from Hoss’s pen, it was still an evangelical tradition – at least in its memory or at least occasionally: “Nowadays a red-hot ‘Amen’ bouncing around through a prayer meeting would frighten half the people, but it ought to meet half a dozen more red-hot ‘Amens’ bouncing round at the same time.” NCA November 7, 1895, p. 3.

¹⁸ TM, October 10, 1895, p. 1. Haynes enjoyed hosting visiting editors and writers, e.g., R. H. Mahon of the *Memphis Christian Advocate*, and MECS holiness advocate, T. H. B. Anderson, TM May 14, 1896, p. 1, 5. He also hosted Bishop Fitzgerald in his office “sanctum,” TM May 21, 1896, p. 4. A network of holiness papers, colleges, and adherents existed, as reflected in the rare sighing of an ad for a newspaper in the pages of a newspaper, The *Kentucky Methodist* ad – “A Great Holiness Paper” in the *Tennessee Methodist*. The ad claimed that, in subscriptions, the Kentucky was first of its class in Kentucky, and second in the South overall, TM September 17, 1896, p. 8. Haynes also participated in politically themed networks, see ads for the *Weekly Atlanta Journal* and the *Atlanta Weekly Constitution*, TM October 22, 1896, p. 8.

clear, Hoss did not criticize holiness advocacy as one might correct a mistaken friend. He never pleaded or reasoned with holiness advocates to alter a teaching or change a behavior. He did not even lecture holiness advocates or demand that they heel. Rather, Hoss condemned, belittled, mocked, parodied, buttressed against, warned against, and generally worked through every issue to undermine any and all holiness adherence in the MECS.¹⁹

Hoss continued earlier criticism of others, too, from polity critics, whom he criticized for being hypocrites for rendering criticism and belittled for belittling their critics,²⁰ to other

¹⁹ “Visiting Pastors Preach,” *The Morning Times* (Washington, D. C.), p. 4. None could have missed the anti-holiness dominant theme. “The Ground and Aim of Regeneration,” NCA April 4, 1895 p. 1., “Growth in Grace,” NCA April 13, 1895 p. 1. Attacking holiness advocates “Revising Jesus and Discarding Moses,” NCA February 7, 1895, p. 1. Follow up attack, his opponent was stupid and immoral “A Wrong ‘Way,’” NCA March 7, 1895 p. 1. Hoss understood the principle he struggled to implement, saying “to love and disagree is often very difficult...” (third paragraph on left), NCA December 26, 1895 p. 1. Other anti-holiness commentary from Hoss’s *Advocate*: “What is Schism,?” NCA January 2, 1896, p. 1., Thomas M. Cobb, “Difference Not Opposition,” NCA January 2, 1896, p. 2., “Organization and Power,” NCA January 23, 1896, p. 1., “Practical Holiness,” NCA March 12, 1896, p. 8. Attacking revivals, NCA March 26, 1896, p. 8. One paragraph invitation to holiness advocates to leave the MECS like O’Kelley and preserve their consistency, and another that rejoiced in the crushed health of an itinerant who left the church, NCA April 9, 1896, p. 8. Attacking holiness advocates as the intolerant ones, individually each was “an enemy of Methodism,” NCA April 16, 1896, p. 1. Jas. W. Hill, “Let Us Have Peace!,” NCA April 16, 1896, p. 5. John Nichols (Duck River, Tenn.), “Sanctification,” NCA May 7, 1896, p. 3. Criticizing the MEC for making formal provision for evangelists, NCA June 4, 1896, p. 1. The Holy Spirit does not speak in direct witness to individuals, only through reasoned study of the Scriptures, “The Leading of The Spirit,” NCA July 2, 1896, p. 1. On the same page Hoss declared that Methodism had no doctrine beyond the Apostles’ Creed and that holiness adherents were heretics, “An Opportune Truth,” NCA July 2, 1896, p. 1. Insinuating against the holiness movement generally based on the actions of George Watson alone, “A Fond, Caressing Spirit,” NCA July 2, 1896, p. 8. Attacking the holiness paper *The Way of Life* and Watson by name, NCA August 27, 1896, p. 8. Bullying and intimidating editors, NCA July 16, 1896, p. 8, NCA July 23, 1896, p. 1. Attacking holiness theology and character of those who held it, NCA July 30, 1896, p. 1, NCA August 6, 1896, p. 1, NCA August 6, 1896, p. 8., from D. C. Kelley, “Old-Time Experiences in Tennessee Methodism,” NCA August 27, 1896, p. 5, Hoss printed an anonymous attack, NCA September 3, 1896, p. 5. Attacking holiness character, NCA October 8, 1896, p. 1. Hoss published others’ attacks on holiness movement – NCA November 8, 1894 p. 6, that urged there was no need to profess anything; a rebuke of that position as thoroughly unmethodistic appeared NCA December 6, 1894 p. 6. ; another, this time from T. L. Boswell, NCA December 13, 1894 p. 9. Hoss bashing “Local Preachers – And Evangelists,” NCA September 12, 1895, p. 1.

²⁰ Attacking or mocking critics of bishops and defense of status quo, NCA January 2, 1896, p. 8., “Not Quite Tyranny,” NCA February 20, 1896, p. 8., “Commended to the Methodists,” NCA February 27, 1896, p. 1., NCA February 27, 1896, p. 8., mocking critics of declension, NCA March 19, 1896, p. 8. Hoss deconstructing the evil hypocrisy of “The Critic,” NCA June 25, 1896, p. 1. Hoss attacking critics of episcopacy and running for the office himself, “Our Episcopacy,” NCA September 17, 1896, p. 1. Attacking Kelley on polity (x2), “A Surprising Article,” NCA January 16, 1896, p. 1., “Dr. Kelley’s Article,” NCA January 30, 1896, p. 1 (responding to the article on p. 4.). Hoss misquoted Kelley, NCA February 27, 1896, p. 2., W. T. Poynter agreed with Kelley, saying “we have our judiciary and our executive departments in the hands of the same persons” (bishops); that despotism would eventually result was “a sure prophecy,” “Dr. Kelley’s Article,” NCA March 5, 1896, p. 4. Hitting Kelley again,

Methodist newspapers that he threatened to shut down,²¹ to the poor, the plainfolk, and the uneducated whose word use “afflicted” Hoss’s soul,²² to women’s leadership, suffrage, the WCTU, the Prohibition Party, and other political efforts that made him angry,²³ and the MEC, Yankees, and African Americans whose very existence at times seemed a mortal threat to the MECS.²⁴ Other political commentary from the *Advocate* was generally more positive, and far

“Finis,” NCA March 5, 1896, p. 8. Right after calling again for an editors council Hoss opined that all critics were hypocrites, one that complains about anyone or anything, is thus proven to be more guilty than they are, NCA November 22, 1894 p. 1., similarly, Haygood bashed discontentment and criticism of authority as a sign of spiritual idolatry December 27, 1894 p. 9. Hoss condemned critics for being sensitive to criticism, a personal trait Hoss embodied as well as any other figure in the period. “Critics and Criticism,” NCA April 11, 1895, p. 1. Critics as disloyal hypocrites, (possibly from J. W. Boswell) “Modern Jeremiahs,” NCA May 2, 1895 p. 8. Hoss criticized the habit of belittling opponents, NCA May 16, 1895, p. 1.

²¹ Hoss calling for merging of MECS newspapers, reduction in number, NCA March 28, 1895 p. 1. Hoss reprinted articles critical of conference papers (the tone suggests these were written by internal critics of particular annual conference papers), G. M. Gibson, “The Missouri Conference,” NCA September 26, 1895, p. 11. Hoss made a formal call for a meeting of editors to occur in Nashville on May 6, 1896. “A Call,” NCA March 5, 1896, p. 8. Hoss withdrew and cancelled the call less than six weeks later due to scheduling conflicts and other reasons he did not want to reveal, “The Call Withdrawn,” NCA April 16, 1896, p. 8. Hoss renewed his call to shut down competing papers, “An Important Matter,” NCA June 11, 1896, p. 1. Inexplicably, Hoss used the anti-pastor epithet “giraffes” in an article appealing for the help of pastors to “Circulate the Advocate,” NCA December 12, 1895, p. 1.

²² Attacking Sam Jones, evangelists, and rural Methodists, NCA April 23, 1896, p. 8. Hoss’s “soul was afflicted” by others’ use of the expression “along these lines,” and it was “absolutely unbearable” that an evangelist would say “along pentecostal lines,” a shot at holiness advocacy, NCA May 28, 1896, p. 1. Hoss hit a grand slam when he was able to criticize the MEC, African Americans, women, and the holiness movement at once by noting that the MEC General Conference invited African American holiness evangelist “Mrs. Amanda [Berry] Smith” to hold “Pentecostal meetings” during the session, NCA May 28, 1896, p. 1.

²³ Attacking Women’s leadership, suffrage, WCTU, Prohibition Party, “Are Women Better Than Men?,” NCA January 23, 1896, p. 1. Haygood decriing the “lunacy” of the “feminine revolt,” “The Cady Stanton Bible,” NCA June 13, 1895, p. 4. Attacking the Prohibition Party while simultaneously denying that he was against them, NCA March 19, 1896, p. 1. Attacking the MEC for pro-female representation movement, “A Grave Situation,” NCA March 19, 1896, p. 1. Attacking those calling for civic righteousness as personal hypocrites, NCA April 9, 1896, p. 1, attacking “Preachers and Politics,” NCA September 10, 1896, p. 1. Similarly, court figure J. D. Barbee “wastes no sweetness on the evangelists, and loves the women too well to admit them to peerage with men in our parliaments,” John M. Crowe, “West Virginia Conference,” NCA October 8, 1896, p. 5.

²⁴ Hoss’s anti-Yankee radicalism trifecta in one page: attacking the 1. MEC for its criticism of white southern treatment of African Americans, 2. personal insinuation against the entire holiness movement in “The Moral of It,” and attacking 3. Frances Willard and WCTU, and all forms of advocacy of prohibition that were not single issue items in “A Widening Platform,” NCA January 3, 1895, p. 1. Hoss attacked prohibition advocate J. D. Smith’s article and Prohibition Party while denying he was doing either, NCA January 24, 1895 p. 5. Hoss defended R. E. Lee from charge that Grant was a better General, “Robert E. Lee,” NCA March 28, 1895 p. 1. Angry that British Methodists had disrespected the MECS, “A Matter to Be Considered,” NCA August 15, 1895, p. 8. From Hoss, on

more temperate in its tone and outlook. Indeed, the stark contrast between Hoss's generally reasonable approach to most topics and the extreme vigor of his rebukes of his standard list of adversaries demonstrated the extent of his opposition.²⁵

Other Court opponents within the Tennessee Conference remained active, such as A. T. Goodloe who decried the "Political Pulpitry" of clergy, the "mobocracy" and "independentism" within his own Tennessee Conference in the pages of another conference's paper, and the

the "General Conference of 1844," (reprinted from *New York Christian Advocate*) NCA September 5, 1895, p. 1. An example of an entirely unworthy and worthless article – a lead article no less – and a complete waste of ink, space, and opportunity, "To the 'Northwestern' – Greeting," NCA October 3, 1895, p. 1. A lynching in Tennessee was sufficient reason to feud with the MEC, even comparing Arthur Edwards of the Northwestern (Chicago) to John Brown and Harper's Ferry, "Another Lynching," NCA October 17, 1895, p. 1. J. W. Boswell defended the NCA from charges that it was attempting to "revive old issues or to keep alive the animosities of the past," NCA November 7, 1895 p. 8. Hoss celebrating the decoration of Confederate graves in Chicago, "The Chicago Event," NCA June 13, 1895, p. 1. Wasting a page 1 article on a mean spirited defense of Robert E. Lee, "The Difference," NCA July 9, 1896, p. 1. Hoss on African Americans, "The Right Sort of Talk," where Hoss said "the negro race has terrible weaknesses of character," and "A Plea for Consistency," NCA July 11, 1895, p. 1. On treatment of African American leaders in the MEC by white northern MEC leaders, NCA August 1, 1895, p. 8. See also "Our Duty to the Negro," NCA August 15, 1895, p. 1. Hoss's anger with the MEC lead him to come very close to justifying lynching and use completely inappropriately graphic language for a family religious paper, "Two Horrible Pictures," NCA November 28, 1895, p. 1. Attacking Northerners and the MEC for hypocrisy on race, "Race Distinction and Caste," NCA February 13, 1896, p. 1. See also NCA March 5, 1896, p. 1. The MEC and Black Methodist churches stole the "ignorant sheep" who were rightly members of the MECS before the war; the negro was a "problem wrenched out of our hands," "Some Facts of History," NCA April 9, 1896, p. 1. Attacking northerners for praising the Boers while condemning the antebellum white South, NCA April 23, 1896, p. 1. Correcting the MEC in its choice of bishops, NCA July 16, 1896, p. 1. Hoss attacking the Episcopal Church, NCA September 3, 1896 p. 8. Hoss attacking "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and defending the Old South, NCA September 8, 1896, p. 8.

²⁵ Boswell (?) urged pastors to keep a particular complex, difficult, and emotional political topic out of the pulpit... to avoid "indulging in intemperate harangues." He said the people heard enough about it 6 days a week. He said introducing such themes into the time and place of worship was offensive both to "good citizenship" and "sound piety." He then closed with the kicker: 99 out of 100 of preachers "have no attainments that entitle them to speak out." Those playing "oracle" had "simply repeated the inane drivel" found in "catchpenny pamphlets." "If a minister is itching to exhibit his opinions, let him at least have the common decency to acquire an adequate acquaintance with matters of which he speaks;" lest he "expose himself, and rightly so, to the general contempt." "A Word of Warning," NCA May 30, 1895, p. 8. "Christianity and Socialism," NCA March 26, 1896, p. 1. Hoss antiwar commentary, "A Paradoxical Situation," NCA June 13, 1895, p. 1. J. W. Boswell opposed to anti-Semitism, supportive of Jews, "A Deserved Rebuke," NCA December 19, 1895, p. 8. Boswell condemned Tennessee Chief Justice D. L. Snodgrass, who shot a man who had criticized the Judge's rulings, "A Shocking Affair," NCA December 26, 1895, p. 8. Hoss was writing about the freedom and opening of Cuba as early as "Cuba," November 14, 1895, p. 1. Hoss wrote about the Indian Mission Conference in Indian Territory, and used the term "half breeds," "In the Far West," NCA November 14, 1895, p. 8. See also TM November 7, 1895, p. 2. Hoss was very neutral in his approach to the 1896 presidential election that stood out as the most intense and dramatic since 1860, NCA October 15, 1896, p. 8, NCA October 22, 1896, p. 1. The NCA urged preachers to be quiet about silver vs. gold and other financial debates, as 99 out of 100 had no qualifications to speak on financial topics. For a positive take on Hoss's engagement with political matters, see Martin, *Hoss*, 141-152.

“Methodist Jayhawkery” of local preacher evangelists. Similarly, W. M. Leftwich attacked D. C. Kelley’s ministry (although not his politics) through the connectional organ by that most common way a pastor could demonstrate an anti-fraternal spirit, namely, the self-inflating narrative about how bad a job the last pastor did and how you showed up and saved the day, while low churchers defended the Tennessee Conference through the pages of the *Tennessee Methodist*.²⁶

While some focused on defending particular figures from Court attacks, Haynes appealed, through his own and others’ words, to Methodist bishops to lead in restoring Methodist liberties, reaffirming Methodist doctrine, and renewing Methodist piety. At times, he drew subtle comparisons to the MEC. At a time when the sectarians Hoss and Haygood were reaffirming schism by sectional, race, and gender baiting the MEC, and mocking any MECS editors who even hinted at organic union, the more ecumenical Haynes called for Bishop Galloway to take the lead in ending “our unnatural and unscriptural relation to our sister Methodism.” Without naming the 1894 MECS episcopal address, Haynes praised the 1896 MEC episcopal address that had “The Right Ring” on sanctification. Haynes warned that MECS abuse of its own holiness preachers would lead to the MEC moving to recruit them away from the MECS.²⁷

²⁶ A. T. Goodloe (a twenty-fiver) criticized “Political Pulpitry,” NCA May 9, 1895, p. 5. A one-sixteener, John M. Jordan, responded at length to A. T. Goodloe, whom Jordan called a “narrow,” “brave, pious dyspeptic.” Goodloe decried the “mobocracy” and “independentism” of the Tennessee Conference protest, TM June 27, 1895, p. 2. Goodloe’s attack was published in the *Arkansas Methodist*. Jordan said that those in Tennessee, knowing Goodloe, would have paid no attention to it. Goodloe attacked the “Methodist Jayhawkery” undertaken by local preachers, NCA October 8, 1896, p. 5. The twenty-fiver ring remained active – see Haynes (top left) January 3, 1895 p. 1., and H. W. Turner, “Elm Street Church, Nashville” TM January 3, 1895 p. 4, that recounted the activities of those still actively whispering against D. C. Kelley, perhaps including T. B. Fisher and especially Leftwich, whose “Nashville Notes,” NCA December 12, 1894 (quoted) painted a very dark portrait of Kelley’s ministry at Elm Street. Several writers noted that Kelley’s appointment away from Elm Street to Bell Buckle was part of an ongoing active conspiracy against Kelley. According to Kelley, the best religious newspaper in America was “Zion’s Herald,” TM January 10, 1895 p. 2.

²⁷ “Why Not?,” TM January 24, 1895 p. 1. Haynes cited statistics from the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* (Chicago) about MEC strength in the South. He was surprised that their white membership slightly outpaced their black membership, celebrated MEC success in the South, and welcomed them, “Figures that Talk,” TM November

Haynes printed the testimony of MECS holiness evangelist W. B. Godbey (printed as “W. G. Godbey”), who recounted the history of holiness movement in the South, his early experience, and Bishop McTyeire’s tearful support for Godbey’s evangelistic ministry. Godbey wrote, “in the death of Bishop McTyeire the holiness movement lost a tower of strength. He was thoroughly Wesleyan in doctrine, and was in full sympathy with the sanctified experience.” Godbey reported that his location for evangelistic ministry was McTyeire’s solution, and the bishop wrote a letter of support for him. Godbey said he long stood alone in the Kentucky Conference, but holiness advocates were now a majority. “Our name is legion,” said Godbey. He concluded “stick to the old ship of Southern Methodism till the Lord rides down on a cloud.” But C. L. Chilton claimed that “one of our bishops” had called holiness people insane, a fact that highlighted the shift in episcopal conduct. Chilton named Key (correctly) and the youthful Hendrix (probably incorrectly) as bishops who believed in the doctrine.²⁸

Haynes did not run continuous commentary about old episcopal mistakes. He managed to refrain from commentary about specific bishops when others did not. When Bishop Haygood died in January of 1896, Sam Jones produced a painfully-poignant and repentant eulogy in

21, 1895, p. 1. See also “Needless Waste to Be Remedied,” TM May 16, 1895, p. 1. “The Right Ring,” TM May 21, 1896, p. 1. MEC sweeping in to get holiness preachers because MECS is so bitter and harsh – from H. C. Morrison in Texas, “Trend of the Tripod: As We Feared,” TM September 6, 1895, p. 1. Another example of the ecumenical Haynes vs. the schismatic and sectarian Hoss, Haynes celebrated the fraternal address to the MEC by MECS fraternal delegate J. C. Morris, whose talk Haynes said was largely about entire sanctification, Haynes, “Dr. Morris’ Address,” TM May 14, 1896, p. 1. Both the TM and NCA reprinted the address in their May 21, 1896 issues. Compare Haynes’s quiet and indirect notation of a mistake in MEC hospitality toward MECS delegate Morris and Hoss’s high-visibility censoriousness that ended a long page 1 review on a very ungracious note, “M.E. Church,” TM May 14, 1896, p. 5, and “The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church,” NCA May 14, 1896, p. 1, and even more anti-ecumenical petulance from Hoss, NCA May 28, 1896, p. 1. Like Hoss, Haynes did not favor the high church (Anglo-Catholic) party within the Anglican-Episcopal tradition that was drawing closer to the Catholic Church, see “The Trend of Ecclesiasticism,” and “A Papal Set-Back,” TM October 1, 1896, p. 1.

²⁸ Reprinted from the *Way of Faith* in Columbia, SC, W. B. Godbey, “The Holiness Gospel: Bishop McTyeire’s Position on Important Questions,” TM November 21, 1895, p. 2. For Godbey (1833-1920), see Barry W. Hamilton’s excellent and deeply-researched biography, *William Baxter Godbey: Itinerant Apostle of the Holiness Movement*. (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000). For Hamilton’s account of Godbey’s 1883 location through McTyeire’s efforts, 47-54. (C. L. Chilton) “Points and Pointers,” TM, January 23, 1896, p.2.

Haygood's honor, a product of a ghastly open wound: an old loving brotherly relationship become bitter enmity that remained unreconciled at death. In this case, Haynes printed the eulogies of others, but for himself merely said the church had lost a "gifted and brilliant" speaker and leader in educational work. It was low praise from Haynes, a very gifted eulogist. He said no more of Haygood than any secular observer would have said, and less than many said. But there had been no criticism, no repeating of previous complaints, no rebuttal or counterpoint, and it had been correct enough in noting a man whose death brought no joy, but whose episcopal conduct and personal example Haynes apparently felt deserved no effusive praise.²⁹

Haynes focused on what he was trying to affirm and encourage, while noting specific and current examples of Court errors. He fused his earlier emphases with advocacy of entire sanctification. Distinguishing between diagnosis and cure, Haynes pressed the recovery of the "experience of our people of perfect love," which he called "the Apostolic and Methodistic Remedy" for the "deplorably worldly condition of the church," worldliness that had "well-nigh wrecked the church." In the summer of 1895, Haynes agreed with Palmore of the *St. Louis* in condemning "unmanly," indirect, and "desultory" episcopal methods against evangelists. Haynes also charged that while some non-holiness evangelists also had to locate, no holiness evangelist had been allowed to remain in his conference with a nominal appointment. Haynes labeled this discrepancy part of a systematic "persecution policy." Criticism of the spiritual and disciplinary state of Methodism brought Court criticism of criticism that encouraged further

²⁹ Jones on Haygood, TM, January 30, 1896, p.1. Haynes on Haygood, TM, January 23, 1896 p. 1. Haygood's stroke NCA October 24, 1895 p. 8. Haygood's talks at an Annual Conference included informing the audience how canned beef was canned, "Arkansas Conference," NCA December 12, 1895, p. 2. An example of Haynes's skill as eulogist, "Memoir" (for Wm. O. Parker of Hobson's Chapel), TM September 10, 1896, p. 5.

examples of overreaching aimed at silencing the jeremiads.³⁰

In the fall of 1895, Bishops Keener and A. W. Wilson began refusing clergy requests to locate if the bishops suspected that the intention was to go into evangelistic work. This novel solution had bishops refusing to grant what earlier bishops had forced, a situation brought on by the bishop-led refusal to make any place for clergy evangelists. Both the refusal to grant location and the subjecting of the requesting member to questioning were new forms of episcopal overreaching. Wilson refused the location of A. C. Bane of the Los Angeles Conference, perhaps because MECS clergy were in short supply in the missionary western conferences. Haynes reported that Wilson's decision was overturned by the May 1896 meeting of the College of Bishops by a seven to two vote, with Granbery leading the vote to overturn against Wilson and Keener. Haynes revealed that his sources were living bishops themselves, and warned against possible cover up of the vote he reported when denials appeared. Indeed, it was soon reported that the bishops had refused to hear the case by a vote of seven to two, resulting in Haynes's direct challenge to Bishop Hendrix to acknowledge and clarify the episcopal action. Bane, a pastor in San Diego, California, left the MECS for the MEC, resulting in a lament and protest from Editor Mahon of the *Memphis Advocate*, introduced and reprinted by Haynes. Some less ominous examples of episcopal treatment of evangelists were simply ludicrous, and suggested incompetence or lack of common sense.³¹

³⁰ "The Apostolic and Methodistic Remedy," TM February 28, 1895, p. 1. "Thirst for Power," TM July 4, 1895, p. 1. "What Next?," TM August 29, 1895, p. 1. R. N. Price agreed with the evangelists' protest, "The Law and the Testimony," TM September 12, 1895, p. 8. See also several quotable paragraphic comments on Carradine, Wesley, McKendree, holiness, Christianity v. churchianity, TM November 14, 1895, p. 1.

³¹ TM, May 14, 1896, p. 1. "A Correction Which Fails to Correct," TM June 18, 1896, p. 1. Haynes's challenge to Hendrix, "Trifling with a Serious Matter," TM August 20, 1896, p. 1. "The Loss of Bro. Bane," TM July 16, 1896, p. 1. T. J. Duncan was Bane's presiding elder, and may have also played a role in Bane's withdrawal, "Where are we at?," by "Local Preacher Myself," TM July 23, 1896, p. 8. See also T. J. Duncan, "Southern California," NCA April 9, 1896, p. 5. See also TM September 3, 1896, p. 5. Haynes and R. N. Price criticizing Keener's bullying actions against an evangelist in Texas, actions Price called "tyranny," whose rationale was entirely incorrect, "The Climax

While the MECS had a more independent system for its newspapers than had the MEC, Haynes worried that in view of the “most unfortunate and unjust silence” of MECS editors in the face of episcopal abuses “Methodist Episcopacy seems too transcendent a power for any kind of church press.” An example was found in the story of *Memphis* Editor Mahon. His unrestrained lament on the behalf of Bane brought down the ire of the *Nashville*. Hoss attacked Mahon so mercilessly that the poor man wrote a terrified apology and abruptly resigned the editorship, while the Memphis Conference that had just re-created its paper debated if they should just suspend production again. The NCA under Hoss’s command had killed the *Memphis Advocate* for the second time. In 1898, the again-restarted *Memphis* was killed off a third time, and the Memphis Conference pledged its undying support to the *Nashville* that included the line “we cannot afford to allow any other paper to displace the *Nashville Christian Advocate*.” The Memphis Conference could stand to allow other papers to circulate, most obviously the *Arkansas*. It was Hoss’s *Nashville*, hemorrhaging subscriptions badly, that could not ‘afford to allow’ it, and the connectional received the padding of the *Memphis*’s subscription list in the bargain.³²

of Absurdity,” TM January 16, 1896 p. 1. See also “Much Ado About Nothing,” TM February 27, 1896 p. 1. See also R. N. Price, “Local Preacher Evangelism,” and Clement C. Cary, “Evangelists and Local Preachers,” (both) TM, October 3, 1895, p. 2. For a particularly silly moment, see the case of W. M. Leftwich – a twenty-fiver and supporter of bishops. Leftwich had been receiving a nominal appointment so that he could do the evangelistic work of helping pastors. But – given there was no formal placement for evangelists and the bishops’ *change* in policy that now made non-legal but conventional nominal appointments unacceptable – Leftwich thought it best to locate so as to protect the bishops from further criticism on the topic. But Bishop Wilson instead *transferred* Leftwich to the Virginia Conference, which, though it was Leftwich’s home state, was entirely overstaffed with clergy, a situation that would have meant that either the aging Leftwich or someone else would have gone unemployed or underpaid. So Leftwich located in Virginia, *then moved back to Tennessee* where he actually wanted to live, and continued his evangelistic labors. Leftwich did not mention if he sent Wilson a bill for any expenses he incurred in the affair, W. M. Leftwich, “Why I Located,” NCA December 5, 1895, p. 3.

³² “Too Great A Power for any Kind of a Press,” TM January 24, 1895, p. 1. NCA bullying of Mahon: NCA July 16, 1896, p. 8, NCA August 6, 1896, p. 8, “Mere Sparks,” NCA August 13, 1896, p. 1, Mahon’s apology, “A Card From Dr. Mahon,” NCA August 27, 1896, p. 8. Mahon’s resignation, NCA September 10, 1896, p. 8. R. N. Price weighed in, “Give Us Light,” TM August 20, 1896, p. 8. The *Memphis* died again, NCA January 20, 1898 p. 8.

Such Court actions produced some interesting commentary. That same summer of 1896, Clement C. Cary expressed a sharp dissent against the domination of non-pastors in General Conference clergy delegations. Cary said that the MEC in 1896 had 69 presidents, 170 presiding elders, and only 78 pastors. For North Georgia in the MECS only two of ten clergy delegates were pastors. “Why, then,” exclaimed Cary, “this ceaseless laudation of these men and their public sayings?” Cary called for connectional officers, editors, and professors and presidents to be subject to the law of itinerancy: put them back “into the pastorate for a season.” Cary did not say that bishops should be included, but his proposal certainly included Hoss, who had not been in an assigned pastoral role in twenty years.³³

A perplexed Hoss reported that the MEC General Conference committees – including their Committee on Episcopacy – were open to the public, unlike the “private” meetings held by the MECS. Hoss tellingly wrote “the general idea is that the public is entitled to know whatever goes on.” He was stunned that when one committee closed its doors, it provoked an outcry. But it was not the “public” that had a right to know, but the delegates of the General Conference, who were undoubtedly and expressly entitled, even duty-bound, to judge for themselves whether or not one of their own committees had done its work properly.³⁴

But Court preference for guarding the reputations of powerful men had limits, and further ironies. When connectional editor of the *Epworth Era* S. A. Steel—elected by the General Conference of 1894—found himself in further trouble, the Court leadership again spoke out against him. Despite his office, no Court protection was afforded Steel because he had

³³ Clement C. Cary, “Changes Needed,” TM August 20, 1896, p. 2.

³⁴ “With Our Northern Brethren,” NCA May 21, 1896, p. 1. See criticism of this secrecy related to the Bane case and the trial of S. A. Steel from Clement Cary, “From North Georgia,” TM August 27, 1896 p. 2.

previously violated the code by defending Kelley, Sam Jones, and other critics of Court authority. It was not the office that provided the protection but the policy. Dissent from episcopal will would not be allowed or tolerated, and the methods used to enforce that policy showed that respect for other persons or offices mattered little. For example, Hoss criticized his “giraffe” enemy Steel by suggesting that Steel favored organic union with the MEC. Steel responded harshly to Hoss’s comments—the words “bearing” and “false witness” were used in close proximity—that Steel understood to have aimed at harming Steel’s reputation. Steel basically accused Hoss of immorality by participating in or leading, with malicious intent, a conspiracy to further false witness, then lying about his involvement. After all, for serious observers in that era, Steel’s opinion on the prospects for union with the MEC was no scandalous matter. Editors of teen publications did not decide such matters. Moreover, the MECS had long had its hopeful idealists whose willingness to forgive and forget went beyond the dominant view. If Steel had been a supporter of union, it only placed him in a minority, a minority many thought included Bishop Hendrix. But Steel’s willingness to criticize bishops and defend other such critics was a serious issue. For that, not his supposed ‘softness’ on the union issue, he deserved Court rebuke.³⁵

Steel’s editorship of the *Epworth Era* was controversial for reasons other than his ability to throw a vigorous counterpunch, and the Book Committee originally tried to manage him directly in violation of Methodist laws that spelled out the method for holding a connectional editor elected by the General Conference accountable during a quadrennium. In late summer of 1896 they formally tried Steel for “inefficiency” and “misconduct.” Editor Mahon appeared as

³⁵ “Trend of the Tripod: A Charge and Its Denial,” TM September 19, 1895, p. 1. Hoss, “In Brotherly Love,” NCA August 29, 1895, p. 1. S. A. Steel was actually a “highly esteemed” member of the “North Mississippi Conference,” (by J. W. Boswell) NCA December 12, 1895, p. 8.

one of the defense attorneys for Steel. Among the long list of specific charges against Steel was one that fell under the heading “inefficiency.” The Court charged Steel with vulgarity and using slang or low expressions, for example, “sand in their gizzards,” “there’s game up this tree.” Steel’s campaign against tobacco use among teens also appeared in the charges, both under the heading of “inefficiency” and the second heading, “misconduct,” another case where a critic of episcopal conduct was ostensibly punished for holding opinions sitting bishops also held. Against Steel’s wishes, he was tried behind closed doors, but was retained after signing a negotiated document that promised to amend his behavior. One Steel defender compared him to John Wesley.³⁶

The Steel controversy in the summer of 1896 was important. But 1896 had already been a decisive year for Haynes’s relationship with Court and the Tennessee Conference. On January 30, 1896, in the same issue as Jones’s tearful farewell to Haygood, Haynes offered a full throated protest against episcopal abuses entitled “A Grave Matter.” Haynes declared, “we are not quite ready for a Methodist papacy” and decried “a lordly assumption of authority” that coincided with repeated episcopal blunders “so frequent and so varied” that the church was “dazed.” Even former critics of criticism were coming to Haynes’s support he said, and the church was weakening in its “confidence” in episcopacy, while “public esteem and reverence” were also being lost. Haynes called for legislation to “protect ourselves from endless and grievous evils when we make mistakes and get wrong men in this high office.” Because legislation was the proper means to solve the issue, “church journalism” had a duty to help pursue suitable

³⁶ See “A Manly Statement,” TM June 25, 1896, (page obscured, but probably 8). “The Trial of Dr. S. A. Steel,” NCA August 20, 1896, p. 8. “Let Us Have Peace,” NCA October 29, 1896, p. 8. Mahon’s involvement, TM August 13, 1896, p. 1. A detailed statement of the charges with issues and page numbers appeared TM August 13, 1896 p. 4. “The Dr. Steel Case,” TM August 20, 1896, p. 5. A vigorous defense of Steel, L. Clay Kilby, “Shades of John Wesley!!,” TM September 24, 1896, p. 2. Steel’s own aggressive defense, TM October 22, 1896, p. 2. Haygood and Candler were noted for their love of cigars, while Hendrix would not allow anyone to smoke in his presence.

legislation. Journalistic silence under these conditions meant one of three things existed, that is, “a craven cowardice unworthy even of average manhood, or an endorsement of tyranny which is un-American, unpatriotic and un-Christly, or an unaccountable ignorance of facts which even a stranger in Israel could scarcely fail to know.” Haynes admitted that some of “the ultra conservatives” would continue to criticize critics and “persist in impugning the[ir] motives.” Haynes’s was no solitary dissent. In that same January issue, in an impressive example of dissenting intertextuality, Haynes mentioned and reprinted in full three different protests from other papers on same topic, whose titles convey their theme: “Centralization, or Absolutism versus Popular Sovereignty” from the *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, “Ecclesiastical Suicide” by R. N. Price from the *Holston Methodist*, and “Breakers Ahead,” by H. O. Moore from *The Methodist and Way of Life*. The effect of the combined statements would provoke calls for Haynes to leave the church entirely.³⁷

The unnamed “St. Louis” writer—who did not mention the holiness controversy—began by alluding to the Pope, Czars, and the autocratic Prince Metternich of Austria, then quoted and affirmed previous commentary from Price, who had compared clergy defying a bishop to “a little scrub bull” standing on the tracks in front of a moving locomotive. Yet, the St. Louis writer noted that “a whole herd” of dissenters would merit use of “airbrakes” or risk derailment. Price quoted the *Pacific Methodist Advocate*’s quotation of the *Texas Christian Advocate*’s threats against holiness preachers. Price then defended the ecclesiastical rights of holiness advocates who believed the “Wesleyan doctrine” and with whom Price himself disagreed. In a brilliantly concise history of the MECS holiness issue between 1886 and 1896, Moore placed the statement

³⁷ “A Grave Matter,” TM, January 30, 1896, p.1. See also “A Still Graver Matter,” TM February 13, 1896, p. 1, where Haynes reported that he had been told to leave the church. Haynes said opponents of criticism were determined to reform “downward.” Several rich and interesting items appeared in that same issue.

of the 1886 Episcopal Address—“men are justified before they are sanctified,” itself a quotation from early Methodism—in contrast with J. M. Boland’s 1888 *Problem* that asserted that entire sanctification happened with justification. Moore noted that while bishops could decry worldliness in comments titled “The World in The Church” (Bishop G. F. Pierce), “High Steeple and Its Official Staff” (Bishop Haygood), and “Forks in the Road” (Bishop Fitzgerald), any non-episcopal watchman heralding the same cry would be labeled a disloyal, censorious, and holier-than-thou “troubler of Israel” and “accuser of the brethren.” Moore warned “our people are not slaves,” and “if the ‘powers that be’ do not ‘slow up’” either “1844 will be duplicated” in the creation of a new church, or the MEC “will gather where we have strewn.”³⁸

In that same dramatic issue, Haynes wrote of urban evangelism as a means toward stemming the tide of “wickedness” manifested in “materialism,” greed, and “moral degeneracy and criminality,” and hoped that the MECS would play its part. But in addition to episcopal abuses, he felt that the MECS was ill equipped for the task because of its active undermining of evangelists and holiness advocates, and its denial of a “public voice” to “gospel-teaching and praying women, those divinely called mothers, having a message from God to deliver.” The church thus “shorn” of these “valuable and forceful agencies” was unready to address societal ills. On the same page with Jones’s ode to Haygood, Haynes had announced that if the MECS could but reign in its manhandling bishops and instead unleash the tongues of Methodist women both the church and “civic conditions” would be transformed.³⁹

T. L. Boswell’s “Centralization of Episcopal Power” largely confirmed charges made by

³⁸ “Centralization, or Absolutism versus Popular Sovereignty” from the *St. Louis Christian Advocate*, TM January 30, 1896 p. 2.; “Ecclesiastical Suicide” by R. N. Price from the *Holston Methodist*, TM January 30, 1896, p. 2; “Breakers Ahead,” by H. O. Moore from *The Methodist and Way of Life*, TM January 30, 1896, p. 3.

³⁹ “Civic Conditions and Methodism,” TM January 30, 1896, p. 1.

Haynes and others that Keener had broken new ground on episcopal overreaching. Boswell's comments also hinted that language on Christian perfection had been inexplicably removed both from the record of an episcopal address and also from paragraph 58 of the *Discipline* that asked candidates if they expected to be made perfect in love in this life. As with other older holiness advocates, Boswell also suggested that Bishop McTyeire encouraged holiness adherents, thus affirming an intertwined narrative of doctrinal and episcopal declension on Keener's watch.⁴⁰

Some Tennessee Conference opponents took special notice of two items from February 20, 1896 that took specific aim at perceived errors in Tennessee Conference clergy. Haynes criticized increasingly respected Vanderbilt theologian and anti-holiness leader Wilbur Tillett for admitting that entire sanctification doctrine was true to Wesley and other authorities, and declared him a heretic by admission (theoretically enough for a conviction in Methodist law). Haynes asked how a teacher in open rebellion against the tradition could retain his place at the denomination's preeminent 'school of the prophets,' as Vanderbilt called itself.⁴¹

On February 6, J. P. Hamilton wondered why Methodist bishops were "discriminating against Methodism," noting that a Methodist preacher could hire a Calvinist like Dwight Moody—who was not ordained or endorsed by any denomination—but not a veteran MECS preacher and holiness advocate like Beverly Carradine, whose meeting in Nashville was shunned by most Methodist clergy and was refused the use of McKendree because he held to holiness doctrine. On February 20, Haynes noted that the Nashville Moody meeting was a heavily supported failure, he believed, because the Holy Spirit had been grieved by the "unnatural, unbrotherly, unscriptural rejection" of Carradine's Nashville meeting by Nashville clergy. Clement Cary of

⁴⁰ T. L. Boswell, "Centralization of Episcopal Power," TM February 27, 1896, p. 2.

⁴¹ "Dr. Tillett's Admission and Its Meaning," TM, February 20, 1896, p.1. For agreement with Haynes's views, see "Appreciative Voices," TM March 5, 1896, p. 1, and "In Commendation," TM March 12, 1896 p. 1.

Georgia also noticed the slight. Cary said few preachers went to hear Carradine, “and fewer still hold up his hands,” (a scriptural reference to prayerful support), while no Methodist church opened its doors to him. The NCA gave only a slight notice, “feeble praise,” and ended with a criticism. Yet Moody received the backing of the NCA and the preachers. Cary said, “Will somebody explain these things?”⁴²

A charge of heresy aimed at cherished Vanderbilt religion faculty for not accepting holiness doctrine was bad enough, but talk of grieving the Holy Spirit for not supporting a holiness revival added to the offense. Whether there had been an organized boycott, or any hint from anti-holiness connectional or presiding elder leadership that supporting Carradine would be regretted, the fact remained that the majority of Tennessee Conference clergy were not holiness advocates. The two charges were not aimed at ‘off conference’ slanderers of Kelley or ‘Old Jerusalem,’ but at the failings of the brotherhood itself. Whether this was bold candor or outrageous impudence on Haynes’s part was in the eye of the beholder.

On March 12, W. R. Peebles called for a halt to debating over holiness doctrine, writing, “I move we quit.” Peebles held that the disputes did no good and some harm, and that the content of the arguments on each side were at least one hundred years’ old. Two years before Peebles had urged anti-holiness Methodists to be tolerant; he now urged second blessing Methodists to be tolerant. Peebles charged Haynes with intolerance in the Moody and Tillett editorials of February 20, and noted that if Haynes wanted to do the holiness cause harm he should continue along that line. He referred to the Wright-Ransom debates that ran in the *Methodist* the previous year, and pledged to help enforce the ban on disputing, if Haynes—“Mr. Editor”—would set the

⁴² J. P. Hamilton, “Discriminating Against Methodism,” TM February 6, 1896 p. 3. “The Moody Meeting,” TM February 20, 1896, p. 1. Clement C. Cary, “From North Georgia,” TM March 12, 1896, p. 2. Haynes called Carradine “the John Wesley of to-day,” and rejoiced that Presbyterians, Baptists, and Episcopalians were adopting holiness advocacy even as Methodism was rejecting its own birthright, ““Good news,”” TM August 13, 1896, p. 1.

example. But Peebles's call—"let's quit disputing about how to be sweet, and all sweeten up"—included express historical claims that early Methodism had been a broad tent on the issue, and that the majority of early Methodists had tolerated the second-adherents, who, in turn, had never thought of accusing anyone of heresy. In Peebles' telling of Methodist origins, the "old Methodist way" was tolerance, under the umbrella of an anti-second majority that tolerated their overstepping and thoroughly misguided, but compliant, brethren.

Haynes's construction of 'primitive' Methodism differed. He rejected the idea that all views were Methodistic. One of them was, while the others—the "growth theory," 'death theory,'" and Zinzendorf's "regeneration theory"—had been expressly rejected by Wesley. "It can in no sense and in no degree be pleaded that any one of these [other] views is a Methodist view," said Haynes. Haynes quoted Vanderbilt historian O. E. Brown's article in the *Methodist Review* wherein Brown held "there is a complete unanimity of our theologians as to the instantaneous attainability of entire sanctification in this life in answer to a faith prepared and adequate." Brown's quotations of luminaries Richard Watson, Miner Raymond, T. O. Summers, Wm. Burt Pope, and Thomas N. Ralston were reproduced, while Haynes added a quotation from John Miley, each supporting, to varying degrees, the second view. Haynes then quoted J. J. Tigert twice before quoting Wesley. Haynes said that no one had denied a gradual work, and affirmed that "we grow in grace both before and after sanctification." Haynes admitted that many received it at death, and that it was theoretically possible that it could be received in regeneration or by process of growth, but said he had never heard of anyone claiming to have received it by growth alone. Haynes held that the Methodist teaching on the question was both clear and unambiguous. He then quoted Lovick Pierce, who identified two majorities. The first, early Methodists, were 95 percent "alive and awake" to full salvation. The second, modern

Methodists, of whom 75 percent were “living with Antinomian indifference to entire sanctification, neither believing in it, praying for it, nor really desiring it.” Peebles’s assertion that “the fathers did not settle it,” Haynes denied. In short, Haynes rejected Peebles’s continuity argument. Elite Methodism had reversed its original position, not sustained it. “I only suggest loyalty to our creed and standards,” Haynes said. He concluded with a defense based on recent history: “As to intolerance, the ecclesiastical animus and administration in our church for the past five years will definitely locate where the intolerance exists.” Yet Haynes would later urge holiness adherents not to “underestimate or deprecate the religious status or usefulness” of those not in “the experience of perfect love.” The debate continued and ended with some pleasantness, a few zingers, and even humor, but it signaled the rapid erosion of support for Haynes’s editorship within the conference.⁴³

On April 30, 1896, Hoss’s curious lead article “Nashville Methodism” appeared. Hoss began by saying that “numerous inquiries” had come to him wondering if the church at the hub was “really in a decadent condition.” Hoss declared he would speak “soberly” of this potentially “sad state of affairs.” The rest of the article defended against this charge, noting various positive

⁴³ “A Communication and Its Answer,” “I Move We Quit,” by W. R. Peebles, and “Answer” by B. F. Haynes, TM March 12, 1896, p. 2. The Peebles-Haynes discussion carried on for two more issues, “From Brother Peebles,” TM March 19, 1896, p. 5, and “Brother Peebles Again,” TM March 26, 1896, p. 5. For respect for unsanctified experience, TM June 4, 1896, p. 1. March 19, Peebles wrote rebuking Haynes for replying to his motion to quit, noted that Haynes had delivered him quite a blow, and declared that he stood on the 11th paragraph of Wesley’s sermon entitled “Patience,” that called for brotherly tolerance of opinion on the question and urged none to rest until they received the blessing. Haynes’s response agreed on the 11th paragraph and moved on to the 12th that said Wesley had never found anyone who had received by growth. The third letter from Peebles said, in what was supposed to be private, that if another could “pull me out from under you I would always love him,” then declared that Peebles had not been able to see that Haynes stood on tolerance as his feet were too busy kicking Tillett out of Vanderbilt. Peebles – humorous if deadly serious throughout the exchange – begged Haynes not to jostle the “big melon” of tolerance Peebles was “trying to tote” to the spring house, that they could share together “under the big old locust tree” when the heat came. Haynes congratulated Peebles on his “sweetness of spirit” before quoting Wesley, Adam Clarke, Lovick Pierce, and R. N. Price showing that what Peebles called intolerance had been recognized as enforceable and enforced Methodist disciplinary practice. Haynes said his “dear brother” had already dropped several supposed watermelons already, then added “my precious brother will have to go henceforth empty-armed of anything resembling the melon family.”

signs, and especially reaffirming the preachers. His conclusion was that “on the whole, then, Nashville Methodism is in a reasonably healthy condition, not as strong and vigorous as it ought to be, but yet not without true spiritual life.” While it was certainly a shot at the holiness movement, and also at the worries about worldliness that had many adherents within and without that movement, it was also a change in Hoss’s behavior toward the conference, whose preachers and protests he had long disparaged. Indeed, Hoss’s tepid rebuttal of the supposedly anxious brethren elsewhere worried about the decadence in Tennessee had Hoss refuting a negative impression he had labored so long to create. It was not a change in policy on the issues, however, but instead an offer to the Tennesseans to rejoin the fold and reembrace Court order, to put an end to the hostilities between the connectional Court and the Country conference on the Court’s terms. Naturally, those terms were Hoss, the bishops, and the Tennessee Conference on one side, and Haynes, his *Methodist*, and his dissenting friends on the other. Hoss’s reason for such timing was obvious, and may have been coordinated with Peebles. Haynes’s holiness advocacy was wearing thin on the majority of his Tennessee Conference fellow clergy. Hoss and the bishops finally had a grievance with Haynes that Haynes’s peers could, and would, affirm.⁴⁴

In July, D. C. Kelley followed Peebles and also tried his hand at leading Haynes to “Nearer Togetherness on Holiness.” In truth, Kelley’s missive was not a peace offering, nor was it a rebuke and a gag rule as with Peebles. Rather, it was an intellectual critique of holiness reasoning. Haynes responded with a lengthy refutation that outlined sixteen separate errors in Kelley’s article. The next week Kelley tried again, declaring “everybody knows the Editor of the *Tennessee Methodist* is an able and skilled disputant,” but ended up merely suggesting that

⁴⁴ “Nashville Methodism,” NCA April 30, 1896, p. 1. A dissent against Hoss’s Court confidence and anti-holiness war-making that quoted and vigorously mocked the “Nashville Methodism” article, and read it as just one more criticism of criticism, “Whereas-Resolved” by ““Carried Unanimously,”” TM May 7, 1896, p. 2.

Haynes should recant. Haynes's second response was shorter, and showed some merciful unwillingness in tone. Haynes warmly declined to print Kelley's third article, claiming he thought both had covered the ground already. As with Peebles-Haynes, the brief debate revealed that such matters could, in fact, be debated with general politeness. It also showed that Kelley was as unbound by doctrinal conventions as by social or political ones. It further revealed Haynes to be a more subtle theologian than some other holiness advocates were, and certainly more subtle than opponents had imagined. Kelley had argued with a stereotype of holiness messaging, for example, that they did not believe in growth, that they believed in freedom from temptation, that they virtually had no doctrine of regeneration. Haynes's voracious reading had been newly focused on these soteriological themes. His rendering of Methodist teaching on sanctification was not original, and it was not uncontroversial. But his teaching was careful and confident. In Peebles and Kelley, the peace offer required Haynes to concede the incorrectness of his minority views before going silent, an offer that neither the country-tough humorist 'Buck' Peebles nor the bold progressive David Kelley would have accepted, or likely even entertained, had the roles been reversed. Editor Mahon of the *Memphis*, noting the Kelley-Haynes discussion, and Kelley's "misconception of the subject," expressed sentiments similar to Haynes's, that anti-holiness Methodists had paid scant attention to Methodist doctrinal standards. But the debate, though serious, was not a bitter feud. Haynes, Kelley, and Peebles had stood by one another under trying circumstances before. By July 30, Haynes was publishing Kelley's rumination on the 1858 General Conference, while Peebles was reporting on Haynes's visit to the Columbia District Conference. Peebles lamented Haynes's too-brief stay among them saying of Haynes that "he is kindly recalled as one of the most zealous and most successful pastors who has ever labored in the bounds of this district." Kelley took his arguments against holiness

doctrines to the NCA.⁴⁵

Haynes did not relent on holiness advocacy any more than the bishops eased up on holiness advocates. Making use of older episcopal examples of the piety he was trying to affirm, he celebrated the dying words of Bishop McTyeire, “I die poor,” and urged preachers and “pewmen” to abandon their obsessions with wealth for the “fruits of righteousness.” He also criticized the “commercial spirit” in the pulpit, recalled the “bread-and-butter-trusting” of early itinerants, praised the Populists of Georgia for nominating prohibitionist Seaborn Wright for governor, affirmed generosity for missions, and lamented “big-pay pulpits and high-priced officialism” that did little to win the confidence of the poor. Haynes also reprinted a letter from the late Bishop Paine cited from R. H. Rivers, *Life of Robert Paine*. The letter laid out the Bishop’s high convictions concerning the importance of seeking the second grace that he called “the great *desideratum*.” “Committed by their creed to this doctrine,” Methodists’ seeking of holiness was both their “privilege and duty,” for “the church will degenerate, and cease to be a working and spiritual body, unless she aspires after holiness,” said Paine. Paine had not found it himself, but the ideal had not been to require possession of a gift, but its pursuit. Paine grounded Methodism’s legitimacy as a church in its commitment to teach, believe, and seek the blessing. If they failed, God would raise up another people for this purpose.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ D. C. Kelley, “Nearer Togetherness on Holiness,” TM July 2, 1896, p. 8 (by mistake, also printed on page 2). “Dr. D. C. Kelley and Sanctification,” TM July 2, 1896, p. 1. D. C. Kelley, “Nearer Togetherness on Holiness,” TM July 9, 1896, p. 5. “Dr. D. C. Kelley and Sanctification,” TM July 9, 1896, p. 1. “We Are All For Peace,” TM July 16, 1896, p. 1. Haynes’s private letter of refusal to Kelley, printed at Kelley’s request, TM July 23, 1896, p. 5. D. C. Kelley, “Episcopal Decisions- General Conference of 1858,” TM July 30, 1896, p. 2. W. R. Peebles, “The Columbia District Conference,” TM July 30, 1896, p. 5. D. C. Kelley, “Old-Time Experiences in Tennessee Methodism,” NCA August 27, 1896, p. 5. For another article that showed the stereotypes of a holiness preacher with “objectionable... methods and manners,” as yet unmet, while acknowledging the actual ones had been “good and sound preachers...men of character and devoutness,” Paul Whitehead, “Virginia Notes,” NCA September 3, 1896, p. 3.

⁴⁶ “I Die Poor,” TM August 27, 1896, p. 1. “A Bishop’s Letter,” TM August 27, 1896, p. 1. The citation is from R. H. Rivers, *Life of Robert Paine* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1884, 1892), 74-75. No date was given for the letter addressed to J. S. Spencer. Paine died in 1882. See also the holding forth of MEC holiness advocate “Bishop

More traditional critics of the holiness movement were surprised to discover that in addition to an old Methodist mistake (the second blessing theory), heresies not of Methodist origin were also well represented. In fact, the increasingly unavoidable advocacy for instantaneous sanctification had led to a loud rebuke that claimed that sanctification was either already possessed by every Christian in this life or that it was impossible for any Christian in this life. John E. Edwards called for the “expurgation” of all references to secondness “not only from our hymns, but also from our standards of doctrine.” For non-holiness traditionalists who believed themselves to be loyal and conservative Wesleyans, and members of a loyally conservative denomination utterly faithful to the Methodist way, this loud and open rejection – so many vandals with scissors in hand ready to gut the hymnbook – called for a clear, unambiguous, and authoritative rebuke. Some particularly addled anti-holiness radicals were so upset they called for a moratorium on using “traditional doctrinal terms.”⁴⁷

Discussions had been ongoing among bishops. Peacemakers sought a clarification and pacification on the issue. Bishop Galloway wrote to Hoss and tried to order him to “prepare a volume on Sanctification...let me suggest that you make it expository and not controversial... you can discuss it with a reverent spirit.” But the management of the delivery such a statement fell not to the hot-tempered Hoss and his *Advocate*, but to the younger, straighter, and more doctrinally-conservative Tigert and his *Review*.⁴⁸

Hamline’s Testimony and Experience of Holiness,” (reprinted from “selected”), TM February 27, 1896, p. 2.

⁴⁷ Peters, *Christian Perfection & American Methodism*, 156, 176.

⁴⁸ Martin, *Hoss*, 198. Letter of January 1, 1892. Tigert and Hoss were similar men in many respects, both learned, scholarly, prepared to engage in intra-Methodist sectional polemics. They were also prone to condescending comments about those they thought were intellectually inferior. But Tigert did not abide by assaults on Wesley and the Methodist tradition, including those of the sort Hoss himself offered. Tigert also recognized the irregularity of the proceedings conducted by Hoss in the Committee on Episcopacy in 1894. But by virtue of their powerful

In the end, no editor had the standing to solve such a problem that, by MECS habit, required an episcopal solution. Bishops Hendrix and Granbery took up the task, and their separate contributions were widely disseminated, sometimes with Tigert's introduction. Tigert, Hendrix, and Granbery were, in effect, an unelected doctrinal council. They were likely chosen because, first, they did not hold to holiness views like Bishop Key did, and second, because they were the only combination of scholarly connectional officers who had not already attacked the holiness movement repeatedly in person and in print. Tigert introduced and reviewed the bishops' statements several times. He declared "if the spirit of come-outism anywhere exists, let it be put away at once and forever." He announced "If the spirit of crush-outism has anywhere found expression, let it not be so as mentioned among brethren... - 'let us have peace.'" Beautiful sentiments, these, but they were irrelevant as long as bishops continued crushing out holiness advocates. But Tigert was not really concerned with stopping the unbrotherly anti-connectional "crush-outism" being undertaken while he was writing, or the come-outism of battered refugees. Tigert's domain was words. His concern was the reestablishment of a textual doctrinal order. The new policy was simple. Bishops Hendrix and Granbery had spoken. The church was to conform its teaching to theirs. Another review from his hand was as terse as it was final: "Wise and timely, modest and moderate, the views in this pamphlet are also scriptural and Wesleyan. The work has contributed materially to the peace of the Church, and ought to prove the end of controversy."⁴⁹

standing (and a recognition they were both likely candidates for the episcopacy, Hoss '02, Tigert '06) they avoided conflict. For Hoss on Tigert and sectional polemics, see Martin, *Hoss*, 176-177.

⁴⁹ Peters, *Christian Perfection*, 177. John J. Tigert review of Bishop E. R. Hendrix, *The Perfecting of the Saints*; and Bishop J. C. Granbery, *Entire Sanctification: The Second Blessing*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1896, in *Methodist Review*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, March-April 1896. p. 456. A shorter and more irenic work by Granbery under the same title appeared in the NCA, August 22, 1895, pp. 1-2. Support for Granbery's article, NCA September 5, 1895, p. 8. Hendrix's article appeared previously in the *Review* in the Sept-Oct 1895 issue. The MECS review was a bi-monthly – not a quarterly – periodical "devoted to Religion and Philosophy, Science and

But the peace offering—somewhat generously characterized by historian of Methodist doctrine John Peters as “allowing” instantaneous while “the gradual was favored”—likely did little to change anyone’s views. Hendrix’s *Perfecting the Saints* (the title was an allusion to an irenic and ecumenical Charles Wesley hymn about the church as one body) was a detailed exposition of the topic.⁵⁰ It was warm, calm, scholarly, careful, and mostly impenetrable, with enough ambiguity to make it quotable by various camps. It was moderate vacillation as an art form, of the sort authors might produce when forced to write about fearfully controversial topics with which they have little previous interest or study. Granbery’s more direct *Entire Sanctification* was a review and assessment of the various camps, a total of four in his account. Despite its first sentence—“this article is not meant to be dogmatic or polemic”—Granbery needed only one page to dismiss the second blessing theory as unscriptural and psychologically unsound, and utterly without merit. Zinzendorfian and Calvinist positions were also rejected but were treated as positions an intelligent person might actually hold. Both Hendrix and Granbery placed great emphasis on growth as a process, with Hendrix allowing much more of a role for crisis as a partner to process. Both repeated ‘the first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in

Literature.” For an example of an ad for the Review, NCA August 22, 1895 p. 15. Hargrove was unqualified for his inattention to theological matters, known hostility to the holiness movement, and his lack of written production. For example, Hargrove cut down on sermons at conference, was called “a business president,” and saw the East Texas Conference discourage membership in holiness associations and separate ownership of property under his leadership, H. O. Moore, “Notes and Else,” TM January 10, 1895, p. 2. Keener was qualified by literary and theological interest and ability, but was a leader of the war party, and would have had to write an article that rebuked his own behavior and Zinzendorfian doctrine. For an example of Keener as theologian, Keener, “The Personal Majesty of the Spirit,” NCA October 24, 1895, p. 9.

⁵⁰ The 1889 Hymnal of the MECS was arranged topically, including an entire section of hymns on the topic of “Entire Sanctification and Perfect Love.” Hendrix’s allusion was to hymn 743, “Christ, From Whom All Blessings Flow,” found in the section on “Communion of Saints.” The lyrics are: “Christ, from whom all blessings flow, Perfecting the saints below, Hear us who thy nature share, Who thy mystic body are. Join us, in one spirit join, Let us still receive of thine, Still for more on thee we call, Thou who fillest all in all! // Move, and actuate, and guide, Divers(e) gifts to each provide, Placed according to thy will, Let us all our work fulfill, Never from our office move, Needful to each other prove, Let us daily growth receive, More and more in Jesus live. // Sweetly may we all agree, Touched with softest sympathy, Kindly for each other care, Every member feel its share. Many are we now and one, We who Jesus have put on, Names, and sects, and parties, fall, Thou, O Christ, art all in all.”

the ear' refrain of progressive sanctification. Hendrix's elegant and evasive piece was celebrated by some holiness advocates as supporting their view. But few missed Granbery's dismissive tone or its implications – change your teaching, be quiet, or leave.

The bishops' emphasis on growth in perfection was useful for traditionalist opponents of the holiness movement, both as a counter to the Zinzendorffian view that undercut both growth and a later crisis, and to counter the holiness advocates whose supposed stress on a quick and complete victory also undercut what critics viewed as the normal path of steady and wholesome growth like maturing corn. With the statement issued, and weary of reckless arguments from both sides, Tigert banned from his *Review* all discussion of sanctification. No articles appeared on the topic from 1896 to 1900, signaling that the topic was as irrelevant to Methodist scholarship and clergy training as it was to Methodist life and practice, a policy not actually that different from the radical proposal to cut references to sanctification out of the hymnbook or to call a moratorium on the use of theological terms.⁵¹

This presumably irenic attempt to shut down discussion did not have that effect. Few observers could miss that Granbery and Hendrix differed somewhat. Moreover, Bishops Keener

⁵¹ Peters, *Christian Perfection*, 177. Tigert, Hendrix, and Granbery had sort of affirmed the theoretical hope of entire sanctification in this life, while avoiding affirmation of the Zinzendorffian views, and, in the case of Granbery, mocking the intelligence of Second Blessing theory Methodists. It was the peace-loving Hendrix who had forced the "disastrous" transfer of holiness preacher A. J. Jarrell from Georgia to Missouri against his will in 1893. "Broken financially and physically," Jarrell died in 1896. Hendrix repeatedly refused to relent, and evaded Jarrell's request to know why he was being transferred. On Jarrell transfer, Turley, *Wheel Within a Wheel*, 146. George G. Smith's pro-holiness dissent and defense of the character of holiness advocates at the death of A. J. Jarrell, George G. Smith, "Georgia Letter," NCA September 17, 1896, p. 3. Cary praised Jarrell, "From North Georgia," TM August 6, 1896, p. 3. Announcement of his death that occurred due to a stroke on August 1, 1896, TM August 13, 1896, p. 5. This ordering could not have been Hoss's doing. In May of 1895 Hoss had claimed that 1) Methodists' amazing "doctrinal unity" was maintained by Methodists' "intellectual freedom," 2) John Wesley was inconsistent in his views on holiness and showed aberrant "mental processes," and 3) "there is no *theory of holiness* which a Methodist may be required to accept on pain of being charged with lack of orthodoxy." Hoss's assertions of radically broad latitude on this point of stood in strange contrast to his strict construal of nearly every other point of Methodist identity shaping. Hoss held the Calvinist view that vitality came with regeneration followed by growth until "its consummation in heaven." "Room for Liberty of Opinion," NCA May 16, 1895, p. 1. "Testing an Error," NCA May 30, 1895, p. 1. See also "Did Mr. Wesley Ever Profess the Second Blessing," NCA July 25, 1895, p. 1.

and Haygood and Key represented the three rejected positions in Granbery's brief essay, that is, Zinzendorffianism, Calvinism, and 'second blessingism,' respectively. Meanwhile, Hoss continued his full assault on holiness adherents. Already keen to any episcopal overreaching, Haynes was not alone in rejecting the notions that authorized bishops to "define" or "decide" on matters of doctrine, objected to the replacing of the Bible and the *Discipline* for the opinion of two bishops, and rejected the claim that disagreeing with the "dictum" of two bishops—no less fallible than others of "equal intelligence, and scholarship and goodness"—was a sufficient basis for the charge of disloyalty. Another reviewer declared, "Pray, when did it come that to urge a higher grace is treating the lower with contempt?"⁵²

Not even fellow Court stalwarts obeyed Tigert's demands. Wilder statements were even made afterwards. The senior agent of the Publishing House, J. D. Barbee had his refutation of holiness doctrine—basically a sermon against Bishop Key, named repeatedly in the short work—published by the publishing house in 1897 after the supposed peace/gag rule. Indeed, Barbee's surprising assertion that "the fact is now apparent that sanctification antedates regeneration, and

⁵² Haynes (disputing the claims of Dr. Armstrong, editor of the *Alabama Christian Advocate*), "The Mark Overshot," TM March 14, 1895, p. 1. H. R. Withers, "Bishop Granbery on Sanctification," TM September 12, 1895, p. 2. Hoss undercut Wesley as a theologian consistently, while saying that Methodists "honor" him by "imbibing his spirit and imitating his work," an approach that assumes that Wesley as practitioner of Christian ministry was a vital and enduring role model, while Wesley as thinker about Christian theology and salvation was not. This position perhaps also suggested that theology was a progressive science but ministry was not. NCA December 19, 1895, p. 1. Hoss disputing with Episcopal Church leader J. E. Martin about John Wesley, and the terms "high churchman" and "evangelical," "Thrashing Old Straw," NCA December 26, 1895 p. 1. J. W. Boswell argued for the requirement of holiness of heart and life, rejecting the Calvinist position, NCA July 18, 1895, p. 8. For an example of an argument that undercut the importance of Wesley's words and the importance of the subject of holiness, see "Orange," "Wronging Mr. Wesley and Starving the Church," NCA August 8, 1895, p. 4. Hoss said of Haygood's *The Monk and the Prince* "On almost every page are sentences that have the force of a stone thrown from a catapult," while Georgian Walker Lewis declared "this book is a masterpiece," NCA September 19, 1895, p. 16. Hoss criticized the phrase "full gospel" saying that holiness advocates narrowly stressed "a single theme," NCA September 26, 1895, p. 1. MECS articles of religion, NCA September 2, 1895, p. 3.

justification also,” put him at odds with all the camps within the debate.⁵³

W. P. Andrews’s *Two Epistles* was perhaps the weightiest item that appeared from the anti-second side. A Pacific Conference preacher originally from Mississippi, Andrews’s “two epistles” were ten chapters of rebuke aimed at “professors of perfect love,” and four chapters of correction to “opposers of the ‘second blessing.’” Andrews intended to be fair. He provided strong correction to holiness opponents. He offered wise counsel to holiness adherents, although much of his rebuke echoed advice given by leaders of the holiness movement themselves without an acknowledgement or apparent awareness that holiness leaders had already been offering the same advice. By far his toughest chapter aimed at holiness “ensoriousness,” and focused entirely on holiness polity dissent, including complaints about mistreatment by bishops and conferences. Andrews decried the failure of charity in holiness preachers for using the word “prejudice” to describe conference leaders who had tried and “expelled from the church” a local preacher. Andrews admitted that holiness preachers were “discriminated against.” But according to Andrews, holiness “denunciations” of leaders who mistreated holiness adherents were the reason for the mistreatment in the first place. Andrews’ advice to “oversensitive” holiness leaders was to “trust” their brethren and remain silent about mistreatment they received because 1 Corinthians 13 read “love suffereth long and is kind.” Second blessingists’ censorious words invalidated their claims, while discriminatory actions against them were justified because those doing the discriminating held offices of trust. But despite such blind spots, Andrews’ attempt to establish reasonable ground rules indicated what might have been possible if MECS leadership

⁵³ J. D. Barbee, *Sanctification*. (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1897), 25. Only 32 pages, it was an address to the Florida Annual Conference that requested it be printed.

had not transformed an intra-Methodist debate into an anti-holiness war.⁵⁴

The bishops' confusion reflected that of the entire church, as recalled by one long-time Methodist in the *Advocate*. The correspondent, Wm. M. Green, recollected in October of 1896 that no pastor or layperson at McKendree from 1847 through 1858 ever professed sanctification or even mentioned a second blessing. Green said his father, a preacher for fifty years, had "died without experiencing or even knowing that there was a second blessing." There were sanctified members at McKendree, but a "second work of grace would have been a strange revelation to them." He knew one preacher as a boy who was said to be sanctified, a man of "irreproachable character," otherwise distinguished by the fact that he required women to remove their gloves before receiving the Lord's Supper. Green suggested to a living bishop that a definition be issued. The bishop declined for "there are men who mean well that would not submit to a Church deliverance." Green said it was "singular" that the Methodists had "no clear-cut, well-defined deliverance" on "perfect holiness." Other denominations' positions were well known and clear to all, but the MECS "sails under no particular flag, and is bound to no particular port, and yet is the acknowledged champion and defender of entire sanctification." Green then remembered "an old deadbeat" asked to deliver a speech during "the Know-nothing excitement." The old man said he "would be most happy and willing to make a speech, but in the general

⁵⁴ W. P. Andrews, *Two Epistles: I. To Professors of Perfect Love. II. To Opposers of the 'Second Blessing.'* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1897), 63-65. Andrews's rebukes of opposers included some similarly sharp barbs, especially in the chapters "Whereby Some Hinder," and "Trying Professors of Perfect Love." For example: "Opposition develops extremists. When it ceases, they are likely to find their equilibrium," and "cranks are seldom ever developed under a discreet and spiritual pastor" (104); some critics were "exceedingly unkind and unjust," and one anti-holiness pastor admitted that, even with several women who professed but were his best lay members, he had "never let an opportunity pass to give them a dig" (107-108). "Some among us seem to feel called to censorship," but were inattentive to worldliness while "on the alert to find some fault" in second blessingists (113). Sympathizers of one side or another would have done well to read the rebuke of the other side first, then the rebuke of their 'own.'

confusion and concatenation of things I cannot discover which side I am on.”⁵⁵

But the Tennessee Conference worked toward its own clarification. At conference in October 1895—six months after Hoss’s peace offering—Haynes wrote that “there was quite a spirit of dissatisfaction expressed” due to his holiness advocacy and Jones’s editorship. Negotiations ensued that resulted in adoption of a resolution recommending Haynes as editor and the *Methodist* as conference paper, while expressing displeasure with “offensive personalities” (touchy articles by Jones, 1894–1895), and declaring the neutrality of the conference on holiness doctrine. That compromise would not hold.⁵⁶

At McKendree Church in Nashville on Tuesday, October 27, the last day of the 1896 Annual Conference, an overflow crowd full of dignitaries come to see the “spectacle,” wrote Haynes, of “another desired and ardently sought consummation [that] was about to be achieved.” At the stockholder’s meeting the night before, the majority had tried and failed to oust Haynes as editor, an ouster prevented because Haynes owned a controlling share of the stock. As it was a stock company, Haynes rejected the arguments of T. A. Kerley and others that a majority of persons equaled a majority of stock. Unwilling to own a paper edited by another man, he had previously offered to relinquish the editorship if they would also relieve him of his 1700 shares

⁵⁵ Wm. M. Green, “McKendree Church and Sanctification.” NCA October 22, 1896 p. 5. Bishops were confused about other matters. Haygood told preachers not to go fishing. Fitzgerald encouraged it. The *Arkansas Methodist* jokingly referred the question to the College of Bishops. NCA December 26, 1895, p. 10. Haynes noted that Bishop Keener wrote in the *Advocate* that he favored silver, while Galloway wrote in a secular paper that he favored gold. Haynes expressed surprise that Hoss and other “guardians of pulpit propriety” remained silent. “We poor preacher-prohibitionists have had our heads thumped and bumped by editors, officials, and even bishops, until we dodge now when they go to shake hands with us. Well, well! We live and learn.” TM June 6, 1895, p. 1.

⁵⁶ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 160. “Tennessee Conference,” (report by J. J. Ransom), NCA November 7, 1895, p. 3, and TM October 31, 1895, p. 4. The adopted resolution: “The *Tennessee Methodist* has done and can do a valuable work in our Connection, and we therefore recommend its continuance as the organ of the Conference. But we deprecate the offensive personalities which have appeared in its columns, and trust that such will not occur again. It is in nowise, however, intended that this indorsement shall commit the Conference one way or the other in regard to the question of the second blessing theory of sanctification. We recommend that Rev. B. F. Haynes be continued as editor of the *Tennessee Methodist*.”

of stock out of 2500 shares—a \$17,000 investment—and any other financial burden he then carried. None took him up on that offer. W. R. Peebles reported that attempts to convince Haynes to ease his holiness advocacy failed; Haynes reported that Peebles and others declared Wesley had taught holiness doctrine but was simply wrong and that they did not believe what Wesley taught. Word got around that the issue would come to a head the next day, and a great crowd gathered, with the Court elite usually well-represented.⁵⁷

Despite Haynes's dropping of Jones after 1895, the Committee on Publishing Interests chaired by Peebles recommended withdrawal of conference endorsement and the creation of a new paper. A substitute offered by Felix W. Johnson and J. W. Cullom proposed simple reaffirmation of the 1895 resolution, keeping the paper as the official organ while declining to endorse Haynes's theology. After lengthy floor debate with Peebles as prosecution and Haynes making an extended defense, that substitution failed by a vote of 130 to 35, or 78.78 percent, just shy of the 82.27 percent of the 116 vs. 25 protest in 1890. Peebles' report was adopted. Thus ended Haynes's formal relationship with the conference as editor of its conference organ, leaving Haynes editor of an independent and unofficial paper. Stripped of a legitimate post, Haynes stood and praised the conference for their "brotherliness of spirit," stressed that publication would continue, pledged that the paper would continue its scholarship award for pastors' daughters, and offered himself to the bishop for appointment. Bishop Granbery then appointed Haynes assistant pastor to H. B. Blue at Hobson's Chapel, a nominal appointment to the

⁵⁷ An Emory and Henry graduate (M.A., '72) W. R. "Buck" Peebles (1855-1904), was a specialist in the rural to county seat towns and districts like Clarksville, Gallatin, Pulaski, and Columbia that ringed Nashville. The conference humorist and storyteller, Peebles once said Haynes's *Methodist* was "the widest awake and widest awakening church paper now published South of the North pole." Ad for the TM, *The Confederate Veteran Magazine* (January 1895), p. 38. John E. Harrison said of Peebles "he who has not heard Buck Peebles' inexhaustible and varied humor has missed much good natured fun," "Our Delegates," TM November 2, 1893 p. 1.

congregation the Haynes family had attended since 1889.⁵⁸

If Hoss's actions were any indication of the will of the Court and episcopacy, external pressure played a major role in the Conference decision. Hoss's "Nashville Methodism" article in April 1896 indicated a potential change in his treatment of the conference. His October 22 bold declaration that "the *Advocate* smiles on the [Tennessee Conference] brotherhood, as it has done week in and week out these sixty years," offered a new relationship based on a denial of past warring. As a sign of the price of that new friendship, on the same page holiness advocates were declared idolaters and frauds in two paragraphic assaults, part of Hoss's contribution to MECS campaigns that aimed, in Stephens' words, to "discredit, muzzle, or expel influential holiness ministers." In another stunning change in policy, that fall at Annual Conference at McKendree, Hoss was happy to see annual conference papers from other conferences: O. W. Patton of the *Holston*, Palmore of the *St. Louis*, and J. E. Godbey of the *Arkansas*. Hoss wrote, "we were more than pleased to see these good men." On November 19, after the vote, Hoss defended the Tennessee Conference from the charge made by "Veritas" from Nashville that the Conference was in rebellion against Methodist doctrine with a clever attack on holiness advocacy. The NCA's guns had finally, at long last, been turned away from the Tennessee Conference, a sure and certain sign that episcopal goodwill had been restored.⁵⁹

When during his speech at conference, Haynes commented in passing that the conference kept endorsing the NCA despite the fact that it had labeled the Tennesseans in rebellion against

⁵⁸ "The Tennessee Conference," NCA October 29, 1896, p. 5. NCA October 29, 1896, p. 8. The 1896 presiding elders were 5 twenty-fivers – R. K. Brown (Nashville), T. B. Fisher (Lebanon), J. A. Orman (Murfreesboro), J. R. Stewart (Columbia), and T. L. Moody (Dickson) – and 5 one-sixteeners, W. J. Collier (East Nashville), L. R. Amis (Fayetteville), J. T. Curry (Franklin), J. W. Hensley (Savannah), and W. B. Lowry (Clarksville). L. R. Amis was conference secretary in 1896, see TM November 26, 1896 p. 8.

⁵⁹ "The Tennessee Conference," NCA October 22, 1896, p. 8. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 155. "The Tennessee Conference," NCA October 29, 1896, p. 5. NCA October 29, 1896, p. 8. NCA November 19, 1896, p. 1. Haynes's response to Hoss entitled "Why This Change?" TM November 26, 1896, p. 1.

Methodism, thus the conference had already shown that endorsement of a paper did not require approval of all its content, Hoss stood and interrupted Haynes. Hoss boldly offered money to any man who could prove the charge, stating that he would provide bound copies of the NCA for them to search. The November 5 issue of the *Methodist* cited those same bound copies and Hoss's editorial of January 3, 1891, showing what Hoss had denied, and demonstrating that multiple Tennessee Conference preachers had interpreted Hoss's commentary for what it was, a charge that the conference had rebelled against denominational fealty in the Kelley case.⁶⁰

With the demise of the conference paper relationship, Hoss had successfully killed two of the three annual conference papers in Tennessee. When he became editor there were four official MECS weeklies in Tennessee. By the early twentieth century, the *Midland Methodist*, as the new paper merged with the *Holston Methodist* would be called, carried the burden of speaking for the Memphis, Tennessee, and Holston Conferences, their furthest points separated by perhaps 600 miles. Despite the distinctiveness of Tennessee's three grand divisions – West, Middle, and East Tennessee – that paper had to cover the entire state, plus southwestern Virginia, and Kentucky's Jackson Purchase region. Suggestive of his intent to see the paper fail, Hoss printed a comment after the 1896 vote that declared “whether the publication of the *Tennessee Methodist* will be continued remains to be seen.” In his speech, Haynes had stated clearly that it would continue, and made a special point of asking the papers to include that statement. Haynes fired back with an editorial called “We Will Not Have To Wait To See,” and charged that “all the papers, religious and secular, which were represented reportorially at the Conference at the time, very kindly made the above announcement... except the *Nashville Advocate*.” The *Baltimore*

⁶⁰ Haynes refuted Hoss's denial, “A Question of Memory,” TM November 5, 1896, p. 1. It is unknown whether or not Hoss paid that debt of honor he owed to Haynes. Nothing was said about the propriety of a connectional officer—not a member of that conference—interrupting a speech during a floor vote, or the propriety of a connectional officer engaged in gambling.

Advocate had already copied and reprinted Hoss's announcement. Moreover, while Tennessee was voting to cut off its own paper, the *Memphis Advocate* closed down, and the publishing house bought its 3500 subscription list to add to the *Nashville*. Haynes decried the policy, noted its secrecy, but mockingly praised the publishing house decision, as something desperately needed to be done to prop up the *Advocate* that in six and one half years of Hoss's leadership had gone from 27,000 to 18,000 subscriptions, a 33 percent loss. Haynes denied that the depression had caused its loss, since Tigert's *Review* had been booming. Haynes also said the justification must not be the presence of new papers in its midst, since "the people want the best paper, and generally take it." Haynes announced that Hoss had sent letters to Tennessee Conference preachers since the October session asking them to send their conference news items to the *Advocate*. If accurate, that action would indicate some inconsistency in Hoss's sharp distinctions about the roles of connectional versus conference papers. A month before annual conference, Haynes had published "A Biblical Portrait of A Bishop" that likely had Hoss in mind as an anti-type.⁶¹

Knowing what was coming that October, Haynes had not pleaded. But he did indirectly make his case for continuance of the paper. Writing just before annual conference, Haynes wrote

⁶¹ "We Will Not Have To Wait To See," TM November 12, 1896, p. 1. TM, November 5, 1896 p. 1., p. 2, p. 4-5. "A New Policy" TM November 26, 1896 p. 1. With "A Biblical Portrait of A Bishop," drawing on Titus 1:7-9, Haynes urged that no bishops should be elected in 1898, but pleaded that if they must elect to choose no "lover of sharpness, diplomacy, adroitness, tricks," but "a lover anywhere and in anybody – North, South, East and West." He said any bishop should be "a sanctified man." A bishop should "impress himself upon the church symmetrically," and not be given to "undue literary ambition" or "excessive bookishness." The "irascible, passionate, hot-tempered man" was a "dangerous man" and should pray he be "delivered from the Episcopate, and the church should pray to be delivered from such a bishop." A bishop should not be "'contentious and quarrelsome' over dead issues and memories that should have been forgotten long years ago." The church will have advanced when it will "bury" those who "so profanely traffic in sacred things as to seek to project himself into office by keeping alive the bitterness and jealousies and strifes of dead issues." There should be spiritual fruit in his ministry, never losing the "soul saver," "gospel preacher," and "exhorter" in the "administrator," "organizer," and "ecclesiastic." The "man of prayer" should not be lost in the "man of power." The account was essentially a biographical sketch of Hoss. "A Biblical Portrait of A Bishop," TM September 24, 1896, p. 1.

autobiographically, saying “sometimes a man’s life is more a protest than a victory.” Haynes exclaimed, “How little we understand of the scope of our work!” So strongly did he express his views just before the conference, that they found their way into one of the more emotional passages of his autobiography many years later.⁶²

There were three reasons for the decision taken by the conference in October 1896. Firstly, external Court pressure provided the most important factor and dominated the entire context for the decision. Secondly, Haynes’s holiness advocacy was not popular, and his turn toward criticism of his own colleagues perhaps even less so, but on both points external pressure was involved. Just three years before 130 had voted him down, 125 had voted for him to lead the delegation and to represent the conference itself. The vote to sever ties happened in the late afternoon session. The worship service that night was remembered for a joyful and ‘brotherly’ mood notable for its lack of acrimony and tension, perhaps suggesting not a disciplinary context—the spanking of an unruly member—but the resolution of a worrisome situation. It spoke to Haynes’s relative fairness toward those who criticized him—and the respect with which the conference treated its own members generally. Indeed, the debate in Tennessee in the mid-1890s had been carried out much more calmly and respectfully than elsewhere. If all the anti-holiness bishops and editors had treated holiness adherents as well as the Tennessee Conference had treated Haynes, the broad outcomes of the holiness controversy may have been quite

⁶² Haynes’s comments in “The True Life,” TM September 17, 1896, p 1 – when he knew a great professional shame and defeat was coming – form the basis for his conclusion to the chapter and section where he wrote of his pain and anguish at losing the paper entirely four years later, Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 202-204. Haynes printed J. C. C. Newton’s article that noted how the British Methodists treated holiness advocacy in a much more positive way than did the MECS. “The Second Page This Week,” TM September 17, 1896, p. 1... and “An Argument that Proves Too Much” (same page), that defends the claim that Wesley did not change his views on sin in believers. J. C. C. Newton, “The Wesleyans in England Hold Their Annual Holiness Convention at Southport,” TM September 17, 1896, p. 2. Elsewhere Haynes declared “some of the loyal saints spend more ink and breath fighting the second blessing than they do fighting worldliness in the church. Suppose you change your guns and fire on the devil in the church and pray for your brethren.” TM November 29, 1894, p. 1. W. P. Andrews would have agreed with Haynes on this point.

different. The happiness of that evening meeting also suggested the causes behind the decision to reject Haynes's position as conference editor. A restored and relieved conference gathered that night, not an angry and bitter one.

The third reason also flowed from the dominant cause of external pressure. There was some annoyance that Haynes had not relented in his holiness advocacy. Peebles, among others, failed in his efforts to get a determined Haynes to ease up on an unpopular point. Had that been merely a matter between Haynes and his brethren, it might have been resolvable or tolerable. Other conferences had managed to tolerate editors who were too this or that, for example, too combative, progressive, or political. But when Haynes pressed his minority theological views, he was drawing further attention to the Tennessee Conference's controversial reputation. Haynes thought his espousal of holiness carried too high a price for his friends "who were already tired of paying the price of loyalty to [the paper] in reduced salaries and episcopal disfavor." Haynes was deep in the Court doghouse long before adopting holiness views in 1895. Haynes's page one did feature strong holiness advocacy, though not quite as heavily as critics suggested. But perhaps more seriously, the news pages reported heavily on holiness activity elsewhere, and most importantly, a flurry of holiness revival and testimonial activity among Middle Tennessee Methodists. When MEC preacher, Dr. C. J. Fowler, the president of the National Holiness Association, began services at "the Tabernacle" in Nashville (the Union Gospel Tabernacle, later renamed Ryman Auditorium) starting just before conference on October 4, 1896, the rising visibility of the mid-state holiness movement would not have been lost on readers.⁶³

Further, Haynes would likely not have been in the position of owning controlling stock of the paper if external pressure had not frightened off investment from within the conference, even

⁶³ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 157. TM September 10, 1896, p. 8. TM October 8, 1896, p. 5.

from among the stockholders who had repeatedly refused to raise sufficient funds. That failing led to the Haynes and Jones stock buy that became effective Haynes ownership of the paper when complaints forced Haynes to buyout Jones, again after others refused to invest. That some of them resented Haynes's stubborn control was a symptom of the pressure they felt to distance themselves from Haynes's, and their own, dissent.

While Haynes does not seem to have viewed matters this way, it seems likely that delegitimizing Haynes in October 1896 was the price for a peace treaty between the preachers of the Tennessee Conference and the Court opposition. The preachers needed to be restored in reputation, to be off the episcopal bad list. From the Court's perspective, the Tennesseans were guilty of many sins that warranted correction or repentance. They needed pardons for their inviting of Frances Willard into their pulpits, for the 116 vote that shamed Bishop Hargrove, for the worldliness resolutions of 1890 that announced to the world that the new panel bishops presided over disciplinary laxity, and for that monument to Sam Jones on Fifth Street locals called the Tabernacle. Moreover, they needed pardons for making a conference secretary, conference editor, and leader of the General Conference delegation that Prohibition-Party-voting, worldliness-decrying, WCTU-and-Willard-loving, bishop-shaming, lies-and-shams-exposing, and Wesley-on-sanctification-quoting ecclesiastical muckraker and arch dissenter B. F. Haynes. It seems unlikely that opponents of dissent wanted to 'get' anyone more than Haynes. Kelley, Steel, and T. J. Duncan in Tennessee had already been gotten. North Georgia's Jones, WCTU women, and other holiness advocates had been crushed out. Moves against Kentucky's H. C. Morrison were in process. Mahon in Memphis was undone. Texas and even California crackdowns were underway. Carradine had been attacked rather mercilessly and boycotted. Legislation giving greater powers to clergy against local preachers and evangelists to enable

complete excommunication had begun, and would be achieved in 1898. But of the itinerant elders in the MECS in October 1896, few, if any, could have remained higher on the hit list than Haynes, the excoriator of connectional mistakes right under connectional noses, placed and sustained there by a rebellious annual conference.

From 1890 to 1896, the Tennessee Conference was the Court's opponent with Haynes as the conference's champion or attorney. From October 1896 on, Court adversaries could move against Haynes without insulting the Tennessee Conference, whose indignation over Hargrove's treatment of Kelley had done so much to ignite the crisis of the 1890s. The conference effectively removed its protection from Haynes, having absolved themselves of guilt for past sins.

Haynes was wrong about the conference's motives in December 1896. They did have motives beyond opposition to his sanctification emphases. But those motives were not the ones Peebles articulated. Tennessee had been a prohibition conference in revolt over episcopal rough treatment, but it was never a holiness conference. In fact, Tennessee seems to have been a very rare conference with scant holiness activity before the 1890s.⁶⁴ Thus, cutting Haynes loose was a small price to pay for peace and restoration of their collective reputations, and was a perfectly reasonable honor/shame solution. If Haynes had cut 90 percent of the holiness advocacy out of the paper, there would still have been attempts to decertify his editorship. He might have been ousted by a smaller margin, but there seems little doubt that Conference-validated holiness advocacy came at too high and unnecessary a price to pay in continued Court animosity,

⁶⁴ The Minutes for 1891 record the death of one W. T. Rowland, whom the author says "so far as I know, Brother Rowland was the only man in the Tennessee Conference during the past twelve years who professed entire sanctification." Haynes was the Tennessee Conference secretary in 1891. These may be his words. Minutes of the Tennessee Conference, 1891. The remainder is a glowing eulogy and defense of his life and testimony from someone who did not share his "theory."

animosity in place long before any theological dissent. Haynes's holiness turn did not create the motive, but it did provide an acceptable grounds for the Conference's actions, the sort of reason one might actually admit in open conference. Better to declare that holiness doctrine was false, therefore we got rid of Haynes, than to declare that we have to end the episcopal warfare against our conference, therefore we got rid of Haynes. The first rationale was both true and could be said aloud; the second was true and absolutely unspeakable, for to speak it would have reinvigorated episcopal wrath and shamed the conference by admitting that they had caved on a matter of principle, and had done to Haynes what they had together refused to do to Kelley—leave him in the hands of an angry bishop. It was easier because Kelley's 1890 cause had been so close to the heart of conference clergy, while Haynes's 1896 cause had much less support. Further, Bishop Hargrove had obviously sought a harsh punishment for Kelley in 1890. Bishop Granbery, while a noted opponent of holiness doctrine, did not have personal motives against Haynes, nor did he have a reputation for harsh episcopal action. Indeed, Granbery's oversight of the event had even merited Haynes's praise. It may also have been easier because of Haynes's well-demonstrated ability to defend himself. Despite Kelley's war reputation and brave dissent, he frequently exited newspaper spats in worse shape than he entered them. While opponents scored some hits in debates with Haynes, most notably Peebles, Haynes did not have a habit of losing arguments. It would have been perfectly reasonable to assume that the enterprising and determined Haynes would be able to take care of himself. His brethren may also have assumed that, at worst, Haynes would find sufficient support from holiness adherents as editor, or may even start an independent congregation. Indeed, given his repeated and growing ties to MEC figures and known support for MEC-MECS union, some may have thought he had an option of

last resort.⁶⁵

Delegitimizing Jones had been a much easier task. But after 1890, Haynes would never again fear and adore a bishop, and he held position granted by his peers, not by his bosses. He could not simply be moved. There were two other strategies for undoing conference protection. First, according to Haynes, the bishops had often tried to get him out of Tennessee by offering him prominent appointments to other conferences, to make him a ‘giraffe,’ undoubtedly to sever his relationship to his own, and place him amongst strangers, not friends. He rejected every offer as he understood that if he had moved elsewhere, he could no longer have that honored place, and there is little if any evidence that Haynes had any interest in leaving his beloved conference. Secondly, the stockholders had tried to vote him out as editor. But Haynes effectively owned the

⁶⁵ For a variety of reasons, the holiness debate in Tennessee was more sharply focused on doctrine than the question of “irregularity” of holiness associations. The reasons for this were several. First, Haynes was a theologian and ethical gadfly whose arguments usually began by pointing out where his opponents strayed from the doctrines, discipline, and moral standards of the MECS. Second, Tennessee was Vanderbilt’s conference – questions of theological orthodoxy and doctrinal progress were never far from the surface with prospective future preachers in training close by in the Biblical department. The presence of the Publishing House, Book Editor, etc., reinforced this. Third, Haynes was not a peripatetic preacher but a thoroughly “regular” one, even a big steeple station man. Fourth, Haynes’s critiques had always been substantive, immediate, and serious. Deep issues like the moral and spiritual welfare of the Methodist Church and even American society generally were in play; pro-discipline arguments like his defense of the rights of the clergy not to be abused by their bishops were at stake. In Tennessee, this debate was not about a “conflict of associations” where the salient issues were connectionalism and loyalty, but about doctrine and ethics, constitutional issues that were less about how preachers should relate to each other, but what the preachers should believe, teach, and enforce. The worldliness complaint against the bishops showed this. In other words, the question wasn’t “was B. F. Haynes a good and faithful Methodist,” but “what exactly good and faithful Methodism was.” That latter question entailed the question “what doctrines and lifestyle would the Tennessee conference preachers commit themselves to.” Over more than two decades as Tennessee conference clergy, Haynes had shown himself to be a heavy-hitter, a serious and strong-willed a man of episcopal caliber with a well-earned reputation for courage, integrity, and honest speech. There could be no question of his fraternal loyalty to his brethren, nor his devotion to the ideals of Methodism; the question was did his brothers accept his theological interpretation of sanctification and his assumption that Wesley and primitive Methodism were in some substantial sense authoritative for Methodist doctrine in the present. Because of Haynes’s standing in the conference, Tennessee Methodist preachers answering the question “is B. F. Haynes right?” could not avoid the more important question “what do we believe?” But the doctrinal debate had been a wash. The holiness adherents had the majority of the dead authorities; their opponents had the majority of the living ones. Personal attacks proved a much more effective weapon against holiness advocates. Since 1890-1 Haynes had been the leader of the Tennessee conference in its protest against episcopal overreaching and high handed abuse of the connectional principle. In Tennessee, “crank” holiness preachers were not the great threat to discipline and connectionalism – bishops were. Haynes had already proven his loyalty to the body of “regular” preachers through his defense of their rights; a stand that cost him in career and financial losses.

paper, and was, for all intents, both editor and publisher. There was no way to silence the protests of the Tennessee Conference's official organ editor; they could not move him out of Tennessee, or remove him as editor. They would have to remove the honor of conference organ editor that prevented the bishops from dealing with him via appointment and economic hardship. But that job could not be done by the bishops, not even by the publishing committee; the full conference would have to remove the honor and protection they had bestowed on him in 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, and with controversy, again in 1895. Haynes would not have expected the bishops to appoint him to an independent paper, virtually to a private business he owned, a position without official relation to the connection.⁶⁶

The holiness people understood the implications for Haynes and the paper. On October 30, 1896, the Nashville Holiness Association endorsed the *Methodist* by a rising vote, praised Haynes as "bold, able, consistent, and faithful," and called on "every believer in the doctrine of Holiness" to send their \$1 subscription "at once." An Arkansas layman—not a holiness advocate—said the paper was "a breakwater to our beloved church." "I am truly glad the oppressed will

⁶⁶ Jones could simply be changed in appointment, as his position had been granted by the bishop, not by conference. And Jones loved, admired, even revered Haygood. He took the demotion better than one might expect until it sunk in just what Haygood had done. A few conferences had a strong minority of holiness advocates. But the Tennessee Conference fight was a leadership revolt, a 5 to 1 vote of no confidence against a bishop from the Tennessee Conference. Haynes was their champion, and their editor and Secretary. Each of the others were dealt with in turn (the evangelists by locating them, Dodge and Haynes by attacking their papers until they went under. Only Morrison retained the institutional mechanisms to sustain an active ministry, through his paper supported by his evangelistic work, and an annual conference that did not allow him to be molested. Eventually, Asbury College would become the institutional home for holiness advocates who stayed inside. But opponents tried to get Morrison, who located after a prominent pastoral career that included Frankfort First MECS – also in 1896. Texas preachers filed charges against him for an unapproved meeting, forwarded the same to his pastor in Lexington, Kentucky – a pastor perhaps appointed by the bishop for this purpose. The pastor promptly excommunicated him from the MECS. The Kentucky Conference overturned the action the next year, and in later years, elected him several times as a lay delegate to General Conference. But the idea that enemies from afar could pass on complaints to an opponent appointed by the bishop and excommunicate a man of Morrison's standing and reputation was staggering. Morrison recalled that the wife of one of the Texas preachers who drew up the charges attended the meeting. While the husband met with the committee, the wife was "most gloriously sanctified... [and] shouted and testified with great joy." Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 93-95, 169. See also "Dr. Morrison's Suspension," TM October 1, 1896, p. 1, and response from T. L. Mellen, TM October 22, 1896, p. 2.

have a hearing somewhere,” he said, declaring “I advocate liberty of conscience and speech.” The Arkansan concluded “I take eleven periodicals. Yours is the best.”⁶⁷

Haynes’s announcement to his readers of the loss of conference endorsement praised Bishop Granbery for his “sweetness of spirit” and his conference peers for their “utmost brotherliness of spirit.” He said that the reason for the loss of endorsement was disagreement over entire sanctification. He pledged that the paper would continue as before but “on a safer and firmer basis.” Haynes expressed “Appreciation” to preachers who, voting against him at Conference (Haynes: “who were perfectly honest in their course, and voted accordingly”), had yet pledged their ongoing support for the paper since. Speaking on the basis of his nationwide travel, Carradine said the holiness movement was booming due to the backing of laity, not clergy. Carradine believed those preachers who did believe the doctrine were “timid, fearful, and silent... apprehensive of severe handlings in various quarters,” such that God was moving laity to “rise up, defend, and spread the truth” by financial backing and their own direct ministry as children of God, individuals who “have no salaries to lose, no church position to forfeit, and no ministerial head to be decapitated.”⁶⁸

During the floor debate between Haynes and Peebles, Haynes had charged that the conference was repudiating a doctrine of Methodism by their vote, and that that vote had been motivated by their theological repudiation of the holiness movement. Peebles’s counter focused

⁶⁷ “Resolutions,” TM November 5, 1896, p. 1. “Appreciated,” TM November 12, 1896, p. 8. Arkansas said he had been taught sanctification “from the cradle” but was not a “professor.” An ad for the paper listed a phone number 926. Six additional letters of support for Haynes and the paper, TM November 26, 1896, p. 8. A prominent Missouri minister declared the paper “a necessary means of grace in our church,” a Kentuckian was “sad and ashamed” for the actions of the Tennessee Conference. Another supporter named “Asbury,” TM December 10, 1896, p. 8.

⁶⁸ “The Tennessee Methodist and the Tennessee Conference,” October 29, 1896, p. 1., “Appreciation,” TM November 5, 1896, p. 1. Beverly Carradine, “Laity and Holiness,” (reprinted), TM November 19, 1896, p. 8. Haynes agreed that laity were more devoted to holiness and old Methodist way than the preachers were, *Tempest-Tossed*, 189.

initially on Haynes's overemphasis on holiness and few disputed points about the history of the Jones arrangement.⁶⁹ After conference, Haynes repeated his view of events, with support from a few others like Lewis Powell, a leader of holiness efforts in Middle Tennessee.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ During the floor debate, J. J. Ransom – father of literary critic John Crowe Ransom of ‘the Fugitives’ and ‘Southern Agrarians’ fame – accused Haynes and the paper of fomenting disloyalty, that the paper was “an organ of reprisal,” and its treatment of “every interest of the church” had displayed its “disloyalty.” Peebles responded to Haynes’s defense, saying the conference wanted an organ “to build it up, not to split it up,” an organ “without tucks and ruffles” (a negative allusion to the second blessing as an unnecessary complication, also used by Ransom, and thus likely intended as an anti-holiness slur). Peebles charged that Haynes had refused to give up the editorship. Haynes retorted that he had tried to, on the terms that with the editorship would also have to go the financial burden, as Haynes would not remain effective owner of a paper edited by another man. Peebles said “sanctification was not the big road of Methodism, but a quiet path in which two friends might walk together.” It was not “to be taken in a band wagon and paraded in the public gaze.” Peebles did not object to “any brother having this second blessing; he did object to the Tennessee Methodist having the second blessing.” Peebles defended Haynes from the charge of disloyalty, and mocked Ransom’s assertion. Peebles claimed that the brothers in 1891 had felt sorry for Haynes’s demotion to Alex Green, and sought to give him a place and salary through the editorship, an “uncharitable” claim Haynes resented and vigorously denied. Peebles wanted a paper “the conference could control,” an “organ” that would “play the tunes the conference wanted.” They did not want the doctrine of the second blessing “for breakfast, dinner and supper.” Peebles proposed a “board of control.” The floor speeches during the debate over endorsement (from Nashville American), TM November 5, 1896, p. 2. See also TM, October 29, 1896, pp. 4-5. The full report of Peebles’s committee on books and periodicals, TM November 5, 1896, p. 3. The full text of Haynes’s speech appeared “B. F. Haynes’s Speech,” TM November 5, 1896, pp. 4-5, and is Chapter 16 of Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, pp. 163-197.

⁷⁰ Addressing the question of his fairness, Haynes said that in the 1894-95 he let in really poor writing that was against holiness in effort to be fair (likely a reference to the writings of J. J. Ransom), a more liberal policy that Tigert followed he said, Haynes *Tempest-Tossed*, 176-177; Lewis Powell, (reprinted from *The Methodist and Way of Life*) “The Tennessee Conference and Holiness,” TM November 19, 1896 p. 5. Powell said that “the common people” or “our plain people” did not feel that way about “this emancipating grace.” Before conference, S. M. Cherry, Sr. said that he heard no complaints about the paper’s emphasis on holiness during his revival efforts and travels in Dover and Stewart County, Tennessee. S. M. Cherry, “A Trip,” TM September 3, 1896, p. 5. Haynes’ defense claimed the paper held “a position of loyalty to Methodism, but stood unflinchingly opposed to the high church tendencies” ascendant therein while defending the Tennessee conference from charges, stemming from the Kelley mess, of “revolt” against “constitutional authority,” “untrue to Methodist polity, doctrine, and usage.” Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 153, 170. Haynes said he had been illogically criticized both that he was profiting unduly from the paper and that it was in dire straights financially, all evidence to him that “somebody is determined to have it a failure” through “secret and open stabs thrust into its side by lofty hands.” Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 172-173. Against critics who charged him for supporting controversial holiness doctrines, Haynes cited Dr. Tigert, editor of the *Quarterly Review* whose holiness advocacy Haynes viewed as clearly more overt than his own. Haynes claimed that critics of holiness doctrine (perhaps especially Peebles) had often admitted to him that holiness was true Wesleyanism and that they were “the heretics,” one saying, “I don’t believe it. Mr. Wesley was simply off base on this question.” Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 182, 185. Haynes said the cause of conference opposition to the *Tennessee Methodist* was “that the church ceasing to stress sanctification had let in worldliness, and now... restoration [of sanctification] to the heart and life of the church would cure us of the ills.” Some conference opponents to the doctrine of holiness – that great “panacea” of “apostolic unworldliness... spirituality and primitive Methodism” – merely sought “a pat on the back from the worldly-minded element of the laity.” Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 186-187. Critics had alluded to the idea that Haynes had been taken in sympathy to the editor’s desk and was making money off the paper while refusing to heed the friends who gave him that chance. It was also being said that the paper was about to go under. Haynes declared “You see, brethren, how somebody is determined to have the paper a failure, one

In November, debates began between Haynes and his October prosecutors. Haynes repeated his view that the Conference had repudiated a Methodist doctrine, and noted that two bishops and a host of connectional officers had sat quietly while it was assailed and rejected. Granbery did interrupt and rebuke Peebles one time...when Peebles started to complain about Hargrove's vindictive appointments in 1890, a complaint about administration of polity, not even the polity itself.⁷¹

December saw harder criticisms of Haynes than had occurred during the vote. T. A. Kerley said it was not over holiness doctrine and claimed Haynes had betrayed conference rights by refusing to allow the majority of voters to have their way in the stockholders' meeting. An indignant Haynes noted that 'the conference' had never invested in the paper, some 80 of its members had, as individuals, and not evenly. Thus 'the conference' as such, had no right whatsoever to have a vote in a stock company of which they are not a party. All who had invested were represented per their investment, as the law required.⁷²

Meanwhile Peebles expanded dramatically his criticism of Haynes. By December 24, Peebles's denials came in two forms. He charged that Haynes's view was not Wesley's view, but by every implication of his comments, Peebles believed that both Wesley and Haynes heavily

way or another." Haynes was getting rich by bilking his friends AND keeping them aboard a "sinking ship," according to critics. defense of TM linked to worldliness emphasis of TN conference, *Tempest-Tossed*, 181, 186; holiness emphases, even if flawed, were desperately needed, part of a cry, plea over worldliness in MECS, *Tempest-Tossed*, 186-187; said he offered editorship to anyone who would also accept the financial burdens, *Tempest-Tossed*, 188; TM had rehabilitated conference reputation said Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 192; terrible national depression (1893 depression) – worst time in a half century to own a business without debt Haynes said, *Tempest-Tossed*, 193-94; Haynes's defense to charge that switch to holiness was a change in editorial policy, *Tempest-Tossed*, 195-96.

⁷¹ "An Inquiry Answered," TM November 12, 1896, p. 1.

⁷² "The Other Side," TM, December 3, 1896, p.5. "Fifty Year Methodist" refuted Kerley's assertions and repeated Haynes's charge that Peebles had expressly acknowledged that Wesley taught the doctrine but that "Wesley was off his base," "A Pretty Kettle of Fish: Sancho Panza's Most Brilliant Feat Eclipsed," TM December 10, 1896, pp. 2-3. It is readily understandable that a majority of persons would seek to distance the conference from a paper the conference could not control. But the issue they wanted control over was the holiness advocacy of the paper.

overemphasized the doctrine. Peebles further charged that Haynes was “narrow” and divisive rather than “catholic” as Wesley had been. Peebles declared that the stockholders rejected Haynes’s editorship because he had changed the policy of the paper, not because of the doctrine he taught. But the only editorial change Peebles mentioned was the change in emphasis on that doctrine. Even Peebles’s own statement at conference stressed that Haynes had pressed the doctrine “too much and too often... in short, the overflowing muchness of it.” Peebles charged more aggressively that Haynes was a new Maxwell or Bell (British Methodist fanatics rejected by Wesley), not a follower of Wesley, and that Wesley would have rebuked Haynes for his “spirit of holier-than-thouism,” a charge that, as the others, had Peebles echoing Hoss as a critic of criticism. Most surprisingly, Peebles, who went out of his way to note that Haynes had paid cash for a stock buy in 1894, also charged that Haynes, evidenced by his “lusty call for subscriptions,” had tried to get himself “knocked off” in order to pursue the “mammon of Second Blessingism.”⁷³

Taken together, the charges by Kerley and Peebles were a tough critique of an old friend. Kerley echoed a sound principle, but very few clergy in the MECS would have been willing to consider for a moment owning a paper and yet being answerable to a board for its editorial policy. The intolerance critique Peebles had made before, but the suggestion that Haynes was an unsound fanatic who was motivated by personal greed broke new ground. Haynes did have considerable personal wealth. He also had a cultured, and perhaps even aristocratic bearing. He was enterprising and had been noted for making good investments in earlier years. But none of that wealth had offended Peebles before, or had prevented him from praising Haynes’s editorship

⁷³ W. R. Peebles (no title), TM December 10, 1896, p. 2 (Haynes’s responses were in-text). Again, TM December 24, 1896 p. 4. “Fifty Year Methodist” cheered Haynes’s successful catching (outwitting) of the unsuspecting Peebles, “Fishing,” TM January 7, 1897, p. 3.

for its plain-spokenness and sensitivity to common folks. Only after Haynes's dogged holiness advocacy had to be explained and after a vote to decertify his editorship had to be defended had Peebles accused Haynes of failing prey to mammonism. With Hoss's hints that Haynes was a brawling Irishman and yellow journalist and street hustler, the combined testimony of his most intense critics of an MECS clergyman as cultured autocrat brawling in the streets excoriating bishops while pursuing religious fanaticism and personal greed painted quite a picture of the Wesley-quoting, mammon-bashing, Methodist law and brethren-defending, and scholarly Haynes. A friend of both Hoss and Haynes, Peebles perhaps felt torn between the competing agendas of two friends. Haynes's refusal to relent on holiness efforts undoubtedly frustrated him. He may also have known better than Haynes yet did that holiness advocacy and prospects in the MECS were irreconcilable. That fact, and Haynes's stubbornness, may have been enough for Peebles to conclude that Haynes's actions indicated he already planned to get out, but only after making a martyr of himself.

But unlike Hoss, Kerley and especially Peebles had been Haynes's allies until 1895. Their critique sought to defend themselves from a simple and accurate charge that they had opposed the shift toward holiness advocacy in the paper. Haynes, "pained beyond measure" by Peebles's abrupt turn, asked "has an emergency arisen?" and said of Peebles that "his course becomes more and more enveloped in mystery," likely an allusion that other parties were directing or influencing Peebles's actions, the same appeal to a coordinated conspiracy that Kelley and Haynes, and several others, had made more explicitly in reference to the Hargrove controversy, when the two struggled to believe that the goodly Chancellor Garland would turn on them. Most directly, Peebles and Kerley had tried to get Haynes to accept their reasoning, and then to heel to their wishes, and when he did not, they tried to fire him as editor. Failing that,

they removed the conference blessing on the paper itself.⁷⁴

Oddly, neither made directly the most obvious charge against Haynes, namely that he had taken over as his own possession something that had been a joint project (that he had bought a monopoly). Even the name of the paper would seem to demand that it belonged to the conference. But more telling was that these men were not willing—or not enough of them willing, or that they could not name another man with enough money who would be willing to suffer Peebles' proposed 'board of control'—to buy out Haynes, the most obvious solution to the impasse. But that solution would not have "gotten" Haynes. His case required certain punishment. The aim, likely not of Peebles's or Kerley's making and certainly not originating with them, was to drive Haynes out. Why else refuse his offer and make new personal attacks against him? If his offensive and dangerous disloyalty, fanaticism, intolerant unbrotherliness, and censoriousness would certainly continue if he retained control of any paper, and if many had already invested in a paper he now controlled, the just and *necessary* course was to buy him out, retaining both the paper's name and liberating the church from his pernicious editorials. If Haynes was as bad as Peebles said he was, the only responsible course was to silence him honorably with money and leave him to the discipline of his conference and the bishops. But that solution would not have resulted in Haynes's professional destruction. The intent was to 'crush' him, including forcing him to keep his money tied in the paper. When it failed, he would be prostrate. Many opponents likely thought that well before that time came Haynes would have chosen to leave the MECS altogether.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ TM December 24, 1896 p. 4.

⁷⁵ Despite the late December blustery ire, there were no formal charges against Haynes for actual misconduct. The rhetoric might have suggested otherwise, but later attempts to destroy him via peer disciplinary charges came from off-conference, and were rejected outright by the Tennesseans.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Tennessee Holiness Exile

Haynes had occupied positions of prominence in the MECS almost continuously from 1877–1896. He had pastored county seat and large urban stations, and served as a presiding elder and a conference newspaper editor. These posts, along with denomination-wide connectional positions and college posts, were the elite appointments the MECS had to offer. His first four years in ministry, 1873–1877, he served in modest appointments. But for 18 of the 19 years from 1877–1896, Haynes served in such exalted posts, the only year outside being his punitive assignment to Alex Green circuit in 1890. In contrast, in the fifteen years following 1896, he would only serve seven years in such posts, and six of those seven years in college positions secured largely in order to escape episcopal appointing power. There were 7 years in that 15 in which he was fully subject to episcopal appointment. He received modest posts in 6 of those 7 years. Throughout, Court leadership fought, resisted, and prevented his restoration to official significance, that is, to being a leader of note. A person long-cultivated in the necessary qualities for such official leadership, he mostly languished for those years in ecclesiastical exile. For most of his peak years of leadership potential, from his forty-fifth birthday on October 31, 1896 to his sixtieth on October 31, 1911, and against his own deepest hopes, Haynes's experience and talents were variously underemployed, blacklisted, under siege, and adrift. For a man who cut such a wide swath through official Methodism to his 45th year, his influence through his mid-life to early senior years was severely truncated. It took many years of trial before Haynes's exilic loyalty to his beloved MECS finally gave way to a search for shelter in a safer and more suitable ecclesiastical harbor.

Middle-aged and older holiness adherents in the MECS were stung by the extent of opposition, but amazingly retained hope that the tide might turn, in part, because the holiness movement grew in spite of the opposition. The organizational base of holiness advocacy experienced transition. It began with independent revivalistic and fraternal organizations that encouraged and protected the revival from denominational disloyalty and radicalism in doctrine or practice. Those gave way to the establishment of holiness colleges and printing operations as 1890s Methodist colleges and publishing outfits grew increasingly hostile to holiness interests. Yet holiness adherents desperately clung to an astonishing denominational loyalty. MECS holiness evangelist Beverly Carradine and MEC Iowa holiness leader Isaiah Reid were among the authors of that second stage loyalist strategy. But Reid's 1895 advice to MECS clergy switching to the MEC—that they were merely going “out of one frying pan into another”—indicated that all this ultimately was just a delaying action. While the “war to extermination” Reid perceived began in the MECS, it would be nationwide soon enough. Both in the MEC, and especially in the MECS, the Court enacted its own ‘push out’ strategy by making it increasingly difficult for clergy to be holiness Methodists. While many of the issues were the same in both communions, including the failure of episcopal leadership to avoid causing dissension in the 1880s and 1890s, the shape of the “Methodist” reaction to holiness advocacy in its postwar phase was set by the harshness of anti-holiness activity by MECS bishops.¹

¹ Timothy Smith in Bucke, *History of American Methodism*, Vol 2, p. 625. There was a pre-Civil War phase, including the reactions that produced smaller Wesleyan Methodist and Free Methodist secessions in the Northeast in the two decades before the Civil War. For reasons why 1890s holiness leaders in the ME churches did not join already existing holiness or holiness-friendly groups like the Free Methodists, Wesleyan Methodists, Salvation Army, the Church of God movement, and Mennonite or Quaker bodies like the Brethren in Christ or the Evangelical Friends, see Dieter, *The Holiness Revival*, 256-262. For Carradine against comeout-ism TM September 24, 1896, p. 3. Many accounts of holiness movement conflict in the MECS stress the actions and style of evangelists who roamed without ministerial authority. However, the experience of leaders like B. F. Haynes, A. J. Jarrell, etc suggests the holiness movement conflict was not a fight between an established ministry and supposed lay pretenders or interlopers. Haynes was elected by his peers and laity on the Tennessee Conference to be one of its delegates to the

“Never in the history of Methodism have we heard so much about loyalty,” Haynes wrote in November 1896. He complained that there were forms of “disloyalty” that did not exist, and types of disloyalty that did exist, including disloyalty to baptismal vows and the “cool, indifferent, flippant” disloyalty of clergy to the doctrinal vows of the ministry. Haynes wrote those who “prate” the most about the first kind of “loyalty,” had little to say about the second two. In the same issue that W. R. Peebles called Haynes a greedy anti-Wesleyan heretic, Haynes declared “we have absolutely no toleration of any spirit or tendency to come-out-ism,” (holiness advocates voluntarily leaving the denomination) in “Come-out-ism Not the Remedy,” adding that if trouble came to “the organized unity and doctrinal integrity of Methodism” it would “be the work of other hands.” On the same page, Haynes reported on the trial of H. C. Morrison, but expressed his confidence in the bishops’ ability to address the “grave problem.” On January 7, 1897, Haynes published Bishop Key’s response to Haynes’s query about how Key taught the doctrine of perfect love. Haynes told a story about the churchly loyalty of the mid-state holiness movement in “A Warning to All Concerned.” When a man appeared at “the weekly holiness meeting” in Nashville claiming to be a holiness evangelist but holding no church membership, seemingly being too good for any church, Haynes reported that “he was promptly notified that his sort were not recognized by holiness people hereabouts.” Despite the rejection and animus of opponents, Haynes remained a committed, even strident, denominational loyalist.²

General Conference in 1889 and 1893. Haynes served a series of prominent appointments, and criticisms of his ministry were not unlike criticisms leveled at W. A. Candler or D. C. Kelley before him. Jarrell too had served a round of the most important pulpits that the North Georgia conference had to offer. In short, these men were not ecclesiastical anarchists, roving evangelists, nor illiterate laymen pretending to the authority and responsibility of the cloth. They were veteran, prominent, even establishment, clergymen of the M. E. Church, South. In Haynes’s case, his ministry would come to evidence a wandering style only after episcopal appointments had so marginalized his stature and his income that he was forced to find suitable positions in college presidency.

² “Loyalty v. Loyalty,” TM, November 26, 1896, p. 1. “Come-out-ism Not the Remedy,” TM, December 24, 1896, p. 1. (About the H. C. Morrison, Dublin, Texas case) “An Unfortunate Case,” TM, December 24, 1896, p. 1.

But some changes came quickly. On January 28, 1897, the *Tennessee Methodist* became the *American Outlook*. Haynes announced the purchase of a prohibition paper, *The Pilot*, and its 5000 to 6000 subscribers. Rather than fleeing to independentism, the MEC, or the ‘mammon of second blessingism,’ Haynes had pursued deepened alliances with prohibitionists. The new masthead would eventually read “Watchman, What of the Night?” Haynes wrote of “a sleepless vigil on the welfare of the charge committed to him.” Haynes declared that “social, economic, and politico-moral questions” would receive even greater attention with the change, and pledged “ceaseless and relentless warfare on Rum, Romanism, and Rascality.” Haynes offered emotional testimony to the grace of God in the trials of the previous six years, the God who through “many heart-aches and...many a tear” had been the “Friend that sticketh closer than a brother.”³

The name change did not signal much alteration in content, however. Political commentary appeared a bit more frequently and holiness advocacy slightly less so, perhaps due to an attempt to retain the pan-Protestant subscribers to the politically-oriented *Pilot*. But holiness-related news and contributions on other pages remained heavy, as did Tennessee Conference news and various forms of polity and doctrinal dissent as had been present in the *Tennessee Methodist*. While non-Methodist Protestant material reprinted from other papers also appeared with slightly more frequency than before, none would have failed to notice the

Haynes praised and reprinted T. A. Kerley’s commentary from the *Methodist and Way of Life* on the Morrison case, TM January 7, 1897 p. 2. “A Statement from Bishop Key,” TM, January 7, 1897 p. 2. Key did not favor use of the term “second blessing,” terminology widely used by holiness opponents. Key thought the term had occasioned opposition, a position Haynes rejected. “A Warning To All Concerned,” TM January 7, 1897, p. 1.

³ “Our New Name,” *American Outlook* (AO), January 28, 1897 p.1. The mailing address was 211 Union Street in Nashville. In 1892, TM had 6500 subscriptions compared to NCA 27,000. In 1896, TM had 7476. Haynes said that a net increase in subscriptions had occurred since the October 1896 conference, suggesting a subscription list of well over 10,000 with the *Pilot* additions. However, Haynes pressed the settling of back accounts from subscribers to both papers with the change, and may have lost many unpaid or unpaying subscribers. 7000 would be a solid or average number for a conference paper, with some operating on even lower numbers. Rowell, *Newspapers*, 1900. George Batten, 1892.

continuing heavy Methodist flavor. The paper had always featured political news and opinion, as well as broad Protestant commentary on religious and political matters. All in all, the *American Outlook* continued to emphasize what Haynes said it would in his earlier days before the name change.⁴

The Tennessee Annual Conference in October 1897 meanwhile elected D. C. Kelley to lead the General Conference delegation on the first ballot, a restoration to his former exalted place. H. B. Reams and W. J. Collier were elected on the second ballot. The third ballot elected J. D. Barbee, a sign of Court power. On the sixth ballot, T. A. Kerley was elected. J. A. Orman

⁴ Haynes demonstrated a stunning case of plagiarism—shown in two parallel columns—by an anti-holiness critic whose article appeared in the NCA, that had that critic using the arguments of Wesley’s 18th century opponents against the holiness movement within the MECS, “History Repeating Itself,” AO July 8, 1897 p. 1. Despite the fact that Wesley was an evangelist, against evangelists were MECS Bishops, who treated evangelists worse than the Anglican bishops had ever treated Wesley, and were “Executing Unenacted Law,” TM January 14, 1897, p. 1. D. C. Kelley and H. B. Crockrill articles complaining about the Morrison trial, TM January 14, 1897, p. 8. From T. A. Kerley, AO, February 11, 1897, p. 8. T. A. Kerley defending Morrison, whom Hoss declared had forfeited his right to appeal, AO April 8, 1897, p. 4. Haynes noting that California presiding elder J. C. Simmons went after holiness advocate E. A. Ross of Oregon; “this method of warfare should cease,” “At It Again,” AO June 10, 1897, p. 1. As part of a running series, R. N. Price declared that the Texans had “no more right than the Pope of Rome” to forbid [Morrison’s] preaching at Dublin, AO, January 28, 1897, p. 2. Price declared himself “a strict constructionist of constitutions, and hold that all power is inherent in the people, and stays there till transferred to rulers by the letter of the law, literally and strictly interpreted,” AO March 4, 1897 p. 8. Carradine declared the MECS had gotten into “a decapitating way... [having begun] to take blood,” AO February 25, 1897, p. 4. Frequent commentary appeared about Morrison case, alcohol being served at Tennessee Centennial, and preachers in debt during winter-spring of 1897. A clever tying of the Kelley-Candler-Abbott affair and Steel controversy to the Centennial and setting aside the four-mile law, “What Will be Done,?” AO, February 25, 1897, p. 1. A proposed MECS exhibit at the Centennial was cancelled, AO, February 25, 1897, p. 4. Haynes criticized Steel’s urging of youth to attend the Centennial, AO April 22, 1897, p. 1. One observer thought Haynes triumphed over Steel on that point, AO April 29, 1897, p. 2. B. A. Cherry disagreed, and believed that those who loved the church should “conceal, not publish,” its flaws, AO June 3, 1897, p. 5. “Fifty Year Methodist” rebuked Cherry’s “whitewashing,” AO June 10, 1897 p. 2. Cherry fired back in June, signing his location as Vanderbilt University. “Fifty” replied, signing off “Old Log School-House,” AO June “31” (July 1), 1897 p. 1. E. M. Bounds on “Secret Praying,” AO January 28, 1897, p. 8. Bounds on prayer and missions, AO May 20, 1897, p. 2. Sam Jones on prayer, AO February 11, 1897, p. 1. Haynes on preaching, “A Change Needed,” AO March 4, 1897, p. 1. A delightfully clever dissent against Court leadership and allusion to Hoss from “Fifty Year Methodist,” “I’m Still Fishing,” AO March 4, 1897, p. 4. E. T. Reinhart writing to Haynes, AO March 11, 1897, p. 3. A very interesting letter from an “ex-Catholic” with some criticism of Haynes, AO March 11, 1897, p. 4. Full-throated criticism (with sketch) of missionary secretary W. R. Lambuth’s attack on the holiness movement (aka, “upholding bossism”) as a example of the Court (“the hub,” “the machine”) and its “unrighteous and disastrous” methods, those of Jesuits and ward-bosses, “Fishing in Head Waters,” by “Fifty-Year Methodist,” AO April 8, 1897, p. 2. Lambuth was elected bishop in 1910. On April 15, “Fifty” retracted his statement on Lambuth, as the *Pacific Methodist Advocate* had placed Lambuth’s name over an article written by someone else, and took two weeks to issue a correction. So “Fifty” criticized Bishop Keener’s attack on the holiness movement instead, AO April 15, 1897, p. 2.

and J. T. Curry were elected alternates on the eighth ballot. The one-hundred-sixteen protesters of 1890 were well represented, minus only Haynes, who had gone from first in 1893 to out in 1897, never to return, his conference declining in 1897, 1901, 1905, and 1909 to return him to General Conference. The *Holston Methodist*, edited by R. N. Price, became the official conference organ, shared with the Holston Conference. Price declared his policy would be “manly conciliation.”⁵

But a plot was in motion. Quarantined in New Orleans, Bishop Keener was supposed to be the bishop that year; the less-forceful and less-skillful Hendrix took his place. In July 1897, while Haynes was away from the office and unaware of the action, a jeremiad against MECS worldliness and loss of spiritual power by Rebecca Latimer Felton appeared in the *American Outlook* under the pseudonym “An Old Methodist.” Felton wrote that an unnamed Atlanta preacher had closed his church doors to “the praying temperance women.” The dissenting Felton, wife and political partner of Georgia Populist leader William H. Felton, and later a U.S. Senator in her own right, especially loathed the heavy-handed methods of Court leadership represented by Haygood and Candler.⁶

A former Tennessean turned WCTU-banning Atlanta pastor, Walker Lewis, outed

⁵ “Tennessee Annual Conference,” NCA, October 28, 1897, p. 2. Carter, *History*, 279-280.

⁶ Felton’s article, “The Future of Methodism,” was published under the name “Old Methodist,” AO July 15, 1897, p. 2. Coker notes that Felton, was “a harsh critic of both conservative Democrats and the Methodist hierarchy,” who worked “tirelessly to reform not only southern society but also southern politics and the southern Methodist Church.” Her “Greenback-turned-agrarian-turned-Populist” politics, fueled her “animosity” toward the Candler family and the elite bosses or “despots” of the MECS. Her “nemesis” W. A. Candler and Emory College symbolized their growing power. Haynes’s ties to Sam Jones and Felton were an alliance against a common enemy—an accommodated and autocratic MECS court. Aside from sharing MECS ties, Haynes, Jones, and Felton shared a concern for restoring earlier piety and discipline, and a privileging of those out of power. They did not share holiness advocacy, however, and had differences in political views as well. Coker, *Liquor*, 50, 152-154, 98. Coker provides this personal and political animosity as a major contributing cause for Felton’s attack on Candler’s son-in-law and Emory professor Andrew Sledd, that touched off “the Sledd Affair.” Sledd’s 1902 criticism of lynching had been unremarkable until Felton attacked it in the *Atlanta Constitution*. Felton had previously defended African Americans. Felton’s attitude changed quickly between February 1896 and August 1897. Owen, *Sacred Flame of Love*, 168-169. Haynes printed an address by Felton, AO July 8, 1897 p. 1.

himself as Felton's target by writing Haynes demanding to know the name of the man who had libeled him, and threatened legal action. Haynes and his brother and assistant, Thomas E. Haynes, refused the demand and warned Felton. Assuming that holiness preacher Clement C. Cary was the author, Lewis published a broadside in the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate*, declaring the author unworthy of Methodist membership. When the powerful and distinguished Felton announced to the world that she wrote the article through the *Outlook*, a horrified Lewis demanded still to know "his" name, and proceeded to begin an article war against an amused Cary. Lewis went so far as to bring formal charges against Cary's character at the North Georgia Annual Conference that fall.

But Lewis did more. He and Atlanta allies brought formal charges against Haynes's character too. Laywoman Felton, who was not a holiness advocate, was guilty of criticizing an unnamed preacher for his stands on women and prohibition. But, somehow, two different holiness preachers on two different conferences were charged with immorality. In Cary's case, the charges were based on the mere fact that Cary said he knew an unspecified 4/5ths of the article to be true. In Haynes's case the charges were based on the fact that another man had admitted supposedly libelous statements without Haynes's knowledge, a situation that would have condemned Haynes for an immoral act when he had committed no act at all.

Perhaps to episcopal chagrin, North Georgia vindicated Cary, while Tennessee vindicated Haynes. The attempt to expel Haynes in Tennessee was undone by two factors. First, Bishop Hendrix bungled the execution. In failing to provide adequate notice of the charges, Hendrix repeated a Hargrove blunder while trying to expel another Tennessee Conference preacher on questionable charges. But more important than Hendrix's repetition of misplaced episcopal self-confidence was the fact that the Tennesseans knew both Walker Lewis and B. F. Haynes.

Therefore, they passed Haynes's character unanimously and with emotion. Presiding elder W. J. Collier declaration that Lewis's attack on Haynes was the worst item that had ever appeared in Haynes's paper was cheered by the assembly, worse apparently than Haynes's pro-holiness material and charges against bishops and non-holiness clergy. The Tennesseans again showed they would not allow outsiders to determine discipline, even the discipline of a holiness preacher. They may also have felt Haynes had suffered enough embarrassment and that further shots, whether from Peebles or Lewis, were unnecessary. They perhaps also intended to reaffirm their support for prohibition efforts, or even to offer a warning to episcopal opponents to leave Tennesseans alone. While there were losses of other kinds between the summer of 1897 and the winter of 1898, Haynes had at least survived an assassination attempt. Had the charges been upheld, Haynes could have been expelled from the ministry in October 1897 as his opponents likely intended. At the very least, the Tennessee Conference had an excellent opportunity to expel Haynes from the ministry of the MECS in 1897. They refused to do so, decisively. The war against Haynes was not *their* war.⁷

Returned for a second year to a nominal appointment in October 1897, Haynes remained free to focus as editor of the *American Outlook* for 1897–98, a particularly eventful year. That spring Methodists talked of war with Spain and preparations for the May 1898 General Conference in Baltimore. In January 1898, the MECS publishing house released T. A. Kerley's *Conference Rights*. Seven years in the making, Kerley's book reopened the 1890 Kelley-

⁷ Turley, *Wheel Within A Wheel*, 172-177. The final three years (mid-1897 to summer-1900) of Haynes's paper are lost, dropping off in July 1897. The *American Outlook* became *Zion's Outlook* in 1898 and remained so past the time that Haynes sold the paper to J. O. McClurkan. The two best sources for the "Future of Methodism" material are Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 211-223 (Chapter 19), and the Rebecca Latimer Felton Papers, University of Georgia Library, Mss 81 (microfilm reels 3, 4, and 11). On losses, in July 1897, Hoss's brother—John Isaac Hoss—was murdered at his home in Conway, Arkansas. Martin, *Hoss*, 206-207. Hoss reprinted in *American Outlook* refuting claims by his brother's murder's friends that his brother accidentally shot himself, AO July 8, 1897 p. 4. In February of 1898, Frances Willard died at age 58.

Hargrove case in advance of Baltimore. Court leaders universally panned and dismissed Kerley's important, irenic, and scholarly work, but it had finally been published. Kerley aimed to rethink and clarify Methodist episcopacy based on previous administrations and the Kelley case. Not yet ready to learn from its mistakes, the Court leadership dismissed the contribution and denied the criticism. The MECS Court thus missed an opportunity to reset and reflect based on Kerley's preventative spring cleaning, and continued lurching from one blunder to another.⁸

The May 1898 General Conference in Baltimore called for two bishops to be elected. But three men received the necessary majority, with Hoss coming in third. When the chair ruled only the top two elected—Emory College president W. A. Candler and Missionary Secretary H. C. Morrison (not the Kentucky holiness evangelist with the same name)—the house erupted in protest. Hoss—whose brother John Isaac Hoss was tragically murdered in July 1897—did the gracious or 'manly' thing and refused to be part of any agitation on behalf of his consecration. The dignity and candor he showed in his response to his brother's death, his opposition to the Spanish-American war, and his refusal to grab power not unmistakably granted to him had impressed many. The 1898 General Conference proved a thoroughly conservative affair, passing crackdowns on evangelists, refusing to endorse the W.C.T.U., and electing three arch-defenders of the Court status quo to the episcopacy. Reaffirmed as champion editorial slayer of all dissenting dragons, and celebrated for his magnanimous display, a victorious Hoss returned to his editorial duties. Rewarded for his patience, he was easily elected bishop in 1902 as expected,

⁸ "Methodist Episcopacy: as Brother Kerley sees it," NCA, February 24, 1898 p.1. Godbey defended Kerley's Conference Rights, NCA April 7, 1898 p. 18; Name change discussions about dropping the name "South" from MECS, NCA April 21, 1898 p. 3; more on "conference rights," NCA May 19, 1898 p.14 from future bishop and Haynes's colleague, A. Coke Smith. Hoss on his editorship. "A Short History of the Advocate," NCA April 7, 1898 p. 8. For Hoss attacking Jones and evangelists, see NCA February 11, 1897, and NCA August 19, 1897. See also Martin, *Hoss*, 167-170.

joined by another former Vanderbilt professor, A. Coke Smith.⁹

Yet amazingly the war with Spain and a General Conference were not the biggest stories for the MECS in 1898. A third great controversy involving Haynes and the Tennessee Conference shook the MECS that year: the war claim scandal. Like the Hargrove-Kelley controversy, later historians have paid little attention to this event. During the Civil War, Union forces in Nashville had utilized and seriously damaged properties belonging to the publishing arm of the MECS. From the early 1870s, with several different persons leading the attempt, the MECS had pursued its claim against the federal government to recoup damages of some \$500,000. Eventually the church reduced its claim to \$288,000 and in 1895 secured the services of Nashville lawyer and publisher, Edward Bushrod Stahlman. ‘Major’ Stahlman, a member in good standing at McKendree, signed an agreement with the publishing house under its book agents, Rev. J. D. Barbee and D. M. Smith. The agreement to pursue the claim at a fee of 35 percent of the received money payable to Stahlman was known to members of the book committee and surely to at least some of the bishops.

But Stahlman’s terms required that the existence of the fee be kept secret. It was known that some in Congress opposed such agent fees, and public knowledge of the fee would likely undermine the church’s claims. Senators were divided on how to view the church’s claim as well. Northern Republicans were more likely to view it as an illegitimate rebel claim but would consider it if it were understood as the church’s request for federal aid—a charity alms request, in effect. The MECS most emphatically did not view it that way. Rather, the federal government owed a legal debt for use and destruction of private property and was honor-bound

⁹ Martin, *Hoss*, 185-187. This mistake of electing three when intending two was possible when voting for two names on the same ballot. For example, if 100 voters are asked to vote for two names each, they have cast 200 ballots. If only 51 votes are needed for election, there would be enough votes available for three persons to receive a majority (153 out of 200). Voting for each office separately removes this possibility.

to pay that legal debt without reference to how that money would be used. Those not taking the claim seriously chaffed at fee payment to for-profit attorneys in a case of a charity claim.

Finally, in the spring of 1898 Congress approved the claim. But rumors that a fee was to be paid had been swirling around Washington, and senators wrote to Barbee and Smith for a denial. In telegrams to Senator Samuel Pasco of Florida and Senator William Bate of Tennessee on March 5, 1898, Barbee informed them the rumors were not true. On that basis, with Pasco waiving the Reverend Dr. Barbee's telegram of denial on the floor of the Senate, the bill passed on March 8. There were still questions about the claim in advance of General Conference in May 1898. The book committee under future bishop Collins Denny met, investigated briefly, and issued a report that all was well, released to the public in pamphlet form. The General Conference decided not to investigate further based on that report. But between the questions within the church and the declarations of the Congress that expressly denied any payment, and knowing the habits of the MECS Court, it seems that both Haynes and Rebecca Felton remained suspicious. Haynes knew both Stahlman and Barbee, the latter man almost universally disliked by Country dissenters of various kinds. Ever on the lookout for bossism, including 'ecclesiastical bossism,' Felton was suspicious because she knew Stahlman, an active operator in southern politics with whom she and her husband had had previous encounters.¹⁰

Haynes broke the story in his paper, now renamed *Zion's Outlook*. But the story did not take off and secular papers in Nashville would not touch it--Stahlman owned the *Nashville Banner*, and may have secretly owned the *Nashville American* as well. T. E. Haynes wrote to

¹⁰ Barbee's habit of opining uncharitably on the floor of Annual Conferences about all Methodists who did not share his Court views made him a frequent target of dissenting counter-attacks. TM, January 21, 1897, p. 8. AO, March 11, 1897, p. 7. AO, April 1, 1897, page unclear. "Fifty Year Methodist" quoting Sam Steel saying of the theology in Barbee's book on sanctification: "Dr. Barbee is not a Methodist," AO April 29, 1897, p. 2. Haynes said one criticism of the publishing house admitted to AO in Haynes's absence that should not have been; expressed charity for the ease of mistakes in the publishing business, including billing mistakes, "Explanatory," AO, May 13, 1897, p. 1. Both "Fifty Year Methodist" and Clement Cary with negative commentary about Barbee, AO June 10, 1897, p. 2.

Felton urging her to publish a letter in the *Atlanta Journal* as no daily paper in Nashville was interested. The story had to break outside of Nashville, and in a secular, not a dissenting, paper. She did so in late May, and someone in Atlanta seeing it wired a story to papers in Washington. By the first week of June, the story broke nationwide that officers of the MECS had lied to the United States Congress in order to secure money. Rumors flew that the agents or others within the church had done so for reasons of personal greed, or that money was funneled to political allies. Felton also wrote to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the powerful Republican from Massachusetts. On the floor of the Senate, Lodge called for an investigation. By late June, the Senate committee called Barbee, Smith, Stahlman, publishing board chair Collins Denny, and muckraker B. F. Haynes to testify. The senators determined that Barbee, Smith, and especially Stahlman had lied with intent to deceive the Congress, but that no stain fell upon the MECS. The report came very close to asking the MECS to punish these men as the price for the Senate's absolving the church of wrongdoing.¹¹

During the Senate testimony, the rough methods and self-referential infallibility of the Court were on full display. Stahlman blamed the whistleblower when he explained to the Senate committee that “there is a class of people roaming about who claim to have got the second blessing, who are trying to belittle and blacken the church and prominent men in it if they can.

¹¹ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 205-210. Martin, *Hoss*, 187-195. NCA July 7, 1898 from Hoss on War Claim; NCA June 23, 1898 also; NCA March 20, 1902; “Stahlman Got the Money,” *Columbia Herald*, July 1, 1898 p. 1. Rebecca L. Felton, *Country Life in Georgia in the Days of My Youth* (Atlanta: Index Printing, 1919) 157-170. Robert O'Brien claims that Stahlman (1843-1930) secretly owned TWO Nashville dailies, the *Banner* and the *American*. The Stahlman family owned and operated the *Banner*—primary rival to the *Tennessean*—for much of the twentieth century. Robert O'Brien, “The U.S. Government's Investigation of E. B. Stahlman As an Enemy Alien: A Case Study of Nativism in Nashville” (M.A. thesis., Western Kentucky University, 1996). Stahlman was the child of Protestant German immigrants who immigrated in 1853 when E. B. was ten—Lutherans from Mecklenberg who left after liberal reforms failed. They named their first child born in America George Washington Stahlman. Stahlman's father died soon after arriving in the country. O'Brien's study of Stahlman focuses on charges about Stahlman's loyalty during World War 1. But Haynes's charge that Nashville dailies would not pick up the story becomes especially explainable if Stahlman owned two of the papers.

There is no man much meaner than an assassin of character.” The chair rebuked Stahlman for those comments, but the characterization of Haynes and holiness adherents remains in the congressional records. The Presbyterians and Episcopalians on the committee were not interested in Stahlman’s scapegoating and assassination of the character of the whistleblower while they were about to pass sweeping condemnation upon his own. Questioning by MECS leader Collins Denny and an Arkansas attorney “Mr. Garland,” counsel for the MECS publishing house, repeatedly asked Haynes if his paper was an official paper and whether or not it had lost that status. Stahlman, Denny, and Garland seemed to think that was relevant to the question of whether or not lies and a cover up of those lies had occurred. It was an excellent example of the mentality that led to the 1895 contract that involved a host of individuals, wittingly or unwittingly, in a conspiracy to deceive the Congress, and to cover up that lie. Decisions made by better man leadership were unquestionable. Those who questioned them were scoundrels, rascals, rogues, and villains, deserving of any abuse better men might devise.¹²

Court wrath with Haynes for his muckraking was merely an extension of its conviction that the Court could not be criticized. Haynes recalled that he was “denounced and slandered in church papers and the most wicked motives were charged against me as having inspired exposure” of the “fraud.” But beyond the echo chamber of Court glory, the official Court story

¹² The testimony and full report is found in Report No. 1416, “Methodist Book Concern South,” 55th Congress, United States Congressional Serial Set. 3627 (1897-98). Barbee quote from p. 60 of report. As for the motive for the deception, the overweening and incessant burden of saluting, divinizing, satisfying, and even covering up for bishops took its toll again. So great was this burden that warped every aspect of MECS life in this period, that men otherwise thought beyond reproach risked their character and reputations for it. Barbee, no doubt, felt pressure from the bishops to secure these funds. Faced with a direct request from the Senator for the truth that also included a direct and powerful motive to lie, and knowing or believing that many in Congress would use any pretense to deny the MECS funds owed to it by the Federal government, and likely believing that that continued denial of the debt to the MECS constituted a moral failing itself, Barbee withheld the truth from men inclined to do evil with that knowledge. If the Congress would use a legal contract between the MECS and Stahlman to refuse a legal debt the Congress owed to the MECS, these congressmen deserved to be lied to in the premises. But Barbee’s and Stahlman’s actions put a Senator in a position to lie unwittingly to his colleagues and put the MECS in the position of having lied to the U. S. Senate.

was not playing well. The book committee's explanation in early July backfired. Methodist bodies at several levels passed resolutions variously calling for the immediate resignation of the book agents, a complete return of the funds to the federal government, and an immediate special session of General Conference to deal decisively with what most believed was an outrageous Court stain on the dignity of the entire MECS connection. The wider public also took notice. A resolution calling for an immorality trial against Barbee and Smith passed by the lowly Macon, Georgia district conference made page three of the *New York Times*. Among normal Methodists, and the public at large, muckraking by Haynes, Felton, and St. Louis *Christian Advocate* editor Wm. B. Palmore, was not the story.¹³

Private Court correspondence revealed their anxiety. In August 1898, Bishop Fitzgerald wrote to Bishop Galloway that “as in the Kelley case, blundering seems likely to give us a chronic connectional trouble.” The indecisively-patient Fitzgerald wrote that “post-disaster wisdom is cheap.” In September, W. C. Black, editor of the *New Orleans*, wrote to Galloway that “Haines and his gang are trying to fan [the scandal] into a dangerous conflagration.” But Black noted that the newly retired senior Bishop Keener—living in New Orleans and still very much the Court's reigning bull in his own mind—had come out opposing the College of Bishops on the issue of refunding the money. Black asked Galloway, “When Bishops disagree, what are

¹³ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 210. The extent of their misplaced views is suggested by an editorial from the Presbyterians upon Hoss's election to the episcopacy. Noting that the *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate* “says it is easier to find a Bishop than an Editor,” the Presbyterian announced “the difference may be stated another way, that whereas a bishop is an overseer, an editor, such as Bishop Hoss was, is an overseer of the Overseers, and can help in keeping them straight.” The Presbyterian did not know that most MECS editors in that period held an obsequious relationship to their bishops, not a responsible one. From the *Presbyterian Standard*, quoted without notation in Martin, *Hoss*, 233. Related treatment of dissenters: Collins Denny's negative and extremely long review of Kerley, *Conference Rights* gave a grand total of two sentences to the one sixth of the book specifically given to the Kelley-Hargrove controversy (NCA January 20, 1898, p. 5.) Hoss's disgusting charges (on bottom left, 2 paragraphs) that any critic of episcopal tyranny was a hypocrite who lusted after high office (i.e., sour grapes), NCA January 20, 1898 p. 8. The Tennessee Conference delegation met and passed a resolution on July 12, 1898, signed by Kelley, Collier, Kerley, H. B. Reams, and D. C. Scales. See *Nashville Banner*, July 18, 1898, p. 3. “Southern Book Concern Claim,” *New York Times*, June 22, 1898, p. 3.

common folks to do?”¹⁴

In February 1899, J. C. Calhoun Newton sent a long and unflinching letter to Bishop Galloway pleading for the bishops to take “decisive action.” A former missionary, Newton began by noting that even ancient Japan had a mechanism for dissent, and “*that was in an oriental government in Asia, among heathen people.*” An ashamed Newton called Stahlman “a self confessed liar,” who “remains...a member in good standing at McKendree Church... [a fact] which is notorious in Nashville and elsewhere.” Barbee’s indefensible telegrams had “compromised the moral integrity of the church before the world and before other churches... [and had] brought reproach upon the Methodist Church.” Newton said “until we repudiate their ‘blunder,’ to speak mildly, in some authoritative way, we must as a church rest under the stigma of condoning evasion, prevarication, etc.” Newton appealed to Galloway, saying that the bishop was “the favorite one with our laymen.” Newton then quoted several laity, one disappointed that “our Mississippi bishop” (Galloway) had failed to meet his expectations for “decisive action.” Another layperson said “the Pub. House affair had been the humiliation of his life,” and that if he had it to do over again, he would not have joined the Methodist church. Newton said that the NCA and conference organs had either banned or curtailed discussion of the case, such that “the deep dissatisfaction that pervades so many of your preachers and especially among the laymen has not been heard, but is there all the same.” Newton then began quoting leaders from “the other great Communion of this Southland.” One non-Methodist flatly declared that Barbee “*is lying, and that is all there is to it.*” Methodist leader Dr. James Carlisle, upon reading the Senate’s report, “wept for grief.” Then Newton threw a hard punch directly at episcopal failings

¹⁴ Fitzgerald to Galloway, August 8, 1898, Charles Betts Galloway papers (Box 1), Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University. Black to Galloway, September 7, 1898, Charles Betts Galloway papers (Box 1), Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

in the face of the crisis. “And yet we are informed that one of our Bishops lays all this agitation at the door of the second blessing people—a few disgruntled sanctificationsists!” An outraged Newton exclaimed “what on earth do honest and devoted ministers” in various states “care for the opinions of Haynes, et al?” Newton declared “of course it is easy to give the second blessingists a dig. That has become too common. Is anything wrong? Nag the holiness crowd. For example, this trouble now before us.” Newton then said, “But with all their failings Haynes and Palmore did not write those telegrams to Bate or Pasco.”

Newton rejected the notion that the bishops “had no authority in the premises,” saying “the welfare and good name of the whole connexion” was involved, and quoted an anonymous leading Methodist who said ““What are our General Superintendents for if they do not give us spiritual leadership at such a juncture as this.”” Newton warned that episcopal “hesitancy...to protect at all hazards the moral reputation, the fair name of our” MECS would have terrible results for the bishops themselves; “then our episcopacy will inevitably lose standing.” If the bishops revealed internal divisions, that too, would “surely weaken you hereafter.” “We are all looking to you good Bishop...to see that our banner shall remain unsullied.” Laity in business and professional fields, “standing in the front ranks of life, are expecting the church through her accredited officials to set a clear example of truth telling and strictest integrity. They have sons and daughters who are to be influenced.”¹⁵

A more vocal “challeng[er] of the Methodist establishment,” James R. Cannon, Jr. of Virginia, a future bishop, polity progressive, and editor of the *Southern Methodist Recorder* (a district paper), wrote aggressively of the cover up of these issues in the MECS. His dissent naturally devolved into a feud with Hoss. The Tennessee Conference, unwilling to let outside

¹⁵ J. C. Calhoun Newton to Galloway, February 2, 1899, Charles Betts Galloway papers (Box 1), Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

pressures force them to discipline their own, after lengthy debate passed Barbee's character in October 1898 when Barbee acknowledged that he might have made a mistake. The bishops did not act until 1902, while Haynes said that the long delay "gave time for the ecclesiastical machine, headed by the Nashville *Christian Advocate*, to accomplish its purposes of defense of the parties involved." The 1902 General Conference did not demand the resignation of either the book agents or the book committee, despite the fact that perhaps all observers in 1898 would have expected that Barbee and Smith would be casualties. Cannon's bold minority report at the 1902 General Conference—barred from the official reports and connectional organs—laid out a thorough statement of various facts in the case. Fearing that his copy of Cannon's report was the only one to survive for future historians, Haynes reprinted it as the appendix to his autobiography years later. So important was the case to Haynes that he would give Cannon the last word in his autobiography.¹⁶

While Barbee remained defiant, Stahlman went on the offensive. While Court extenuation of Court errors is a sufficient explanation of the conduct of Hoss and the bishops, it is possible they also feared a litigious Stahlman. At General Conference at Dallas, Cannon had read aloud his minority report. At the end of his more than hour-long address, Hoss stood and told the body that he so feared a libel suit that he would not serve as editor of the proceedings for the day Cannon's report was to appear. The publisher likewise refused to print it. Cannon had to print copies personally and distribute them to the delegates. But Hoss was no neutral party and this fear of libel suits may have been a secondary motive to squashing the controversy. The venom of the Hoss-Cannon feud may also have been sufficient rationale. Cannon's biographer

¹⁶ Hohner, *Prohibition and Politics*, 33. Martin, *Hoss*, 193-195. NCA September 8, 1898 Hoss v. Cannon; Haynes reprinted Cannon's report as its own chapter in his autobiography, Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, (Haynes's comments, 205-211, and Cannon's report, 265-310); Haynes quotation, *Tempest-Tossed*, 209.

reports that Cannon's criticism of Hoss had included an "incidental reference to Mrs. Hoss" that so enraged the belligerent editor that he had to be "physically restrained" to prevent him from "assaulting" Cannon on the floor of the General Conference. Indeed, days later Hoss's son did attack Cannon, who left quietly and unharmed. While this was going on, the delegates had elected the senior Hoss to the episcopacy.

There is stronger reason to believe that Haynes feared a suit. Haynes's brief comments about the war claim in his autobiography years later do not mention the names of Barbee, Smith, or Stahlman. Haynes merely printed Cannon's lengthy report. But Haynes did mention the role of the *Advocate*, and East Tennessee lawyer, "Judge E. C. Reeves," who made "unbrotherly and false" contradictions of Haynes's Senate testimony only after Haynes left and could not answer. Haynes did not further identify Reeves, but Hoss's biographer does, introducing words of praise for the Hoss family by Hoss's "kinsman and lifelong friend, Col. E. C. Reeves." The biographer reports that Hoss and "'Eb' Reeves" shared a "love...like that of David and Jonathan 'e'en down to old age.'" Reeves may have also been offended by Felton's role in the scandal as his views of lay voting rights for women opposed "a female, strutting in the garb of masculinity, [who] takes on boldness in lieu of modesty." The 1902 meeting did not, however, reelect the aging Barbee, at whose death incredibly lengthy extenuations appeared in all the official outlets. Other men under similar circumstances and charged with much lesser offenses had resigned under pressure in order to save the church some measure of embarrassment. D. C. Kelley had in 1888. But Barbee spent the 1898–1902 quadrennium traveling the connection selling books and giving speeches. At retirement, the bishops appointed him Nashville presiding elder.¹⁷

¹⁷ Hohner, *Prohibition and Politics*, 40–41. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 207, 209. Martin, *Hoss*, 29, 58. Reeves quote, John Patrick McDowell, *The Social Gospel in the South: The Woman's Home Mission Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1886-1939* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1982), 132. Stahlman sued Palmore of the *St. Louis*

If the Court continued its stately stumbling despite criticism, Haynes too continued his social and political commentary despite his theological shift to holiness advocacy. Haynes's theological views were more conservative than Hoss's, but his politics remained much more progressive and provocative. For example, Haynes declared in "Reform the Swamp" that the church should attend to "the moral health of social and civic bodies" just as a man whose family members were falling ill due to an adjacent swamp would labor day and night to "reform that pestiferous swamp." In addition to saving the individual sinner, the church should "strive to Christianize the social and civic environments of those whom it would lead to Christ and keep unspotted by the world of surrounding sin."¹⁸

Haynes's adoption of holiness theology in the end did not transform his political views in any substantial way. Like many other observers, religious and not, he grew somewhat more urgent and anxious about national trends throughout the 1890s. Historian Joe Creech asserts that holiness folk were radically countercultural and that they largely "withdrew from the southern public sphere." Yet Haynes' public advocacy—before and after his sanctification experience—

for \$50,000 for libel, "Damage Suits: Stahlman Making It Warm for Editors of Methodist Papers," *Crittenden Press* (Marion, Ky.), May 11, 1899, p. 1. For Tennessee Conference discussion of Barbee's character, Carter, *History*, 286-290. For Barbee (1832-1904), see Carter, *Leaders*, 119-120.

¹⁸ "Reform the Swamp," AO March 4, 1897, p. 1. Same page, several paragraphs about mammonism, including its connection to evangelism. Haynes decried the "reign of the corruptionist" in "Danger Ahead," TM January 21, 1897, p. 1. Haynes praised the advance of international arbitration in "The Great Treaty," AO February 11, 1897, p. 1. In 1895, 6500 suicides nationally, 10,500 homicides, AO February 11, 1897, p. 3. Complaint against corporations and idea that humans serve governments not vice versa, AO March 11, 1897, p. 1. European and American Christianity threatened by "Monarchized Mammon," AO May 27, 1897, p. 1. Haynes celebrated a Baptist who rebuked John D. Rockefeller and called for him to repent, "Unclean Money at Work," AO June 10, 1897, p. 1. Hoss did not believe in reform except by long process of education, "Reform in its practical outcome is the exchange of one set of rascals for another," "Empirical Reform," NCA June 6, 1895, p. 1. Haynes denied that Christianity should be viewed as falling to the realms of "theory or sentiment," when it had ability to shape "the practical forces that move the secular world," TM July 30, 1896, p. 1. Haynes expressly denied the teaching not to mix religion and politics, and urged Christians to vote as they pray for "money greed and political party greed for power are riding rough-shod over all godliness in both our civil and social life." "Telling the Truth," TM June 11, 1896, p. 1. R. N. Price on maintaining a line between moral instruction of the State and political questions, even if it was difficult to know where to place that line. Price also comments on the United Brethren Church, R. N. Price, "Holston Letter," NCA June 6, 1895, p. 3.

fits closely Creech’s description of the ways “evangelical Populists would weave together themes of tyranny, centralization, patriotic millennialism, and anti-Romanism to urge preachers into politics.” Creech found that the Populists and holiness churches did well in the same areas in North Carolina, and that holiness perfectionism, extra-regional ties, rejection of party loyalty and white supremacy, “antcentralization, and common folk emphases, dovetailed well with the reform ethos of Populism.” Christopher Owen similarly found that holiness advocacy in Georgia “appealed to many urban, working class congregations, and Holiness Associations frequently met in such churches.” He also noted that holiness advocacy also found welcome in “factory churches” in “smaller towns, especially mill towns.”¹⁹

Haynes was not an agrarian populist, but rather an ardent third party Prohibitionist, a commitment that tied him closely both to the crusade against alcohol and to women’s causes. Prohibition was not an anxiety about someone enjoying themselves as many claimed. Its aim was to oppose domestic violence, human trafficking, homicide, rape, and public corruption. Even lynching was generally tied to drunkenness. Haynes publicly aligned himself with Frances Willard, and even provided space in the paper for women preachers.²⁰

¹⁹ Creech, *Righteous Indignation*, 20, 38, 143-144, 146. Owen, *Sacred Flame of Love*, 152. Creech notes that scholars have asserted connections between populism and the holiness movement, including Wayne Flynt and David Harrell. 186, n4. The democratic governance of the holiness associations appealed to religionists—Methodists and otherwise—who disliked the bureaucratic trends in Christianity and society. Owen’s suggestion of working class ties in Georgia seems particularly likely. Nazarenes came later to the southeastern coastal states, but they and the Wesleyan Church had success in later decades in the mill towns in the western piedmont of the Carolinas, North Georgia, and northern Alabama (roughly the Interstate 85 corridor today), much of that area fitting the upcountry region identified by Randall Stephens.

²⁰ This study suggests few ties between holiness advocacy and the People’s Party in the South. Most ties were more rhetorical than substantive, e.g., both groups appealed to and were inspired by similar ideals and ideologies, but had little actual cooperation. Haynes printed a series of letters from a woman holiness evangelist, Mary McGee Snell, who was preaching at Wilmore, Kentucky, TM July 30, 1896, p. 8. D. C. Kelley opened with prayer, and Haynes introduced Frances Willard during a Sunday afternoon address at the Tabernacle in Nashville, TM December 19, 1895 p. 1. Haynes’s introduction and Willard’s address, TM December 26, 1895 p. 1. Haynes on hospitality of Nashville in welcoming Confederate Veterans, affirmed loyalty to the “reconstructed Union,” and said causes of Civil War included “manifested centralism in government,” “Well Done,” AO July 1, 1897 p. 1. Prohibition

Haynes did comment on the major parties consistently, however, and generally with anti-corruption complaints in mind. Haynes declared of the Democratic Party that it was “corrupt, only corrupt, and that continually.” The two major parties belonged to the saloon, and “a saloon party voter” was as likely to face the “goat” punishment at the judgment as the saloon keeper. Populists also came in for similar critique. Haynes praised both William McKinley and William Jennings Bryan in 1896, however—a good Methodist and a good Presbyterian respectively—as “clean men” of “The Right Kind,” and declared there was “no room for mudslinging in this campaign.”²¹ Beyond praising the two devout candidates, Haynes denied that he had adequate knowledge of the financial issues involving gold and silver to suggest specific remedies. But he warned that “a conflict of classes is upon us,” and declared that “the agricultural and laboring classes in this country are suffering from oppression, an oppression which has been systematically pushed for years past, and the capitalists have been and are the beneficiaries of this oppression.”²²

opposition was quite serious. Sam Jones brother, the evangelist Joe Jones, was attacked after preaching a vigorous sermon at an event sponsored by the WCTU. His assailant was charged with “assault with attempt to kill.” “Tried to Kill Sam Jones’ Brother,” TM July 30, 1896, p. 8. Hoss, Baptist editor E. E. Folk, and B. F. Haynes were the first three to sign statement adopted by body proposing at State Temperance Convention, NCA February 27, 1896, p. 8.

²¹ “Tied Hand and Foot,” TM February 28, 1895, p. 1. “The Coming Fight,” TM May 7, 1896, p. 1. “As Expected,” TM May 14, 1896, p. 1. “The Right Kind,” July 23, 1896, p. 1. Prohibition advocate J. D. Smith declared of the paper that “I thank God that I have one extensively circulated paper in the South through which lovers of good government can freely express themselves on such subjects,” “How Can I Keep Silent,?” TM March 7, 1895, p. 7. Heavy reporting on political items, including foreign policy in Europe, Latin America, and desegregation attempts at home (with an ad for Morphine as a “cure for opium and whisky habits”), TM November 14, 1895, p. 4. Holiness leader Clement Cary wrote that he was a confirmed independent having abandoned the Democratic Party for its complete corruption, “intimidation,” and “bull dozing methods.” “From North Georgia,” TM August 6, 1896, p. 3.

²² “Thoughts for the Thoughtful,” TM September 24, 1896, p. 1. See also bottom-left paragraph of that page discussing labor’s view of the church compared to its view of Jesus. “The Two Schools” of economic thought, one American and pro-labor, the other the “Plutocratic or European system of labor,” TM December 3, 1896, p. 1. Haynes quoted Lincoln in an extended commentary on the 1896 presidential election that viewed it as a contest between two alliances composed of sectional and class commonalities, in short, human need and “free white American labor” in the South and West versus “plutocratic greed” and “the degraded pauper labor of Latin Europe” from in the North and East, “What the Political Campaign Means,” TM October 29, 1896, p. 1. Haynes also wrote an endorsement for Joshua Levering, the Prohibition Party candidate for president, “The Heroic,” TM October 29,

But for Haynes, corruption was a symptom of the overwhelming dominance of the sin of greed in American life. Haynes's commentary on this point was persistent, strident, and abundant. It shaped how he viewed the labor movement, poverty, the Catholic Church, the major parties, immigration, and even church discipline on worldly amusements. It was, in short, the dominant feature of his social critique, and it operated together with Protestant American notions of republican liberties to shape his political views. Greed, plutocracy, autocracy, and corruption were all aspects of one sin-sickness that threatened individual bodies and souls, families and communities, the moral integrity and missional effectiveness of the church, and the entire American political and ideological project.²³

Haynes leveled a direct assault on corporations and "corporate Christians." Whether or

1896, p. 1. As economic conditions generally were improving, Haynes had poverty and justice on his mind. "The fatherhood of God is a great truth," Haynes said, "but the brotherhood of man is just as true. The church will never persuade the poor to believe and practice the first of these until she practices the second with reference to the poor." Another paragraph asserted that "the church will sing in vain to the poor of Beulah land and of the mansions prepared for them as long as she does nothing to abolish laws and conditions which render their existence in this world a pitiless struggle against injustice and outrages which the church is divinely called to abate." The claims of labor also came to Haynes's attention: "when labor is driven to strikes for relief against oppression of unscrupulous monopoly, the church has no right to become more concerned for the maintenance of order than of justice." Haynes declared "it is painful to see men go into spasms of disgust at interruptions of order who have maintained perfect silence and serenity at long continued and systematic butchery of justice and righteousness." TM, August 1, 1895, p. 1. Rejecting "dollarism" among clergy who ask what does it pay and mean in dollars instead of in souls, "Does It Pay?," TM January 9, 1896 p. 1. Haynes, also January 9, 1896 p. 1., "the masses are fast seeing in Christ, the Nazarene carpenter, a friend and a champion. As a wanderer, he was homeless—as an agitator he was despised—as a supreme social reformer, he was persecuted—and as a deliverer he was crucified."

²³ Haynes directly rejected "German socialism," "The Socialism Needed," Tennessee Methodist, January 23, 1896, p.1. Trio of articles "Christ and the Individual," "Christ and the Home," and "Christ and Society," TM December 27, 1894, p. 1. An appeal for altruism "Responsibility for Others" TM November 8, 1894 p. 1. "Tainted Money," Haynes protesting against "Plutocratic money," "coined out of human hardships, suffering and blood." The Christian rich must "realize...that they are not the owners but the trustees of that money, entrusted with it to better human conditions and to place and keep the world in close touch with Christ." TM, December 19, 1895, p. 1. "Purse strings in the pew have a tendency to reach out and tie too many pulpit tongues," TM May 7, 1896, p. 1. Haynes denounced "all methods and measures for the oppression of the poorer classes," and those who criticized him for it occasionally resorted to "rose-colored" defenses of the great pay, posh working conditions, and easy labors of the working classes. Haynes declared "the rights of labor are safe in the hands of the Nazarene Carpenter." "A Horrible Sample," TM May 23, 1895, p. 1. TM December 3, 1896, p. 1. See also, "Christianity and Labor," TM November 26, 1896, p. 3, and R. B. Fitzgerald of Marion, Alabama, "The Only Solution of the Capital and Labor Problem," TM December 3, 1896, p. 2. The need for a ministry educated toward, not away from, "the common toiling millions," AO April 29, 1897, p. 1. On the church and labor, "Stirring Words," May 20, 1897, p. 1.

not corporations had souls, the shareholders who owned them did, and would be held morally accountable for the votes they took. The “convenient abstraction” of corporation, the “corporation conscience,” said Haynes, was “an ingenious trap of the devil.” Those “corporate Christians love the poor on Sunday and ‘sweat-shop’ them to death on Monday,” he said. Militarism and vanity spending were criticized. Southern plutocracy caused the American Civil War, as “chattel slavery” produced wealth envied by the North that now extenuated for its own plutocracy, “the wage-slave system.”²⁴

Haynes’s views of African Americans meanwhile were fundamentally paternalistic. He lived his adult life within a nearly all-white denomination. It might be reasonable to describe him for his day as on the progressive side of moderate, neither a racial conservative nor a true racial liberal. Among elite MECS clergy, his positions were progressive, and more so than Fitzgerald or Hoss. Yet that progressivism did not lead Haynes to embrace the progressive

²⁴ “Too Many Consciences,” TM February 13, 1896, p. 1. Haynes, like Hoss and Candler among others, despised football for its barbaric violence and the quick grip it was gaining college campuses, e.g., “Too Late,” occasioned by a brawl at a University of Nashville v. Vanderbilt University football game, TM November 19, 1896, p. 1, “The Pagan Sport Must Go,” TM December 10, 1896, p. 1. Haynes also objected to sports-oriented collegiate experience generally declaring that the Master of Arts should be replaced with degrees like the “M.B.K.—Master of Ball Kicking.” TM November 29, 1894 p. 1. On municipal government, “if every city had a Parkhurst and a Roosevelt this republic would have solved... municipal misgovernment,” TM August 15, 1895 p. 1. Haynes a full-throated protest against, “Militarism,” and its threat to liberty (via potential plutocratic coup) as seen in proposal to extend uniformed military drill in public schools, TM May 28, 1896, p. 1. On the same page, “Against Public Good,” concerned about alcohol and federal excise law, supported restricted Catholic immigration (only 3 of the 100 cities over 100,000 in population had a majority native-born in habitants, Haynes reports) and contrasted “Roman” and “European” with “American” and “Protestant,” and a bill that transferred over \$6,000,000 in public funds to Catholic organizations in Washington, D. C., in violation of separation of church and state. Hoss on immigration, concerned about “the evils of Continentalism,” “What Shall We Do With Them?,” NCA June 4, 1896, p. 1. Haynes opposed to militarism as merely part of “Plutocracy’s Bold Move,” TM October 15, 1896, p. 1. Haynes on plutocracy, the rum power, and the papal power that defeated an immigration bill (with the help of President Cleveland’s veto), “The Trinity of Foes,” AO April 1, 1897, p. 1. On French moral decline, and the Good Citizenship Convention in Nashville, AO May 6, 1897, p. 1. TM October 8, 1896 p. 1, Haynes asks “Is it Christianity that has taught” American women spend six times more on kid gloves than foreign missions, and “that moves” women spend as much on “ostrich and other bird feathers” for their hats as the nation gives to mission work? An even stronger attack from Haynes, that argues southern “chattel slavery” was the first American manifestation of “Plutocracy,” “the devil-god of this age,” and which, because of its “domineering supremacy” in national life, “provoked” the envy of the North to uproot “the slave system.” It was defended by “the Southern pulpit and press” just as the northern pulpit and press now defend their version—“the wage-slave system”—of “Plutocracy,” TM October 8, 1896 p. 1.

‘scientific racism’ of his day. Haynes held that black lives were valuable and had the full potential that white lives did. Weaknesses were not ontologically or genetically binding, but the result of conditions or nurture. He further acknowledged that animosity existed between the races in the South, and that white animosity toward black southerners sustained much of that tension. He usually did not drag white northerners into the discussion as provocateurs of white southern animosity. Even hints of Confederate memory only rarely appeared in the columns of his paper, much less than with Fitzgerald or Hoss.

But on the other hand, like most of his contemporaries Haynes did not think African Americans were yet ready to assume voting rights *en masse*. He was an advocate and celebrant of black uplift and white charitable work toward meeting what he understood to be the qualifications for voting, i.e., literacy and reading habits generally. He likely underestimated how much progress had already been made in literacy among African Americans. His views were generally typical of white southern progressive reformers; Jim Crow was an urban reform in this view. It was progress, not a rural regression. Its aim, in this view, was to suppress racial violence by separating the races and furthering clean government by removing ill-qualified voters whose poverty made them a ready target for political bribes and extortion. It seemed to many a reasonable and progressive solution to widespread racial violence, and to political corruption fomented by moneyed interests.²⁵

²⁵ In his antebellum youth, large percentages (c. 20%) of MECS membership were African American. Those numbers fell to less than a miniscule 1000 members by the 1890s. Indeed, by the time he joined the Tennessee Conference in 1873, the mass exodus of African American members out of the MECS to the MEC and African American Methodisms had *already* happened. There were *vastly* more Native American members in the MECS than there were African American members in the MECS during his active years. Haynes frequently and aggressively condemned lynching. For examples of his anti-lynching commentary: Haynes condemned lynching, generally without mentioning directly the crime supposedly committed. He condemned lynching as murder, and extended that criminality to any crowd that observed it. He rarely used the term “fiend,” even more rarely used that term with a racial identifier as was common in that day, e.g. ‘black fiend.’ Rarely did he write the typical two paragraphs—one decrying lynching, the other decrying rape—and he never declared lynching justified. Haynes did not question the

Haynes's paternalism came with both concern and condescension. Responding to a report to the South Carolina Medical Association, Haynes lamented the staggeringly high infant mortality rate among African Americans. Declaring "the colored people are among us and have a future with us," Haynes mourned the effects of "immorality, poverty, and disease." The negro "has his faults," said Haynes, "but he has a great many more misfortunes and infirmities, and many excellencies of character, and his history and traditions and conditions appeal tenfold more to our sympathy and forbearance than to our censure." Haynes hoped that "we are far enough away from the heat and bitterness of the war for their natural distrust of us, and our smarting under defeat and losses" to enable effective cooperation in ministry. He expressed "unspeakable contempt" for the "sentiment" that "applauds and apotheosizes" whites in foreign missionary work but "ostracizes cruelly" whites devoted to "uplift of this race at home." Haynes concluded with an appeal for Paine and Lane Institutes, whose financial need was "a crying reproach to us as a church." The president of Augusta, Georgia's Paine, "that polished, scholarly Southern gentleman, Rev. George Williams Walker," Haynes loved and honored "with peculiar tenderness and depth," as he did "the heroic, consecrated Sanders" in charge at Lane in Jackson, Tennessee. Haynes said "we are not doing our duty by these people. We are ashamed of our negligence in the matter." "Let the church rally to these institutions," said Haynes, for "we cannot be true to

rightness of capital punishment, but lynching was always wrong, always an enemy of (Christian) civilization. But he did assume what most did in that period, that lynching of African Americans was often a response—unlawful, barbaric, and immoral in Haynes's view—to acts of rape against white women committed by African Americans. He believed what the papers reported, that the crime of rape was rapidly becoming more frequent. An urban southerner of the Upper South living in Nashville from 1887 to 1898, Haynes rarely commented on the urban 'reforms' related to Jim Crow and voting restrictions. His extra-regional travels in the Eastern US were almost entirely confined to large northern cities. Haynes's commentary on lynching almost always referred to rural and small town lynchings, and personal descriptions of Haynes might suggest that he was too cultured and urbane to have close knowledge of actual conditions beyond urban and county-seat town America in which he lived almost his entire life. There is some reason to believe he kept out lynching commentary that was not specifically invited (the latter a very rare occurrence). It appeared on page one from his own hand, not by way of news report or commentary from other sources. This was likely an attempt on his part to avoid furthering any sensationalized, salacious, or hysteria-inducing crime reports as were so common in the secular press of that day.

God and untrue to the neediest of his creatures.”²⁶

Between the episcopal election of anti-holiness aggressors Candler and Hoss and the scandal over the MECS war claim, the events of 1898 further dampened holiness optimism concerning MECS futures. But Haynes received mixed signals. In October, after months of being excoriated for his role in breaking the war claim story, Bishop Key appointed Haynes to the pastorate in Lebanon, Tennessee. Haynes had received nominal appointments in 1896 and 1897, assigned as an assistant to the church his family attended, Hobson’s Chapel in East Nashville. That arrangement provided no income but left him free to remain editor of the paper. The county-seat station was Haynes’s first full-time formal assignment to pastoral work in nearly ten years. More impressively, Lebanon was a good assignment otherwise, nearly elite or

²⁶ “The Colored Race,” TM June 13, 1895, p. 1. See also paragraph comment, TM November 7, 1895, p. 1. Haynes quoted Charles M. Sheldon of Topeka, Kansas (his novel *In His Steps: What Would Jesus Do?* appeared that year), C. H. Phillips of the CME Church, and *Harper’s Magazine* in support of the idea that despite the ravages of slavery, intentional evangelistic and educational efforts, including those of Methodism, were beneficial to the religious and moral life of African Americans. These positives were quickly being undone in younger generations “coming in contact with the prevailing and aggressive vices of the day.” Haynes further argued that southern whites were “practically kindlier disposed to the negro than are the Northern whites,” noting that a colony of Grand Army men and their families in Fitzgerald, Georgia had voted to ban all African Americans from the town, a “proscriptive spirit” that he thought was not indicative of white southern views. “Telling the Truth,” TM June 11, 1896, p. 1. A similar reaction to Sheldon from E. H. Pearce (Winchester, Ky.), “An Article and An Article,” NCA May 28, 1896, p. 5?. Citing papers from Massachusetts regarding the poor treatment of African Americans, Haynes defended disfranchisement as “self-defense against African ignorance and low civilization... the negro is now getting in the South all the political rights [the context suggests voting rights, specifically] that safe civil government warrants,” “The Negro in New England,” TM August 20, 1896, p. 1. Two weeks later Haynes made it clear that he opposed the “wholesale negro enfranchisement” after the war, but declared that African Americans had more preparations for good citizenship than “the average importation of Latin Europe,” against which they were a labor bulwark. He called for greater emphasis on their educational and religious life, saying “give the negro the schoolhouse and the church, and he will give back in return a good stewardship of himself as a citizen,” “The South and the Colored Man,” TM September 3, 1896, p. 1. In contrast, referring to the Wilmington racial violence and lynchings in 1898, Hoss was much less optimistic about any potential advancement for African Americans, saying “not in a thousand years” would they reach equality “man for man” with whites. Hoss further declared “they will never again have a controlling interest in the Southern States. That Question is settled.” “Why the Difference,” NCA December 1, 1898, p. 2. Haynes disagreed with AME Bishop Turner who called for blacks to arm themselves and shoot accurately in response to lynchings, “Bad Advice,” AO April 1, 1897, p. 1. Urbana, Ohio lynching, AO, June 17, 1897 p. 1. On African Americans and labor, AO July 8, 1897, p. 1. Haynes printed CME Bishop Isaac Lane’s appeal for the construction funds for Lane Institute, TM, January 24, 1895, p. 2. Lane reported that all the bishops had pledged \$25 except Galloway’s \$15 and Haygood, who pledged \$5. Sam Jones pledged \$870. A rare issue from Haynes with sectional overtones or disputing, AO June 3, 1897, p. 1.

‘plumb,’ and a surprisingly exceptional one for a holiness advocate in the 1890s. The appointment could be seen as a benevolent attempt on the part of Bishop Key – a known holiness adherent – to restore Haynes in purse and reputation.²⁷

But the appointment had another effect that may also have been intended by Key. Haynes’s troubles with Methodist leadership had been primarily related to his work as editor of the *Methodist/Outlook*, not to his preaching or pastoral service. A move to Lebanon – about 30 miles east of Nashville – would strain but not quite prevent his editorial and book subscription business, all of which was based on Union Street in downtown Nashville. Before 1889, Haynes had done well pastoring at Springfield, Gallatin, and Pulaski, other similar mid-state county seat congregations. He grew up in such a church at Franklin. It is possible that Key hoped to get Haynes to drop the paper in hopes of restoration through the pastorate. Haynes recalled that he packed up his family and moved to Lebanon that fall “with the settled purpose of spending the remainder of my days in regular pastoral work.” But he also retained his home in Nashville and his publishing efforts.²⁸

²⁷ Smaller and more remote town/rural appointments and urban mission appointments were much more common for holiness preachers than county-seat or established urban churches. While the former were the lowest-paying appointments, some of those locations were – in the bishops’ minds – the most likely places where holiness advocates might receive welcome. Certainly bishops did punish via the appointment system. But in some cases, i.e. with *some* bishops, a bishop might have intended to find a reasonable place for a controversial but competent preacher to land. Urban missions often proved more welcoming, and frequently became the special province of holiness clergy that did not travel widely in evangelistic ministry. Urban mission assignments in the ME churches were low hanging fruit – appointments for young men just cutting their teeth, or for old men winding down. But holiness adherents found themselves with a more receptive audience there and bishops more than willing to send them to low-paying, low-prestige duties for which there was little competition. But as Tim Smith noted “such missions inevitably produced a class of converts who could not feel at home in stylish downtown congregations.” Smith in Bucke, *History of American Methodism*, 625. Mid-state holiness leader Lewis Powell said “the holiness people in Nashville are poor.” TM December 3, 1896, p. 8. The Haynes family attended Hobson’s Chapel from 1889 to 1898, beginning during his time as P.E. for the East Nashville district.

²⁸ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 224. The Haynes family lived in the district parsonage, while presiding elder W. T. Haggard and his wife took up boarding with a Mrs. Combs. *Lebanon Democrat*, November 3, 1898 p. 5. Haynes had produced no shortage of commentary on pastoral work during the gap in pastoral assignments, and had continued to think seriously about the nature of pastoral ministry. Pastoral advices and commentary on topics such as ministry, preaching, marriage, children, pastoral instruction and baptism, the death of a child, women’s

Haynes proved a successful pastor once again at Lebanon. He reported that finances were up with all collections paid in full. He said “about four-hundred conversions, sanctifications, and

contributions and education, aging and the life cycle, the importance of history for contemporary ministry, and human suffering were salient features of Haynes’s editorial pages. While much less frequently, Hoss also addressed some of these themes, especially those related to marriage, children, and death. The delicate issue of how to lead a seeker to conversion, “Final Step,” TM, March 28, 1895, p. 1. “Power in the Pulpit,” TM May 16, 1895, p. 1. “Intelligent, faithful, efficient sextons are an unknown class. If ever such existed it was in ages of which no history has been preserved,” TM June 4, 1896, p. 1. MECS law prohibited admitting as members persons who had not been baptized, NCA February 28, 1895 p. 5. Using godly means in pastoral ministry, “The True Attractive Force,” TM September 6, 1895, p. 1. “The tongue aflame with altar fire is the tongue to declare the unsearchable riches of Christ,” TM January 9, 1896 p. 1. Several nuggets of piety July 23, 1896, p. 1, e.g., “That sovereign truth, the ‘ministry of the Spirit’ is a pulpit theme that grows fresher and never thread-bare by use. The more you feed on it, the more basketfuls remain.” TM July 23, 1896, p. 1. “The secret worm of indulged sin, if left alone, will eat Christ right out of the soul.” TM July 23, 1896, p. 1. See also, “He Is At Our Door,” that announced “God is in controversy with His people at this day,” TM July 2, 1896, p. 1, and an affirming response, D. W. Foster, “An Open Letter,” TM July 23, 1896, p. 2. Warm-hearted piety and confidence, and evidence Haynes was postmillennial in the summer of 1896, “Its Type,” TM July 30, 1896, p. 1. Haynes held that Christian history provided great inspiration for those seeking revival and renewal in the present, “We Owe the Past Much,” TM January 23, 1896 p. 1. Haynes calling for self-emptying prayer: “To your knees, oh Israel!,” “The Tongue of Fire,” TM December 19, 1895, p. 1. Haynes on his first ministry assignment at Big Bottom on the Tennessee River in 1873 (the Tennessee, Duck, and Buffalo rivers all crossed his circuit), meeting with W. R. Lambuth and other clergy in St. Louis, reporting on Texarkana, and feeling pensive about growing older when observing his 43rd birthday, “Editorial Correspondence,” TM November 8, 1894, p. 1. On children, family, and marriage, see Haynes’s sermon, “A Plea for the Higher Education of Girls,” AO June 24, 1897 p. 1, 8. Women’s advancement, “A True Advance,” Haynes said “woman has unquestioned right to knock at every door of human endeavor, and all doors should swing wide open to her co-equal fitness with men in achieving and pursuing the general weal of humanity,” AO July 1, 1897 p. 1. Direct instructions to children from Haynes, “Words with Our Pets,” TM January 16, 1896 p. 1 [masthead typos with an incorrect year appeared throughout January]. Entire page of letters received from children address to the paper, TM, January 16, 1896; Haynes affirmed WCTU efforts to secure a curfew for children in Atlanta, as “the home is the place for children and not the streets, especially at night,” AO May 20, 1897, p. 1. Sam Jones on love and marriage, AO, June 24, 1897 p. 3. A report on Haynes’s eldest, Maude Haynes, who returned to Nashville from Boston having graduated with high honors from a school of expression, and being in demand as a reader. (a reprinted report from the Nashville *American* of May 14, 1896), TM May 21, 1896, p. 4. Haynes’s praise for Miss Sallie Belle Thornton upon her wedding, TM January 21, 1897, p. 5. A touching death announcement for an almost seven year old girl named Rubie, AO March 11, 1897, p. 7. Complaint about Sunday-Sabbath bicycle-riding craze among youth, “The Spinning Evil,” AO June 17, 1897, p. 1. “To Boys of Sixteen,” NCA August, 8, 1895, p. 1. Jones about the welfare of young men, TM February 28, 1895, (page illegible). Haynes, “A Word to Girls and Boys,” TM August 22, 1895, p. 1. “A Word to Girls,” TM December 5, 1895, p. 1. See Jones’s “Letter to His Critics,” mostly a mini sermon against immodesty, including the practice of groups of young men ogling women coming out of public buildings like churches and theatres, TM December 19, 1895, p. 8. Poignant reflection on the quick passing of time, urge to live without regret, every home in the process of passing away, “A Memory,” TM December 26, 1895, p. 1. “To the Boys and Girls,” TM January 9, 1896, p. 1. A note from Haynes TM, January 23, 1896 p. 1 : “the Bible has some meanings, written with invisible ink, that have to be held before the fire of suffering, before they will reveal themselves.” Hoss had very rare weeks when he suppressed his native censoriousness and devoted page 1 to positive uplifting commentary. For example, September 3, 1896, p.1 where Hoss included two items on friendship, three items on family, one on the education of boys, one that warned parents not to be rude to their children, and another on “Conversation in the Home,” NCA September 3, 1896, p. 1. He also ruminated on “The Value of History,” NCA September 3, 1896, p. 1. Hoss despised a publicly scolding wife, NCA June 11, 1896, p. 1. Hoss did chide authors to edit closely their own submissions, but those instructions were commonplace for editors at the time, and in this case, his advice was both practical and useful. Positive statement from Hoss on marriage, NCA May 9, 1895, p. 1.

reclamations” occurred “directly or indirectly” through the work at Lebanon that year. The Lebanon people told him his report at conference the next year was the best report ever given for Lebanon, and Haynes said that spiritually the year had seen “the best results that ever attended my ministry.” The town and surrounding area was “inundated” with “pungent and wide-spread conviction.” On his visits with families, even small children with little or no prompting would begin weeping and kneel to seek salvation. Leila O. Stratton, wife of a prominent local banker, was sanctified and became a notable evangelist. A holiness prayer meeting took place every Friday that was “always an occasion of people getting through to God.” Haynes declared further that while he was pastor “the holiness movement at Lebanon was...held strictly under the fostering care of the Methodist Church.”²⁹

Judging from reports from the *Lebanon Democrat*, Haynes had not overstated the religious fervor. In April 1899, the *Democrat* reported that the evangelist H. C. Morrison held a

²⁹ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 224-225. While complaining of the abuse heaped upon Dr. Barbee for the war claim scandal (Barbee’s character was passed at the same conference that saw Haynes sent to Lebanon), the editor of the *Lebanon Democrat* greeted news of Haynes’s appointment on October 27, 1898 with the comment he “is said to be a fine preacher.” “New Methodist Pastor,” *Lebanon Democrat*, October 27, 1898 p. 4. The next week he reported that the congregation was “much pleased” with Haynes after two “strong” sermons on his first Sunday. *Lebanon Democrat*, November 3, 1898, p. 5. The holiness movement had broader rhetorical support than Haynes’s accounts noted. In January, northern Presbyterian evangelist Wilbur F. Chapman held three services in Lebanon after a two week meeting in Nashville. Backed by the faculty of Cumberland University and the Cumberland Presbyterian church, Chapman devoted a sermon to “the Baptism of the Holy Ghost,” and testified that he had received the “fullness” in 1892. “The Great Divine,” *Lebanon Democrat*, January 26, 1899 p. 1. Chapman’s sermon suggested that entire sanctification was possible at regeneration, but that it was often not received at that time. In May the Christian Church, also holding revival services, heard “Elder White” preach on “the Bible doctrine of sanctification.” *Lebanon Democrat*, May 18, 1899, p. 5. On women in ministry, see “Woman’s place in the church” by T. A. Kerley (largely hinting toward progressive) *TM* February 20, 1896 p. 2-3. Mrs. W. H. Felton—Rebecca Latimer Felton—loved Kerley’s article, and affirmed that “Susanna Wesley engrafted Methodism on her boys, John and Charles, and the Methodist Church was built on the preaching of women.” Mrs. W. H. Felton, “Woman’s Place in the Church!,” *TM* March 26, 1896, p. 2. Haynes said, “Righteous women have all freedom and right to pull dollars out of the world’s pocket to spread the Gospel, but no freedom and right to pull souls out of the world of sin to spread the Kingdom of Christ; for revenue gain making a mere money-raising convenience out of gifted and consecrated womanhood. That is high-steepled Churchianity, and no lowly Nazarene Christianity. It is greed for gold, and not zeal for God.” *TM*, December 17, 1896 p. 1. See also “Honoring Woman,” (Lady Aberdeen address at University of Chicago), *AO* April 15, 1897, p. 1. Same page, reference to Helen Kellar (sp?). One holiness adherent defended Wesley’s obedient openness to innovation, R. A. Foster, “John Wesley and the Woman Question,” *TM* September 12, 1895, p. 2-3. For a supportive account of a woman preaching at a Cumberland Presbyterian church, “Grant Meeting,” *Lebanon Democrat*, August 3, 1899 p. 7.

“remarkable” series of services at Haynes’s church that saw “numbers” of conversions, “many” wandering “christians... reclaimed,” and “not a few” professions of entire sanctification. Estranged friends and families were also “reunited.” J. O. McClurkan (frequently spelled ‘McClurkin’ in these reports) and a “Rev. Mr. Brown of Mississippi” took over evangelist duties as Morrison went to Nashville. The holiness approach to preaching contrasted with some of their opponents’ styles. Hoss, while arguing against enthusiasm and “ecstatic height of emotional fervor,” declared “that the Christian religion is designed above all things to secure the regulation of conduct.”³⁰

The July-August 1899 holiness camp meeting at nearby Horn Springs drew even greater interest than the April meeting had, and sparked heavy commentary. Reports noted the behavior of the model crowd—“quiet, attentive, and large”—that came to the meetings led by McClurkan. A decade younger than Haynes, the rural Houston County native McClurkan came home to Tennessee after successful Cumberland Presbyterian pastorates in Texas and California. A holiness advocate brought into the experience under Beverly Carradine, McClurkan organized an

³⁰ *Lebanon Democrat*, April 27, 1899 p. 5, and April 20, 1899, p. 5. The editor did not capitalize “christians.” Haynes also preached in other Methodist churches in the area, and opened his own pulpit to Methodist clergy without strong ties to holiness advocacy, *Lebanon Democrat*, July 6, 1899, p. 5. Hoss quote, NCA June 18, 1896, p. 1. An account of Hoss’s preaching said “we listened for one hour to another logical and interesting sermon,” TM September 3, 1896, p. 5. For revival as theme and practice, see “Reinforcements,” “A Great Meeting” (Jamison), and “The Tent Meeting” (McClurkan), TM September 3, 1896, p. 1. Haynes introduced a new corner of page one for reports of revivals entitled “Fire Falling.” Haynes declared that “The Methodism that is not evangelizing and revivalistic, but is staked off and stationed into self-ease and self righteous deadness, does not bear the orthodox and aggressive Wesleyan stamp,” “Her Power,” TM August 6, 1896, p. 1. Haynes also denied that “numbers and wealth and high social caste...cathedral buildings and high-priced professional choristers...machinery and officialism...pulpit scholarship and pew culture” were “the might of Methodism,” but rather “Holy Spirit power” that enabled “its theology of repentance and free grace and undying love [to] be sin-conquering and world-conquering.” A lengthy account of holiness revival activity drawn from multiple sources, “Fire Falling,” TM August 20, 1896, p. 8. See also from a skeptic turned defender, if not adherent, by “An Old Steward,” “Talk from an Old Methodist,” TM September 3, 1896, p. 2. Haynes’s passionate testimonial of a revival at Cowles’s Chapel—“the happiest ten days in the writer’s ministerial life”—where after much initial resistance, “salvation rolled like great billows.” “A Great Meeting,” TM March 5, 1896 p. 1. Felix Johnson preaching at Bethesda Circuit including reports of his family, TM August 27, 1896, p. 8. Haynes with Beverly Carradine and musician Dr. Reinhart at a holiness revival meeting in Erin, Tennessee TM November 12, 1896, p. 8.

independent ‘undenominational’ ministry called the Pentecostal Alliance (later the Pentecostal Mission) at Tulip Street MECS in 1898. Haynes was briefly a member of the founding executive board, along with other Methodists and both Cumberland and Southern Presbyterians.

McClurkan shared Haynes’s high expectations for the Christian life, and the same low view of the spiritual vitality of the average, “‘back-slidden,’” Protestant church-member. The *Lebanon Democrat* celebrated the “genuine revival of old-time religion,” (if not quite accepting holiness doctrine per se), and noted that “Mrs. B. F. Haynes is attending.”³¹

Reports of the meeting were glowing, but quickly elicited complaint from a minority of well-placed townfolk. Given reports that even the teenagers had been well-behaved, the critical attitude of “people whom it seemed would be above the least misconduct” incensed the editor of the *Democrat*. At least six separate defenses of the holiness meeting appeared in the paper. The complaints were “hard to explain,” the editor said, declaring “we say amen to their labors and down with their critics.” The ecumenical spirit of the people and “the way some of these women can pray” encouraged him. He had never seen such a revival of religion in Wilson County, despite what he thought was a little too much “reproach” for average members and “contempt” for old churches, “dead though [they] be” from McClurkan. As the meeting expanded to tent services in town, the editor said the “whole hill about the old preparatory department” was overwhelmed with people, horses, and carriages for the meeting. He announced the revival was “genuine and spiritual. Let everybody welcome it.” “The back of my hand to the carping critic who opposes it,” declared the editor, who published a defense of “the holiness people” from Sam Jones on page one the next week. The editor further added that “some people” were “scared to

³¹ On Horn Springs (about four miles out in the country from Lebanon), *Lebanon Democrat*, July 13, 1899, p. 1 and p. 5 (two items). *Lebanon Democrat*, June 29, 1899 p. 5. Haynes on the interdenominational flavor of the holiness movement, “Not Denominational,” *AO*, January 28, 1897, p. 1.

death” of the words “holiness” and “sanctification,” and said “the leading members of the churches in Lebanon are not giving this meeting...[the] support which it deserves.” He noted that S. M. Cherry, Rev. Willie Jones, and Mrs. McClurkan were preaching to “the colored people,” with Martha Frances “Fannie” McClurkan preaching on Sunday morning at the tent.

Another defender, “a country man” named W. E. Bell, announced that he had “never seen or heard nothing that justifies the odium and offense” expressed by critics. Rather than “fanatics,” the “culture and refinement” of the leaders, especially Mrs. McClurkan, deserved an “amen.” As the meeting closed August 10, 1899, the editor praised the McClurkans and several male and female lay leaders individually before announcing “I have never seen any people live so close to the Master, or talk to him and about him so much.” “They are,” he said, “the happiest lot of people I have ever seen in all my life.”

Haynes’s account at the time in *Zion’s Outlook* was reprinted at considerable length by the *Democrat*. Haynes praised Lebanon for its characteristic hospitality and the universal and unusual good behavior of its youth at the meeting. He noted that rude opponents were “lonesome as they were lamentable,” as nearly every opponent of holiness doctrine was still “catholic, broad, and christian.” Haynes wrote that a Friday night service for young women saw a tremendous response, begun when two fifteen-year-old girls came forward to pray and answer the call to urban and/or foreign missionary service. Twenty more young women followed them. “It was morally sublime,” said Haynes, and made such an impression that “a holy awe rested” on those watching. He added that “strong men wept and walked homeward at the close of the service in silence and solemnity.” Haynes announced that ten acres a mile out of town had been

purchased and \$500 raised for the construction of camp grounds and tabernacle on the site.³²

Whatever the locals and the editor thought of the holiness efforts in Lebanon, Haynes's presiding elder, W. T. Haggard, and a handful of Methodist laity, were not pleased. They shared their complaints with the new presiding bishop in 1899, Bishop Galloway. Despite rapid growth in members and reports of revival, Galloway told Haynes "you have ruined our church at Lebanon." Haynes protested that the bishop had not heard from the majority of members, but Galloway would not reconsider. Haynes told Galloway that they would revisit the matter "at the judgment." Galloway then sent Haynes to Trinity church in Nashville, a congregation paying only \$200 and one that that, being devoted to J. D. Barbee, loathed Haynes. Trinity refused to receive him, and Haynes offered to have no appointment for 1899–1900. Haynes's successor at Lebanon, no doubt sent to root out the holiness infection, drove holiness adherents out of the church and out of Methodism before he was arrested, tried, and convicted for arson and perjury in an attempt at insurance fraud.³³

The brief restoration to pastoral work at Lebanon had several effects. Haynes's book subscription business suffered such that the move to Lebanon, despite the pastoral salary of perhaps \$1000 being paid in full, actually hurt him financially. Even the local paper reported his occasional absences from Lebanon to attend business in Nashville. Meanwhile, his move out of Nashville opened the door for new resident leadership among holiness adherents in the city. The rise of the Pentecostal Alliance under McClurkan—and its rapid movement toward an

³² "The Camp Meeting," *Lebanon Democrat*, July 20, 1899 p. 1. "The Revival," *Lebanon Democrat*, July 27, 1899, p. 1. (Sam Jones) "Second Blessing," *Lebanon Democrat*, August 3, 1899, p. 1. During part of the revival, Haynes would have been away attending the Lebanon district conference at Livingston. "The Revival Continues," *Lebanon Democrat*, August 3, 1899, p. 8. W. E. Bell, "As a Country Man Sees It," *Lebanon Democrat*, August 3, 1899, p. 8. "The Revival Closes," *Lebanon Democrat*, August 10, 1899, pp. 1, 8.

³³ Timothy L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, pp. 44-45. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 226-229. *Lebanon Democrat*, February 2, 1899, p. 5. The financial strength of Tennessee Conference churches, TM November 21, 1895, p. 5.

independent denomination—coincided with Haynes’s absences from Nashville from 1898–1899 and 1900–1908. McClurkan’s organization centered on the large urban holiness congregation that eventually became Nashville First Church of the Nazarene. But as early as 1901, McClurkan’s growing regional network was already ordaining ministers, had acquired *Zion’s Outlook* from Haynes, founded Trevecca College, and was supporting missionaries to China, Sudan, Congo, and India. After Haynes’s death fewer and fewer would even associate his name with holiness advocacy in Nashville. In later memory, the importance of McClurkan’s role in fostering holiness advocacy in Tennessee has lost some context in the varied ministries of Methodist clergy who preceded him, including earlier efforts in the Memphis Conference. Haynes’s old Nashville paper folded in the 1910s, as fleeting as the paper it was printed on, but McClurkan’s Nashville congregation and college have dominated the southeastern area of the Nazarene denomination. But Nazarenes’ monthly Tennessee district newsletter would be named *The Tennessee Nazarene*, a distant and unrecognized echo of Haynes’s *Tennessee Methodist*.³⁴

³⁴ William J. Strickland with H. Ray Dunning, *J. O. McClurkan*. (Nashville: Trevecca Press, 1998), 19-48. In later years, Haynes said that the holiness movement came to middle Tennessee in 1894. Later interpreters have truncated that to “came to Tennessee” in the mid-1890s. However, T. L. Boswell (1816-1898), the leading holiness advocate in the Memphis Conference, was defending holiness as loyal to Methodism and offering that its critics “come and see” as early as the late 1880s. Also, holiness expansion into middle Tennessee included areas along the boundary between the Tennessee (Middle Tennessee) and Memphis Conference (West Tennessee and the Jackson Purchase region of Kentucky). Many of these areas were likely at least influenced by Memphis Conference holiness efforts under Boswell where a “Tennessee Holiness Association” and a “Wesleyan Theological Society” were created. See “Holiness Association,” by T. L. Boswell, NCA July 12, 1890 p. 3. See the warm and entirely positive eulogy of Boswell by the Memphis Conference in 1898. Minutes of the Memphis Annual Conference. His eldest son was John W. Boswell who was assistant editor of the NCA from 1894 to 1900 under Hoss. Martin, *Hoss*, 199. Abundant items related to holiness activity in the Memphis Conference appeared in the late 1880s NCA. See defense of holiness advocates against charges of anti-connectionalism, “Tennessee Holiness Association” NCA January 26, 1889 p.4—including names (Dodge, Godbey, Collins, Smith, McDowell, rev. T. P. Sanders and T. L. Boswell of Tennessee) as T. L. Boswell holiness meeting also functioned as a holiness summit, NCA March 9, 1889 p. 7; Another similar item, NCA April 4, 1889, p. 2, where same names mentioned “Come praying for a Pentecost.”; another—Dodge dropped, B. A. Cundiff of Cadiz, Ky. Added, NCA April 11, 1889 p. 5. “West Tennessee and Kentucky Holiness Association,” NCA, April 4, 1889 p. 2. Strong appeal for perfect love from T. L. Boswell, NCA May 16, 1889 p. 17 including its aim. Boswell’s reply to criticism, “Brother Hedgepeth’s Inquiries Answered,” NCA July 11, 1889 p.17 (detailed, including very strong statements); Hedgepeth’s reply (critical of holiness), NCA September 19, 1889 p. 4; Boswell and Hedgepeth debates, “Reply to ‘A Few Inquires’ Noticed,” NCA September 19, 1889 p. 4. For several reports of holiness revivals, seeking sanctification, and two more from Boswell, NCA

The Lebanon experience also allowed Haynes to experience first-hand the ins and outs of life as a holiness pastor within the MECS. It allowed the chance to lead a local movement as pastor, experiences he had seen and reported on in great detail in the paper in previous years. The previous booming revivals in the mid-state area, perhaps especially in Franklin during Lewis Powell's pastorate there, had encouraged Haynes and other holiness advocates as to what could be done. But the experience also reinforced the unwillingness of episcopal leadership to allow holiness pastors to build up a congregational ministry. As Powell had been from Franklin, so too Haynes was moved away from Lebanon, with many of their holiness parishioners scattered by hostile succeeding clergy. Evangelists could reap and sow but only a resident leader could sustain and build up a holiness organization over time. Haynes also saw again the effectiveness with which lay women and men could minister and lead when working with a supportive pastor.

September 19, 1889 p. 5. For Boswell's age, reputation and ties to Fitzgerald, NCA October 10, 1889 p. 9; reputation in conference, NCA October 17, 1889 p.8; for Fitzgerald's opinion of T. L. Boswell as a "considerate man," and "venerable and beloved servant of the church," NCA October 24, 1885 p.8 and NCA January 8, 1887 p. 8. "Holiness Meeting," by T. L. Boswell including aim of association, NCA October 31, 1889 p. 5; also "Notice" of same issue/page regarding holiness meeting in Mississippi. On holiness associations, "A Kentucky Note," by W. B. Godbey and "Kentucky Holiness Association," NCA December 19, 1889 p. 5, the former concluding with "Many sanctified, and not a few converted. God bless the CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE." "Kentucky Holiness Association," by W. B. Godbey and J. S. Keen, NCA July 16, 1887 p. 7 states that "All ministers and laymen whose experience or faith is in accord with scriptural holiness, as taught by Wesley and the official utterances of the Methodist Church, are invited to be present and take part in the services. We also invite brethren who are not in full accord with the Church on this subject to be present to see the working and hear the experience of these Christians. The Association is uncompromisingly opposed to anything like schism in the Church, and will not tolerate it in the meeting. The above invitation includes all denominations... Let the Church pray for a Pentecost." Godbey issued "An Invitation" printed separately to the 1887 meeting in Louisville to the editor and readers of the NCA, "especially the bishops, editors and preachers," NCA July 16, 1887 p. 9. A positive irenic statement on sanctification and need for "higher life," "The Church is Waking Up," by R. H. Mahon, NCA November 7, 1889 p. 2. For criticism of Mahon and holiness associations along connectional lines, including that they represent an abandonment of old prudential means such as the class meeting (that had already died off long before this), "'Sin and Holiness'" by E. E. Hamilton, NCA November 14, 1889 p.3. On the "Wesleyan Theological Society" including speakers and topics "Wesleyan Theological Society" NCA January 26, 1889, p.9. Same title, NCA June 4, 1887 p.14 gives appeal to "every young preacher of the Memphis Conference who expects to make a man and preacher of himself ought to join this society." The group committed themselves to "preach, work, pray and vote for Prohibition." Also "discussed with lively interest" was "should the Methodist Church be more denominational? The conclusions reached were that we should preach more upon the great distinctive doctrines of Methodism, and conform more strictly to the characteristic forms of worship laid down in the Discipline." See also "WTS" again NCA April 4, 1889 p. 9, "WTS" again including a summary of meeting by S. B. Love, NCA July 11, 1889 p. 17, and holiness evangelist C. L. Chilton's note reprinted by NCA with very kind note by the editor NCA November 24, 1888 p. 9.

Yet as much as Haynes and some other MECS holiness leaders might have desired it, the pastoral route to holiness ministry in the MECS was an effective dead end. McClurkan—a Cumberland Presbyterian unthreatened by any MECS episcopal hostility—lived a pastoral dream simply unavailable to Haynes and other MECS holiness stalwarts.³⁵

³⁵ On the revivals in Franklin, Tennessee, see TM March 21, 1895, p. 4., “A Great Revival,” TM April 11, 1895 p. 1 [Carradine], “A Great Meeting,” TM September 6, 1895, p. 1., “A Great Meeting Ended,” TM September 19, 1895, p. 1. MECS preacher H. B. Reams among the Protestant pastors in Franklin who invited Sam Jones and George Stuart to conduct union services at the holiness tabernacle in Franklin, AO April 15, 1897, p. 2. An irenic Haynes on Jones meeting overcoming divisions among Methodists in Franklin, and Haynes compliment to sermon preached by Hoss at Fayetteville, “Editorial Correspondence,” AO April 29, 1897, p. 1. B. F. Haynes’s brother, R. E. Haynes, lived in Franklin. R. E.’s wife died, AO, July 1, 1897 p. 3. See also editorial correspondence regarding the death of Haynes’s sister in law, Edgewood and Erin, Tennessee, and J. O. McClurkan’s wife preaching, AO July 8, 1897, p. 1. Obituary for R. E. Haynes’s wife, AO July 21, 1897, p. 1. On Lewis Powell, TM January 21, 1897 p. 2-3. See also, Lewis Powell, *Life and Service* (Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1918). On early history of Franklin tabernacle, “Tabernacle Cornerstone Reveals Records of ‘90s in Williamson,” from a local Williamson county newspaper clipping in private collection of Franklin United Methodist congregational historian dated September 22, possibly from 1929 (certainly after June 1927). See also reports on revival in Franklin and Powell’s own experience, and mentions J. O. McClurkan and Carradine, Lewis Powell, “The Holiness Movement in Franklin,” TM September 26, 1895, p. 4. McClurkan wrote of meetings at Charlotte and “Clarksville,” TM July 16, 1896, p. 5. On McClurkan, see TM December 3, 1896, p. 4, announcing that McClurkan and family had moved to 95 Meridian Street Nashville, and was conducting meetings at Alexandria, and McEwen, Tennessee. The sanctification testimony of Robert Chenault, TM January 7, 1897, p. 3. McClurkan in Meridian, Mississippi, AO April 22, 1897, p. 5. McClurkan and L. P. Brown in south Nashville, AO June 10, 1897, p. 5. Haynes announced that “the holiness people” of Franklin had purchased a prominent lot “fronting the female college” for the erection of a tabernacle seating at least 1500 people. Haynes hoped that an annual camp meeting would be held there, as well as “annual convocations of representative holiness people from the Southern States.” He announced his hope that East and West Tennessee would also soon have a similar facility for such purposes, “Well Done,” TM March 12, 1896 p. 1. On the Franklin holiness revival from R. N. Richardson that describes the transformations in congregational life and closes with an appeal to the bishop to appoint again the pastor Lewis Powell who was leading the revival, TM October 24, 1895, p. 5. (He was not—demoted to McTyeire Memorial, where he—with C. L. Chilton—was again leading “Holiness Tent Meetings,” said E. T. Rinehart, TM July 2, 1896, p. 5.). The Rev. Dr. E. F. Walker preaching at “Franklin, Tenn., Holiness Tabernacle,” TM September 10, 1896, p. 8. See also “Holiness Meeting in Franklin,” TM September 24, 1896 p. 5. E. M. Bounds supported the holiness movement and Asbury College, “A Campmeeting,” TM September 6, 1895, p. 4. Haynes and W. R. Peebles warmly praised the character and piety of J. S. or John Samuel “Sam” Childers of Pulaski, TM August 6, 1896, p. 1, 5. In the same issue, page 1, Haynes celebrated “Gospel Bicycling” reported among British Methodist that made use of the new invention to conduct evangelistic tours. For revival meetings in Nashville, see “The Holiness Tent,” and A Layman, “The Nashville Holiness Tent,” TM August 27, 1896, p. 5. “A Layman” reported favorably on the ministry of Lewis Powell and J. O. McClurkan, while noting that Mrs. McClurkan “is filled with the Holy Ghost fire, and her success in exhorting and in the altar service is marked.” “Capt. Tom Ryman” and “Sheriff John D. Sharp” both gave \$5 toward the “Holiness Gospel Tent” in Nashville, Lewis Powell, “‘Unto the Lord,’” TM May 7, 1896, p. 5. Subscriptions were to be submitted either to Powell or to Haynes’s brother and office assistant, Thomas E. Haynes at the offices of the *Tennessee Methodist*, TM May 14, 1896, p. 4. They came in heavily from out of state, many in western states, TM May 21, 1896, p. 5. Other preachers included J. W. Bigham of Union City, Tenn., and J. W. Hughes of Asbury College, who preached at the holiness tent in Nashville when it was at the corner of Jefferson and McLemore streets in North Nashville, TM August 6, 1896, p. 1, 5. Haynes said over 1200 conversions and sanctifications during the Nashville holiness tent campaign, TM September 17, 1896, p. 8. For another description of a holiness revival meeting at Liberty with T. A. Carden and Joseph Jamison that included accounts of the spirit and popular reception

Dramatic denominational contests over holiness doctrine and advocacy have obscured for later observers the warm-hearted piety seen in the preaching and worship of holiness revivals. As with the Lebanon editor, many contemporary observers had a very different impression of holiness people after seeing their liturgical life on display. Even cynical opponents noted the intensity and sincerity of holiness piety. J. A. Smith, whose history blamed Haynes and the holiness infection for various mid-state calamities, nonetheless noted that “holiness songs became more popular than the official hymnal, published jointly” by the MEC and MECS in 1905 that supplanted the 1889 MECS hymnal. Holiness and non-holiness Methodists alike had long stressed singing, worship, and prayer as theological acts of first importance. They stressed hymnody as creed, the hymnbook as theological primer, the altar rail as holy place. Methodists believed that they learned their theology first and best by singing that theology, often as prayers set to music.³⁶

But Haynes, as a theologian, did not jettison older traditional theological sources and authorities for new holiness gospel songs or even older hymnals. Indeed, his sanctification experience inspired three of his four published books. The first book was a short devotional and theological primer on *The Sanctified Life* that appeared around 1897. His most extensive work, *Facts, Faith, and Fire; or Chapters on the Situation*, appeared in 1900. Beginning by lamenting the decline of doctrinal preaching, and more than 300 pages long, *Facts* ranged widely from

of the preaching, Carden’s sanctification testimony, and a note that Jamison also preached in a special service for African Americans, see Carden, “The Liberty Meeting,” TM May 7, 1896, p. 5. High praise for Jamison in Benton, MO TM May 28, 1896, p. 4, and Nashville, p. 5. Benton again, TM June 4, 1896, p. 5. Jamison assisted by Mattie Brown and Miss Eaton and Joe Eaton at Cowles’ Chapel “a few miles south of Franklin, Tenn.,” TM September 3, 1896, p. 8. Connections were made with editor and evangelist H. C. Morrison who visited Haynes in Nashville, and an item “Well Said,” that quoted a correspondent of the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* who praised Carradine’s work in Columbus, Georgia and declared none should touch the Lord’s anointed (in this case, Carradine). TM November 28, 1895, p. 1.

³⁶ Smith, *Cross and Flame*, 253-254. Smith says that J. T. Benson might have been more popular in northern Middle Tennessee, but southern Middle Tennesseans preferred the songs of James A. Vaughn of Lawrenceburg.

commentary on ministry, the spiritual state and duties of the church, missionary and evangelistic efforts, including chapters on the “Church and the City,” and “The Rule of Mammon,” to the doctrinal and devotional material that formed nearly half of its content. A second devotional study appeared in 1912 entitled *Beauty for Ashes* (reprinted in 1927 after his death under the title *The Beauty of Holiness*). His last book, an autobiography titled *Tempest-Tossed on Methodist Seas*, appeared in 1914 and again in 1921. General views of holiness advocates often expect them to favor life over creeds, the “margins” over the “center”, the country over the city, and itinerant revivalism over pastoring churches. Yet Haynes urged the use of catechism, contra those who denigrated the need for doctrine—those he called “ecclesiastical anarchists”—not what one would expect from an anti-authoritarian. Nor does Haynes fit other typologies created to explain the holiness movement. Haynes did not engage in widespread itinerant revivalism, nor was he a rural outsider with a marginal relation to power within mainline Methodism.³⁷

Haynes held that theories claiming that entire sanctification was attainable by growth alone and through regeneration alone were “entirely modern...without father or mother, ecclesiastically... orphans, the offspring of Methodist apostasy from her creedal, historic, and original position... [views] unsupported by a single church in this world.” Haynes believed that most people were mistaken about the origins of heterodoxy. Sound creeds were no refuge, for people often read their own definitions into the language of the creeds. Furthermore, heterodoxy was not a disease of the head, but a malady of the heart. “Heterodoxy” begins “in the heart, in spiritual decay.” Neither careful creedal statements nor strict discipline against departures from the faith would serve as effective remedies, for it was the work of the Holy Spirit to guard the

³⁷ B. F. Haynes, *Facts, Faith and Fire or Chapters on the Situation* (Nashville: B. F. Haynes Publishing Co., 1900). 34-35. While *Tempest-Tossed* remains the best single source for Haynes’s narrative, *Facts, Faith, and Fire* is the best short source (aside from newspapers) for his views.

“purity of [the church’s] creed.” Haynes titled his chapter on the topic, with characteristic alliteration, “Pentecost alone perpetuates purity of faith.”³⁸

Haynes decried the “whims of culture” that embraced the “esthetically ethical.” While active men were expected to be driven, emotional, and sensational in their business and professional work, and in their politics and amusements, Haynes said let one show the same “vim” in their religious pursuits, and up came the cry of “fanatics,” and “crank.” It was a satanic deceit that “hotbloodedness” was just fine for “getting and enjoying money,” but in “getting and enjoying religion the heart should be cold-blooded as a snake.” Christian

³⁸ Haynes, *Facts, Faith, and Fire*, 225-226, 256-257. Haynes reminded holiness adherents that the Holy Spirit’s work involved more than that of a sanctifier, and was also an enlightener of the human mind, “A Square Look,” TM November 19, 1896, p. 1. Same page, Haynes commented on the ties between education and holiness in the effective preacher. On keeping the blessing of entire sanctification R. A. Foster, pastor at Chipley Circuit in west Florida, cited Wesley saying that less than one in three retained the blessing, TM December 3, 1896, p. 8. Additional commentary on sanctification included the following. Haynes stressed the connection between criticism of sin and preparing the ground for repentance. No person unaware of their need to be saved would seek either salvation or a savior, said Haynes, and no Christian unaware of a deeper calling would seek a deeper grace. Haynes—who disliked war, football, and boxing—expressed this theological point in a rare violent metaphor: the “old theology hit sin with knuckles that cut conscience to the quick. The new theology uses the padded glove of apology.” TM August 27, 1896, p. 1. In a similar homespun way, Haynes affirmed prayer and the dependence it signified as central: “kneeology is the oldest ology, and the best key to theology.” TM September 3, 1896, p. 1. Haynes defended the historical reach of holiness advocacy in Catholic and other Protestant traditions, “What Shall Be Done With It?,” TM May 21, 1896, p. 1. Haynes reprinted from the *Kentucky Methodist* Bishop Key’s entire sermon “Heart Purity and our Reasons for Urging It,” TM August 6, 1896, p. 2-3. J. W. Cullom experience of being sanctified TM, September 26, 1895, p. 5. “Misunderstood,” TM August 15, 1895, p. 1. J. M. Wright’s review of Bishop Hendrix on sanctification, TM—October 24, 1895, p. 8. “Bishop Soule as a Witness,” TM January 9, 1896, p. 1. “Sin Not Necessary,” TM April 11, 1895, p. 1. For criticism of non-second Methodists like Tillett, Mudge, Boland, and Paul Whitehead as eschewing the Methodist doctrinal tradition, see Rumsey Smithson of Washington, D.C., “The New School of Methodist Theology,” (reprinted from *Richmond Christian Advocate*), TM August 27, 1896 p. 2-3. J. M. Wright, “Sanctification and the Standards,” TM October 3, 1895, p. 2. J. M. Wright, “Mr. Wesley and Sanctification,” TM May 16, 1895, p. 3. Wright praised MEC Bishop Jesse T. Peck’s holiness classic, *The Central Idea of Christianity*, Wright, “Book Reviews,” TM November 21, 1895, p. 3. “God’s Great Desire and Man’s Great Privilege,” TM March 28, 1895 p. 1. According to Haynes, authorities for doctrinal Methodism who affirmed holiness doctrine: Wesley, Adam Clarke, John Fletcher, Richard Watson, McKendree, Soule, Miner Raymond, Wm. Burt Pope, T. O. Summers, John Miley, Thomas N. Ralston, Enoch Marvin, Lovick Pierce, and McTyeire. He noted that those who would flippantly wave off Wesley were also dismissing “*et id omne genus*,” more recent luminaries beloved and revered in recent memory, unlike John Wesley who died 105 years earlier and left America for the last time 160 years before. TM March 5, 1896 p. 1. One particularly bold Zinzendorfian named John B. Robins of Atlanta, Georgia rebuked Clement Cary for believing things “not known among Methodists,” e.g. “inbred’ sin in believers,” i.e., the residue theory, of which the Robins declared “a Methodist does not believe that.” For Robins, children born to Christian parents were sinless—“sanctified by their parents”—unless they were corrupted by later decisions. John B. Robins, “Clement Cary and Heresy,” and “Dr. Robins Reviewed,” TM October 15, 1896, p. 2. Two reviews of Robins, TM October 29, 1896, p. 2-3. Haynes declined to print a response from Robins, TM November 12, 1896, p. 8.

civilization was the “product and handiwork of rebels,” wrote Haynes, and Jesus was “the crucified Rebel Chief.”³⁹

Sometime between 1898 and 1901, Haynes rejected common-place postmillennial eschatology and adopted premillennial eschatology. Haynes was slower than many holiness advocates in adopting either a more robust eschatology generally or a premillennial eschatology specifically.⁴⁰ He was not among the earliest adopters of the ‘pre-mill’ view that was widespread among holiness advocates, including many of his friends, by the mid-1890s. It did not appear in his writings before July 1897, nor did it appear from his pen in the single surviving issue of his

³⁹ “Old-Time Church Work,” and “Rebels,” TM September 10, 1896, p. 1. On the same page: “doctrinal preaching should be valued not for its excellent logic but for the excellent good it may do.” Haynes had previously been noted for his theological views on topics not directly related to holiness doctrine. For example, “Pulpit Extinguishers of What?” by B. F. Haynes, NCA, September 15, 1888, p. 4 quoted Mark Guy Pearse in the Methodist Times, London. Haynes argued that preachers should preach, not prove, the gospel. Preachers should avoid becoming “an extinguisher of infidelity.” Haynes also quoted Matthew Arnold, “‘Fear God’ has made many men pious; the proofs of the existence of God have made many men atheists.” Haynes then quoted the editor of the *Independent* of September 6, saying that a preacher should “‘treat the gospel as true without stopping to prove it, and by the earnestness, solemnity, and urgency of his own mental action press upon the hearer’s attention as the truth which he must accept and upon which he must act, or lose his soul for eternity.’” “Our mission is to preach the gospel ‘not with enticing words of men’s wisdom but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.’” Signed as B. F. Haynes Nashville, Tenn. September 6, 1888. NCA editor Fitzgerald agreed—don’t advertise for atheists NCA December 15, 1888 p. 1. See also “Can He do all the Work of a Methodist Preacher?,” T.A. Kerley (Franklin,Tn), NCA January 26, 1889 p.13. A response to Kerley, “Oakland Mission, Tennessee Conference” by John R. Reagin, included positive comments about Haynes and Kerley, NCA February 16, 1889, p.5.. Reagin praised Haynes’s comments on Sabbath and said he “is creating a breeze in your city” and “says some very practical things.” He was more critical of Kerley’s article. Haynes opposed the “impudent skepticism of Higher Criticism” in Germany, “‘Dens of Thieves,’” TM August 6, 1896, p. 1. See also “An Illogical Defense,” TM April 16, 1896, p. 1.

⁴⁰ For 19th century social and political importance of Protestant theology, especially postmillennial eschatology and pneumatology (doctrine of the Holy Spirit), and indirectly the doctrine of sanctification or perfection, see Timothy L. Smith, “Righteousness and Hope: Christian Holiness and the Millennial Vision in America, 1800-1900,” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (Spring, 1979), pp. 21-45, and Grant Wacker, “The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Age in American Protestantism, 1880-1910,” *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 72, No. 1 (Jan, 1985), pp. 45-62. For premillennialism, see Timothy P. Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1925* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987). Weber says that premillennialism is “not so much a theology as it is a particular view of history. Premillennialists reject popular notions of human progress and believe that history is a game that the righteous cannot win,” Timothy P. Weber, “Premillennialism and the Branches of Evangelicalism,” in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (Downer’s Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 6. T. J. Jackson Lears notes that “Despite the Promethean optimism of the official culture...an entire range of human experience lay beyond the boundaries of official optimism,” Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981, 1994), 4. See also, Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 161-169, 334-336.

paper from the late 1890s in January 1898.⁴¹ His autobiography suggested adoption after the war claim scandal of 1898, and perhaps even as late as after the 1902 General Conference. It did not appear in *Facts, Faith, and Fire* published in 1900. But in 1901, L. L. Pickett would list Haynes as an advocate of the “Blessed Hope,” the premillennial return of Jesus, declaring Haynes to be “fearless, sweet-spirited, uncompromising, yet kind; an exposor of shams, but a lover of men; a man of God, strong in character, unflinching in the hour of danger, never known to forsake the post of duty.” So prominent was Haynes in Pickett’s mind as a “faithful, earnest advocate of the blessed hope” that he included Haynes in a photo array with Seth C. Rees, E. F. Walker, J. O. McClurkan, and Martin Wells Knapp.⁴²

But contra many interpreters of turn of the century holiness Methodism, Haynes’s shift in

⁴¹ The masthead of the issue named the paper *American Outlook And Tennessee Methodist* [the second name was a line below and in much smaller font], and was dated January 13, 1898 (Vol. VIII, No. 2.). The issue is held in the Nashville Public Library. The issue contained an expanded 14 pages, secular and publishing/book ads, and cost \$1 per year for subscription. Haynes alone was named on the masthead as “B. F. Haynes, Editor” (no “Rev.” or “D. D.”), while Beverly Carradine, W. B. Godbey, L. L. Pickett, and A. C. Bane were listed as contributing editors for various departments (all four with “Rev.,” Carradine and Godbey with “D.D.”). The *American Outlook* had recently acquired the subscription list for The *Christian Soldier*, L. L. Pickett’s periodical focused on the prohibition cause. In 1898, the name of the paper was changed again to *Zion’s Outlook*. Haynes sold *Zion’s Outlook* in 1900 to pay his remaining debts. J. O. McClurkan continued the paper, later renaming it *Living Water*. No issues of the Haynes-edited *Zion’s Outlook* (1898-1900) were available for review. Based on Haynes’s statements and the multiple offers and special rates mentioned, the *American Outlook* was published at a considerable loss. The book sales were a more important stream of revenue than the subscription list itself.

⁴² L. L. Pickett, *The Blessed Hope of His Glorious Appearing*. (Louisville, Ky.: Pickett Publishing Co., 1901), 199, 272. All but Knapp would later become important figures in Nazarene history. Haynes described his shift to premillennialism in some detail in *Tempest-Tossed*, chapter 8 “The Second Coming,” 71-77, and chapter 9, “My Three Bibles,” 78-92. Relying on the widespread presence of the theme in the New Testament, the primary thrust of these chapters was the importance of the return of Jesus as divine intervention and the hope of Christian living, in contrast to postmillennial views that often seemed to understand Jesus’s return as a reward to the church for its near perfect management of earth in Jesus’s absence. God would save, not through governments, administration/s, or programs, but through direct action to redeem a broken, corrupted, and sin-sickened world. Haynes seemed to have no interest in dates, timing, or predictions but in the anticipation of Jesus’s return itself, i.e., “the Blessed Hope.” For a comparison to zealous affirmation of eschatological hope from a different source, see J. M. Buckley, “The Christian Hope,” reprinted in TM October 31, 1895, p. 2. Buckley called for “searching of [one’s] own heart to ascertain whether the spirit of the age many not have despoiled [one] of the earnest of the inheritance.” A similar item from Haynes, “An Inspiring Thought,” TM December 5, 1895, p. 1. From Pickett on his famous debate with M. A. Smith, that also claims the *Texas* was conducting a strong campaign against the holiness movement, AO May 20, 1897, p. 8. An argument for premillennial eschatology from J. O. McClurkan (writing from Erin, Tennessee), “Jesus is Coming,” TM July 2, 1896, p. 2. Haynes generally used “to-day” when referring to the present or modern day. But he began *occasionally* to use the term “latter-days” as early as 1896.

eschatology did not undo his abiding interest in public and political matters. If a great reversal away from social reform occurred at all in Haynes, it would take nearly a quarter century to take root in his thought and happened only within the last year or two of his life, after his health collapsed, he near death, and with the depressing pall of the early 1920s hanging over the nation. Haynes was not an ahistorical or apolitical thinker—not before, and not after adoption of premillennial eschatology. His political opinions would remain remarkably steady despite his ecclesiastical upheavals, and his shift to holiness and then premillennial holiness theology. Haynes remained what he had been since Kansas Governor John St. John’s 1884 campaign for president, a Protestant reform-oriented third party Prohibition Party man with a robust alertness to justice in socio-economic matters. Rather than explore the suppressive impact a change in eschatology had on political activity, scholars should explore the impact of a series of crushing political (and ecclesiastical) defeats of grass-roots reform attempts had on religionists’ eschatology. At least with Haynes’s eschatology, the theological shifts did not drive the political convictions.⁴³

Bishop Galloway’s curt rebuke and discouraging appointment in October 1899

⁴³ Holiness advocacy was not a form of historylessness. It was not a denial of the existence of a social order, nor an attempt to destroy and remake that social order. Holiness adherents’ adoption of premillennial eschatology did not signal or cause an opposition to social and political reform. If there were holiness advocates who held such views, but they do not appear in this study, and secondary sources seem to suggest that ahistorical and apolitical views were more common among an early generation of pentecostal leaders and later generations of holiness figures. For one of many arguments that premillennial eschatology caused an abandonment of social and political interest, see Randall J. Stephens, “The Convergence of Populism, Religion, and the Holiness-Pentecostal Movements: A Review of the Historical Literature,” *Fides et Historia* (Winter/Spring 2000: 51-64). Stephens argues that “as a result” of adoption of premillennial eschatology, “holiness folk like B. F. Haynes grew increasingly uninterested in social reform or politics of any kind.” Stephens notes that L. L. Pickett adopted the same eschatology in 1896. Yet Pickett ran for Governor of Kentucky on the Prohibition Party ticket in 1907 (Haynes ran for State Education Superintendent). Stephens says “of course, the holiness faithful had little interest in politics even before this doctrine, though a few—including Beverly Carradine and A. J. Tomlinson...—did flirt with politics in the 1880s and early 1890s.” Stephens assumes that little evidence would be found of Populist connections with holiness and pentecostalism because these groups were thoroughly apolitical. But southern holiness advocates with MECS ties like Haynes were not Populists, not because they were apolitical, but because they were already devoted Prohibition Party adherents. Stephens says “turn of the century Holiness and Pentecostal newspapers and church minutes say virtually nothing about politics and world affairs.” Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 138, 167, 170. Stephens, “Convergence,” 64.

meanwhile began five horrible years for Haynes, likely the rock bottom of his life. Haynes's mother, Elizabeth Hardaway Andrews Haynes, died unexpectedly on December 30, 1899. Stricken with grief, and guilt for his busyness, he "knelt alone by her cold form in her silent chamber [that] night and prayed God to make me a better man." The next day, the family "tenderly laid her away on this cold December Sunday," December 31, 1899. She had lost several children, and her husband over two decades before. In the spring of 1900, his estate of \$30,000 exhausted, Haynes sold his beloved Nashville home to pay the debts on the paper. The home was a "sacred spot," "holy of holies," and his "holy shelter" during a decade of great trial, he wrote. Presumably large enough for their many children, the home stood on a large wooded lot on Gallatin Road, likely between the location of Hobson's Chapel and Spring Hill Cemetery on Gallatin Road where their infant was already buried. The home and "twenty-three acres of ground well improved near the city," had all been lost in furthering the paper. The sale of the house almost covered his debts. At McClurkan's bidding, friends of Haynes and the Pentecostal Alliance purchased the paper from Haynes in May 1900. The sale price of \$3300 was only equal to what he owed. Haynes wrote of the paper's loss, "not everyone triumphs who aims nobly."⁴⁴

In October 1900, Bishop Galloway got Haynes out of Nashville, sending him to Lewisburg and Petersburg, an appointment that received a mere two sentences in Haynes's account. After a low-paying and statistically unsuccessful year, in October 1901 Bishop Fitzgerald sent Haynes up on the highland rim to the miners at Tracy City and Altamont. For a cultured man with a large and urbane family accustomed to Nashville and Middle Tennessee's

⁴⁴ On mother's death, Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 233-235 (quoted from Zion's Outlook at the time of her death). For loss of the home, Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 229-231. A streetcar line ran in front of the house. On the loss of the paper and sale to McClurkan (unnamed in Haynes's account), Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 198-204 (Quote, p. 202), and 256-260. See also for loss of paper an account that notes well the import the sale had for Haynes ("the cup of human bitterness spilling over," 54), Mildred Bangs Wynkoop, *The Trevecca Story* (Nashville: Trevecca Press, 1976) pp. 53-56.

prosperous county seat towns, these two remote appointments were a jarring return to his first pastorate at Big Bottom on the Tennessee River in 1873, almost three decades earlier.⁴⁵

Shortly after the October 1901 appointment to Tracy City, rumors flew on the street and in print that Haynes had balked at the appointment and requested to be allowed to travel as an evangelist for the year, with Bishop Fitzgerald agreeing before the folks at Tracy City and Altamont heard about it, forcing both Haynes and the bishop to withdraw his amendment. Weeks passed before retractions appeared, and only after Haynes preached an installation sermon entitled “Ministerial Obligations” that provoked the *Columbia Herald* to declare “Dr. Haynes now has the full confidence of his church.” Haynes served an awkward but statistically successful seven months on the Highland Rim, dutifully preaching, visiting, and ministering to the miners in the mountains, and “burying their dead,” while praying earnestly for a way out from the episcopal screws. “After a long winter of prayer and deliberation,” Haynes realized that “the authorities were relentless in their purpose to starve me out.”⁴⁶

Still soul-searching, Haynes attended General Conference in Dallas in May 1902. There he watched as Barbee received no punishment, and watched Hoss’s election to the episcopacy. When he arrived back in Nashville, Haynes faced a crisis. Still an MECS loyalist, he was convinced that he needed to find a refuge from episcopal appointment. If kinder bishops like Galloway and Fitzgerald would send him repeatedly to punitive appointments, perhaps he

⁴⁵ Years later, Haynes was given a strong endorsement upon election as Olivet president by someone who knew him in Tennessee. The correspondent noted the cultured qualities of the Haynes family and recalled Haynes’s statements to him while president at Martin College 1902-1905, that both he and his wife’s wealth were lost via the *Tennessee Methodist*. “Congratulation,” by F. W. Johnson, *Herald of Holiness*, April 26, 1916, p. 14.

⁴⁶ “Rev. Haynes’ Troubles Settled,” *Columbia Herald*, November 22, 1901, p. 3. “Church Trouble,” *The Bolivar Bulletin*, November 22, 1901. “American’s Correspondent Wrong,” *Sequatchie Valley News*, November 21, 1901. The *Columbia Herald* was staunchly Democratic and racist—see *Columbia Herald*, Oct 28, 1898, p 4. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 235.

wondered what Hoss might do. Doubting that he should even go home without a plan, he considered going to Franklin to confer with his brothers. Finally, he relented and bought a ticket to Tracy City. Just after boarding the train headed home, he read a notice that Martin Female College in Pulaski needed a president. It was a potentially liberating development, for, unlike pastoral appointments, bishops did not select the presidents of Methodist supported colleges. Haynes forced the train to stop, hailed a streetcar back to Union Station, and bought a ticket to Pulaski, where he had pastored successfully from 1885 to 1887. Congregational connections were paramount, for at that time, the college was owned by the congregation itself, not the conference. Having secured the presidency, he returned to Tracy City, informed his family, resigned his pastorate, and moved to Pulaski just in time for intensive recruiting for the fall session.⁴⁷

While Haynes found rapid early success in finances and student enrollment, a campaign against his presidency quickly developed. The pastor of the Pulaski Church—either J. W. Cherry or H. B. Reams—recommended Haynes’s old friend C. L. Chilton to Haynes for revival services at the college. But the college’s board of trustees summoned Haynes to a meeting and threatened to enjoin him in the courts if he did not cancel the meeting. Haynes went ahead and town Methodists boycotted the meeting as a result of the same pastor’s “secret” insistence, and prayer meeting warnings of “the sinister designs of the president” to start “an independent holiness church...stuck up on the side of the hill yonder” taking “half the members of this church with him” (the same prominent hill overlooking the town upon which the Klan had been proposed).

⁴⁷ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 235-237. If the bishops would not restore him to suitable appointments fit for his experience and able to offer reasonable financial support, he would seek another path beyond their direct control – higher education. Bishops deferred to the trustees in such cases and formally appointed clergy to that role. Haynes was like many other holiness advocates who were slow to leave the episcopal Methodist churches, being still “genuinely dedicated to Methodism’s own commitment to order and organization.” Dieter, *Holiness Revival*, 233. For an example of his commitment to order, see his criticism of Pentecostalism and “tongues,” B. F. Haynes, “Fanaticism and Its Progeny,” *Pentecostal Advocate*, February 10, 1910, p. 2.

The pastor had been the one to suggest Chilton after raising objections “of a personal nature” against Haynes’s first choice. Whether the pastor set Haynes up by suggesting Chilton, simply changed his mind, or was pressured to change course by out-of-town enemies, Haynes felt betrayed. He could have had an independent church in Nashville years before, he recalled, a prize much greater than a struggling independent church in Pulaski. Opposition deepened on the board and in the community, such that his teachers and students were ostracized and afraid, “a fear of holiness engendered in them by the town gossips,” Haynes recalled, “a spirit of fear and dread as though if they were in danger of some kind of contamination.”⁴⁸

Haynes’s relief from this hornet’s nest came by another tragedy. In October 1904, his third year at Martin, the college was destroyed by fire. The fire also destroyed Haynes’s entire personal library accumulated over 30 years. Receiving \$1500 in insurance for his personal loss, Haynes stayed on, attempting to stabilize and save the school by moving it to Tullahoma, perhaps also getting it away from its Pulaski ‘supporters’ as well. The Tullahomans failed to fulfill their promises, and when the \$1500 of his own money was exhausted in late December 1904, Haynes shut the school down, resigned, and returned to Nashville. Official accounts of his time at Martin are few but include a notice from a Tennessee Conference historian some forty years later: “Rev. B. F. Haynes, who was a highly cultured member of the conference, was president of Martin College when it was destroyed by fire in the fall of 1904.” Carter also reported that while immediate predecessors had not succeeded, “under [Haynes’s] capable management the school began to build up and prospects were bright until October, 1904, when Martin College, the pride of Pulaski and Giles County, burned to the ground.” Haynes’s autobiography was primarily written c. 1906, when the memory of such struggles was at its

⁴⁸ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 237-240

rawest, and when he felt the need to defend himself and his reputation greatest. Indeed, the embittered tone of the widely-accessible autobiography is largely unlike the more positive, affirmative, and constructive tone of his voluminous but largely unread periodical work and other books. Those who encountered him in these years, however, left evidence that his efforts in more modest appointments in southern Middle Tennessee were well-received. The *Columbia Herald* reporting on the 1901 Columbia District gathering named Haynes among “the notable visitors,” despite the fact his attendance was required as pastor at Lewisburg and Petersburg. In 1904, an editor in Grundy County who likely remembered him from Tracy City, labeled him “a man of wonderful energy” whose “many friends wish him the success he deserves.” Many remote and modest appointments were unaccustomed to prominent clergy serving among them. What Haynes found discouraging, some experienced as an unusual treat.⁴⁹

Haynes’s trials were accompanied by the deaths of a staggering number of prominent figures from earlier years. A generation of Methodist churchmen was disappearing. J. D. Barbee, W. R. Peebles, and T. J. Duncan died in 1904, while Hargrove died in 1905. Keener and Sam Jones died in 1906, Granbery in 1907. W. W. Duncan and Galloway died in office in 1908 and 1909, respectively, and D. C. Kelley died in 1909. Fitzgerald died in retirement at Monteagle, Tennessee in 1911. These swift losses, some of them at a youthful age, may have encouraged Haynes to record his own memories for posterity.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 241-243. Cullen T. Carter, *History of the Tennessee Conference*, Nashville, n.p., 1948. p. 316. Cullen T. Carter, ed., *History of Methodist Churches and Institutions in Middle Tennessee, 1787-1956*, (1956). p. 416. *Columbia Herald*, May 10, 1901, p. 2. “Tullahoma Secures Martin College,” *Mrs. Grundy*, October 27, 1904, 1. For an example of the range of collegiate ads in the NCA, see August 22, 1895, p. 14. The University of Tennessee, University of Mississippi, and the University of Virginia all advertised in the *Advocate*, as did the New England Conservatory of Music.

⁵⁰ T. J. Duncan never came back home to Tennessee after being transferred in 1893. He spent three years as presiding elder of the Los Angeles district—a better title than it was a job—before being transferred to the Northwest Texas Conference in 1896, where he died in 1904. Between 1878 and 1890, Duncan was probably the

In June 1905, Haynes assumed the presidency of Asbury College in Wilmore, Kentucky, near Lexington, following the ouster of founder and long-time president, John Wesley Hughes. Haynes had visited the college as early as 1896, publishing reports and noting progress. His attempts at Martin were likely influenced by the role model Hughes's Asbury College provided. Asbury was one of several new holiness colleges established within the preceding fifteen years as the colleges supported by the ME churches became increasingly unsuitable places for the children of holiness families.⁵¹

L. L. Pickett, Haynes's friend, associate, and Prohibition Party ally during the 1890s, was an Asbury board member and a primary fund-raiser for the college. Political efforts continued, with Pickett running for governor and Haynes running for superintendent of public instruction on the Prohibition Party ticket in Kentucky in 1907. Several strong-willed bishops known to oppose the Prohibition Party were in office that year, including W. W. Duncan, Hoss, and Candler, but neither Pickett nor Haynes were tried for this breach of etiquette. Perhaps bishops had taken a more tolerant approach, or the hardliners were now a minority, or were unwilling to break convention to move against a college president. Likely the decisive factor was that the less-

most important Methodist leader in southern Middle Tennessee, serving 5 years at Pulaski and Columbia, then 7 years as presiding elder of the Columbia and Shelbyville Districts. After a year at North High Street in Nashville 1890–91, Duncan served Columbia again for one year, then Bellbuckle one year before being shipped out. Columbia and Bellbuckle were very good appointments, but to receive three consecutive one year appointments was considered rough treatment. In Texas he served 2 years each at Taylor and Mexia, then died in his fourth year at Ennis. Minutes of the Northwest Texas Conference, 1904.

⁵¹ Having attended commencement, Haynes wrote a lengthy article praising the work done at Asbury College, where the fusion of spiritual vitality and scholarship impressed him deeply, "A Pentecostal Commencement," TM June 4, 1896, p. 1. Letters from President Hughes including revival work in Nashville with Powell and Haynes, TM September 3, 1896, p. 5, 8. B. Sarmast, "Letter from a Persian Convert," (and student at Asbury), TM September 10, 1896, p. 8. Similarly, J. M. Matsumoto, "The Experience of a Japanese," TM September 24, 1896, p. 8. Asbury in Kentucky, Texas Holiness University, Trevecca College in Nashville, God's Bible School in Cincinnati, Taylor University in Indiana, and Central Holiness University in Iowa, just to name a few. Smith in Bucke, *History of American Methodism*, Vol 2., 624. For Haynes's own brief account of his time at Asbury, see Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 244-245.

forceful A. W. Wilson was now the senior bishop, and that Keener, Haygood, and Hargrove had passed.

In 1906, Haynes attended a holiness convention in Atlanta where he delivered an address on the subject “Christian Socialism.” The Atlanta *Constitution* reported that “Dr. Haynes...read a very excellent paper” declaring that “the time had come, in his opinion, when the pulpits of the land should speak out against all kinds of greed, graft, and dishonest gain.” H. C. Morrison “followed in a few striking and eloquent words” on the same topic, “sympathizing with the rank and file of the labouring class and severely condemning the merciless tyranny of the beef trust.” The *Constitution* concluded by noting that “there was no encouragement, however, given to anarchy or ‘communistic socialism.’” Pickett, Haynes, and Morrison were all premillennialists with ties to Asbury College. But their visible political activities tied the leading holiness college in the South both to premillennial eschatology and political reform.⁵² .

During Haynes’s presidency, heavy emphasis fell on revival and the missionary impulse in chapel, religious services, and extracurricular activities at the school. Famed Methodist ecumenist, internationalist, and missionary to India, E. Stanley Jones, was a student during this period, graduating in 1907. Reports from Haynes’s presidency at Asbury were glowing. The *Jessamine Journal* called Haynes “a bold advocate and defender of the faith and of the old doctrine of the Wesleys,” and a “southern gentleman of indomitable energy and deep religious experience.” His “able” editorials “started new thoughts along many lines.” Evangelist and publisher H. C. Morrison, a strong supporter of the college, affirmed Haynes as “cultured,

⁵² “Big Attendance on Convention,” *The Constitution* (Atlanta), Friday, October 26, 1906 (page unclear), copy held in Personal File of B. F. Haynes, Nazarene Archives. The Haynes/Morrison commentary came during the session of Tuesday, October 23, 1906. In 1908, Morrison spoke out against electing “a man who repudiates Christ” for president, i.e., the Unitarian William Howard Taft. “A Terrific Arraignment,” *The Springfield Herald* (TN), July 30, 1908 (page unclear). After quoting Morrison, the *Herald* added that both John and John Quincy Adams had also been Unitarians.

intelligent, and suited for the job.” Reports of the first term celebrated the passionate emphasis on missions. “The missionary spirit of the school is truly apostolic in intensity and fervor,” said one report, noting that “the study of missions is systematically and diligently pursued.” Even the “daily noon prayer meeting,” centered “on the theme of foreign missions.”⁵³

By the end of Haynes’ second year as president, a jubilant Morrison declared that the year just closed was “perhaps the greatest year in the history of Asbury College.” “Dr. Haynes is proving himself well fitted for the position of president,” stated Morrison, “and as a man, Christian and scholar, has gotten a strong grip upon the student body.” Especially pleasing to Morrison was “the enthusiasm of the students over their President, Dr. Haynes, and his wife.” “They are father and mother to the school,” noted Morrison.⁵⁴

At Asbury, Haynes was finally entirely immersed in an environment that was both Methodist and holiness. As such, it provided Haynes with networking opportunities that expanded his base of holiness associates. That expanded base included several persons who were or would become influential leaders in the early Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene. Famed Nazarene evangelist and humorist Bud “Uncle Buddy” Robinson spoke in chapel of “Sunshine and Smiles.” In May of 1908, W. C. Wilson, elected in 1915 as one of the Nazarene general superintendents and a close lieutenant of California Nazarene patriarch, Phineas F.

⁵³ Joseph A. Thacker, Jr., *Asbury College: Vision and Miracle*. (Napanee, Indiana: Evangel Press, 1990). pp. 62-63. Jones would become an associate of Franklin Roosevelt and Mahatma Gandhi, eventually influencing Martin Luther King, Jr. Jones was one of many mid-20 century figures who combined a love for missions with a reputation for peace-making. William Kostlevy draws a link, through Jones, between “southern Methodist holiness radicalism” of the 1890s, and the work of Reinhold Niebuhr and King. Kostlevy says that King first heard Jones speak of Gandhi’s non-violent resistance in 1942 at age thirteen. Jones’s efforts linked him to Reinhold Niebuhr, Mahatma Gandhi, and Martin Luther King, Jr., ties that would place Hughes, Haynes, and Asbury College as part of the chain of influence on the American civil rights movement and the broad sweep of American foreign policy. Pickett’s son, J. Waskom Pickett, graduated with Jones, taught at Arkansas Holiness College in Vilonia, Arkansas, and later joined Jones as a missionary in India, eventually becoming a bishop William Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers: Evangelicals and Radicals in Progressive Era America*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 14-16.

⁵⁴ Thacker, *Asbury College*, pp. 71-72.

Bresee, reported in the California Nazarene newspaper of his meeting with Haynes while visiting Asbury College. The glowing report had as much of the tone of an advertisement as an introduction: “Dr. Haynes, the president of the College, is a fine, cultured Christian gentleman, a great preacher and is evidently accomplishing a great work in training the minds and hearts of the young for effective Christian work. He has treated us with the greatest of courtesy, having us to speak to the students at the opening morning service. We further had the pleasure of enjoying his Christian fellowship by dining with him and his cultured family.”⁵⁵

Yet Wilson did not mention that Haynes had already resigned the presidency of Asbury College in April 1908. He and the board had a disagreement about financial oversight, fundraising responsibility, even perhaps the condition of the grounds, and Haynes resigned abruptly. Haynes recalled that the board, in an attempt to “save money,” wanted to shift from a system where the president leased the college from the trustees and received what pay he could from it, to a system where the board paid the president a salary. Haynes believed the latter approach resulted in “a nominal presidency,” wherein the president would be held responsible in “the eye of the public” without any “controlling voice in its administration.” Believing that “responsibility and prerogative should go hand in hand,” Haynes surrendered his lease and resigned without apparent hard feelings.⁵⁶

It is also possible that Haynes had another offer. According to a report a few years later, sometime between 1906 and 1910, Haynes had been elected president of Deets Bible College in California, later renamed Nazarene University, then Pasadena College, now Point Loma

⁵⁵ *Nazarene Messenger*, May 14, 1908, pp. 8-9. Formed as a merger of three different holiness denominations in 1908, the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene dropped the word Pentecostal from its name in 1919 to avoid confusion with groups that practiced glossolalia or speaking in tongues. Haynes befriended Nazarene E. F. Walker, elected general superintendent in 1911, by 1896, TM September 10 and 24, 1896.

⁵⁶ Joseph A. Thacker, Jr., *Asbury College: Vision and Miracle*. Napanee, Indiana: Evangel Press, 1990, pp. 73-74. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 245.

Nazarene University. Haynes could not serve due to a death in the family. That relative is not identified in the report, but Haynes's eldest child, Eleanor Maude Haynes Edmands, died of tuberculosis on November 11, 1908 at age 33, preceded in death by her three children. Haynes's daughter in law, wife of son Bayless of Jacksonville, Florida, died February 14, 1909. The young granddaughter Jean, "the joy of our home and hearts," bore her mother's name and lived with her grandparents thereafter. Given the timing of Haynes' resignation, and Wilson's visit and glowing report, Haynes may have been on the verge of moving to California and joining the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene in 1908 or early 1909. The Nazarenes spent 1907 and 1908 preparing for a merger with southern holiness groups consummated at Pilot Point, Texas, October 8 to 14 of 1908. It is possible that Maude's progressive illness prevented Haynes from attending that as well. As an MECS elder with nearly four decades of ministerial experience, former president of Asbury College, former presiding elder and pastor of McKendree, editor of a conference-turned-holiness paper for nearly a decade, and a man scourged by the episcopal Court for nearly two decades, Haynes would have been a distinguished presence. It is unlikely that anyone present could have claimed war wounds equal to those Haynes bore. He was, by this point, a walking example of how 'Methodism' treated 'holiness.'⁵⁷

Haynes' most serious conflicts with Methodist bishops occurred between 1890 and 1898, and he never recovered his earlier optimism about the MECS. However, Haynes did not fail to build for the future. Haynes's college presidencies from 1902 to 1908 were an attempt to shape Methodism through investing in a new generation of students. But the presidencies at Martin and Asbury were not of the same importance. Asbury College took him out of Tennessee. Haynes had travelled extensively, but he had never lived beyond the bounds of the Tennessee

⁵⁷ *Herald of Holiness*, April 5, 1916, p. 14. Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 242-243.

Conference for any length of time. Before the year 1905, Haynes had lived his 54 years in Tennessee. In the final eighteen years of his life, he would live in Kentucky, Tennessee, Florida, Texas, metropolitan Kansas City, and Illinois.

Asbury also drew him closer to holiness connections, associates, and networks, while decisively away from the intimate but localized networks experienced by most Methodist ‘preachers in full connection.’ As Timothy Smith noted, the trio of holiness camp meeting, holiness college, and holiness paper bound otherwise independent groups or isolated persons to the national holiness movement and ethos. That Haynes experienced this shift via an institution of higher education gave him access to a visiting holiness elite—persons with broad knowledge of, and ties to, the holiness orbit. Undoubtedly, the effect was to draw him closer to the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, forging its national union of regional holiness denominations into a single nation-wide church in 1907 and 1908 during Haynes’s time at Asbury. Contra normative stereotypes, it was not the work of an itinerating evangelist that was his way out of Tennessee and closer to the Nazarenes, at least not directly. The extensive ministry of Morrison had sustained Asbury College, but it was Haynes’s orderly work as an educator and administrator, not as evangelistic traveler, that drew him away from his identity as a Tennessee Conference preacher of the MECS.⁵⁸

Yet just as Haynes did not leave the MECS in 1890, 1896, 1899, 1902, and 1905, he did not leave it in 1908. In fact, he went home to the Tennessee Conference where Bishop Hoss appointed him to Nashville’s Park Avenue congregation, where he served for a year. In October 1908, Haynes served as chair of a disciplinary committee that expelled a minister for immorality.

⁵⁸ Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 300. Smith’s discussion provides helpful insight into both the power of these institutions, and the reasons why non-holiness Methodists would find their influence intolerable.

In 1909, he received five votes for delegate to the 1910 General Conference. He busied himself in prohibition politics, drawing newspaper attention with fellow preacher and MECS Sunday School editor and secretary E. B. Chappell in 1909 for their charges that wet forces were attempting to bribe and otherwise corrupt the Tennessee legislature—liquorites had brought in “a carload of ‘beautiful fallen women’...to seduce” legislators—during its deliberations that resulted in the state going dry in 1909.⁵⁹

Haynes reacted sharply to the growing glossolalia or tongues-speaking movement that spread rapidly after 1906. In February 1910 his forceful denunciation “Fanaticism and Its Progeny” appeared in a Texas newspaper entitled *The Pentecostal Advocate*, highlighting how quickly the word “pentecostal” would change meanings in popular American religious use. One of several official Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene papers, the *Advocate’s* editor was Charles A. McConnell who would play a vital role in the fledgling Nazarene publishing house begun in 1911. Haynes’s critique of the early glossolalia movement recounted his experiences while travelling “from ocean to ocean” in 1909. “Nauseating and disgusting villainy” accompanied these “bands of fanatics,” said Haynes, “it is high time our recognized holiness teachers and editors and evangelists were speaking out.” Worried that “caricatures” and “prevalent distortions or perversions of holiness” would defame and ultimately destroy the movement for “genuine holiness of heart and life,” Haynes declared “never was there need of greater activity and more pronounced and definite teaching of the scriptural truth on the subject than now.”⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Isaac, *Prohibition and Politics*, 164n33. The accusations were reported widely. For example, *The Illinois Issue*, January 15, 1909, p. 8. The *Issue* was the official publication of the Illinois Anti-Saloon League. Hostile reactions to his charges were reported by newspapers in Sumter, SC, Newport News, VA, and Pensacola, FL. For moves 1908-1911, Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 245-246. 1908 *Journal of the Tennessee Conference, MECS*. 1909 *Journal of the Tennessee Conference, MECS*.

⁶⁰ B. F. Haynes, “Fanaticism and Its Progeny,” *The Pentecostal Advocate*, 10 February 1910, 2. Haynes says “lust, falsehood, sundering of marital relations, family estrangements and even murder are some of the fruits of the so-

Haynes wrote the “Fanaticism” article from Jacksonville, Florida, where two of his sons, both businessmen, were living. In 1909–1910, Haynes attempted to start a holiness college named Livingstone College in Enterprise, Florida, on Lake Monroe near Sanford, between Daytona and Orlando. Conference records show he was appointed to Nashville’s East End congregation in October 1909, but may not have served. In October of 1910, he was transferred to the Florida Conference, and back to Tennessee in October 1911. The latest attempt at college presidency would fail, as Haynes became ill with “the fever” and “was forced to change climate.” According to his own account, he fell ill in January 1910, and returned to Nashville with “little expectation of recovery.”⁶¹

In September 1911, a recovered Haynes moved to Texas, joined the faculty at Texas Holiness University in Peniel, Texas, now Greenville, northeast of Dallas, as Dean of Theology, where he succeeded Emily Ellyson. Her husband, E. P. Ellyson, was one of three Nazarene General Superintendents and president of the school until 1911. As with some other rural holiness college towns, Peniel was part college/company village, part holiness campground and retreat. Haynes joined the fledgling denomination at the Dallas District Assembly, located (resigned) from the ministry of the MECS as a member of the Tennessee Conference. His long 1890s crisis was finally resolved in the 1910s. The lifelong Tennessee Methodist with thirty years of experience as a pastor and journalist was now a Texas Nazarene, fully expecting to

called ‘tongues’ and kindred movements in this country.” Ferguson’s quick characterization of the difference that emerged between “holiness” and “Pentecostal,” two terms that belong together to the movement pre-split: “designated as holiness if their joys are confined to feeling perfect love and pentecostal if they claim also the gift of glossolalia.” *Organizing to Beat the Devil*, 265.

⁶¹ Haynes “founded Livingstone College at Enterprise, Florida, but contracting the fever, was forced to change climate.” *Herald of Holiness*, April 5, 1916, p. 14. See also Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 246, and “A New College,” *The Ocala Evening Star*, September 19, 1910. According to the Ocala article, the effort was in concert with holiness leaders Emma and Tina Tucker, and influenced by D. L. Moody’s Northfield seminary for women.

retire as a college theology professor.⁶²

Haynes's own rationale for the change entailed the lessons he learned in the three great crises of the 1890s: the Kelley trial in 1890, the rejection of the *Methodist* in 1896, and the war claim scandal in 1898. Court leaders punished Haynes because he stood "unflinchingly for the rights of the preachers against the usurpation of Bishops" (the Kelley trial in 1890), "unflinchingly in favor" of "holiness of heart and life as taught by the founder and fathers of Methodism" (the *Methodist* trial of 1896), and "unflinchingly in favor of *honesty*" in the "administration of high church officials in all things" (the war claim scandal of 1898). Haynes had long resisted the sad conclusion that "episcopal power in Methodism is little short of omnipotent," and lamented that "the ecclesiastical machine" had decided to be "marked in its course by injustice and usurpation of rights," a machine that "sooner or later swerves men back into line" and reduced its opponents "to want, suffering, and hunger."⁶³

Had MECS leaders been 'wrong,' but flexible and tolerant, another course might have been possible. Haynes was a man of "protest" who had "ever cherished an abhorrence for shams, semblances...hypocrisies, or all simulacra," and mourned the great lengths Methodism had gone to "suppress" true religion "through her high officialism...the spirit which animates all the dominant ecclesiasticisms of today." Saddened that he had "not a better life to chronicle" he decried "the malevolent and cruel policy and administration of a great ecclesiasticism... the machine managers of the hierarchy" who had attempted "to crush humiliate and wreck" the

⁶² Cunningham, ed., *Our Watchword and Song*, 198. It is not clear who offered Haynes the position, but both Ellyson, aged 42, and new president R. T. Williams, only 28 and also soon to be elected General Superintendent himself, were much younger than Haynes, aged 60. It is possible that Asbury ties may have proved helpful, as A. M. Hills had taught at Asbury College in the 1890s before becoming the founding president of Texas Holiness University in 1899. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 162. Mainline Methodists have districts below the conference level. Nazarene districts largely correspond to Methodist conferences.

⁶³ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 260, 143.

“personal standing” and “pecuniary estate” of a “brother minister in good standing.”⁶⁴

In the end, Haynes—like so many other holiness advocates within the ME churches—came to believe in “the irreconcilability of the Methodist Church with any distinctive and definite spiritual movement.” Methodism had “abandoned holiness never to return to it.” “Irregular” episcopal actions had aimed at “the usurpation of the rights of the Conference and the trampling under foot of the rights and liberties of the preachers of the entire church.” He believed that he was engaged in “a fruitless endeavor to reform a hopeless ecclesiasticism of flagrant evils and injustice.” It was the hopelessness of intra-*religious* reform that led him to reject the “inherited” postmillennial belief that claimed the Church “was gradually to overspread the earth with salvation until all mankind were saved and that then the millennium would come.”⁶⁵

Readers of Haynes’s complaints who knew the history might have noticed his protest focused on polity complaints. Two of his three great crises, the Hargrove and Barbee fiascos, were polity sins, not doctrinal heresies. Even the rejection of the *Methodist* for its holiness stand could be viewed as a failing in hospitality and discipline as much as orthodoxy. Moreover, while Haynes focused on three great crises, a fourth injury—repeated miserable appointments—had been such a consistent feature of episcopal reaction to any dissent that it formed its own, separate justification. In short, Haynes might have remained in the MECS despite the perceived spiritual and doctrinal slippage if only the connectional ‘machine’ had not treated its own dissenting loyalists so roughly. His exit, then, had more to do with 1890 than it did with 1896. In polity terms, the rough treatment of holiness advocates merely echoed and confirmed, like so many

⁶⁴ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 257-260.

⁶⁵ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 200, 118, 107-108, 62, 155, 73. Haynes claimed that premillennial faith increased his commitment to “rescuing the lost” while the Lord “tarried.” 75.

aftershocks, the force and effect of the earthquake of October 1890, a manifestation of episcopal wrath as revealing as the episcopal denunciations of May 1894.⁶⁶

The holiness advocates who left did not walk out as a secessionist group. They left over time as individuals or as families, many slipping over the side quietly after making reasonable decisions that they were no longer welcome and no longer had reasonable prospects of welcome. Anti-holiness and conflicted fence-sitting Methodist preachers with varying degrees of sympathy badgered their holiness colleagues with appeals for denominational loyalty while the denominational leadership demonstrated unbridled contempt. Older holiness advocates had few opportunities for any major change, but once-respected mid-life leaders like Haynes still had hopes that the tide of antipathy, derision, and malice might turn. Somehow, most holiness advocates chose the route of loyalty, many investing years of their lives, and the financial prospects for their children, attempting to undo decisions their fellow Methodists had no intention of reopening. Meanwhile, MECS bishops exercised unfettered and arbitrary control, punishing regular itinerant clergy via the appointment system, often without any resort to charges of heresy or any arrests of character that might have to be legitimated. Only powerful in-group socialization into an elite professional society that valued loyalty and intimate fraternal itinerant bonds over other considerations could explain why so many holiness clergy remained in a denomination whose connectional leadership loathed their presence. The loyalty policy hammered out by National Holiness Association leaders in the 1880s increasingly made less sense given the actual circumstances facing holiness adherents, especially those in the MECS. Why someone would leave needs little explanation. For historians of religion, the more

⁶⁶ The road the MECS could have taken on holiness, but did not, Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 198-200. The crisis in Tennessee—and other forms of episcopal abuse that showed in other controversies—helped eventually to moderate the practice of some bishops. By 1948, Carter declared that “in the Old Jerusalem Conference there has been less *episcopos* and more *democracy* in administration in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.” Carter, *History*, 261.

important questions are, under these hostile conditions, why would anyone stay? Why did so many stay? Why for so long? Fear of change, loss of stature or standing, are possible reasons. But part of the answer must be the staggering brand power of ‘Methodism.’⁶⁷

Yet if Haynes wrote often of the failings of Methodism, he wrote more often of the Methodistic ideals and practices to which he had committed his life. Haynes’s quarrel was a lover’s quarrel, a stalwart loyalist’s cry for reform as restoration, and his defeat was all the more bitter for the intimacy of the former bonds. His “fanaticism” article revealed Haynes not as ecclesiastical anarchist but as a denominationalist caught in the tension and interplay between denominational order and movements of piety. Put another way, it reflected the persistent dynamic between the perceived need for the liberating work of the Spirit and the need for the conserving work of organization. That tension itself was thoroughly Methodistic.

Haynes’s early social and political concerns lead him eventually into viewing the episcopacy through the same anti-corruption and anti-declension lenses, a combination that set him up rather well to embrace the holiness call to deeper piety. That renovation became the solution to social and episcopal corruption, to rot from within. But Haynes’s shift from editor to

⁶⁷ Charles Edwin Jones said that “most preachers drawn into the movement before 1890 lived and died in the church,” Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 57. Ferguson, Dieter and others have noted ““A strange silence shrouded the subject of holiness”” in the ME churches and with the separation of so many adherents both the “controversy over doctrine” and “the zeal in its proclamation waned.” But while it may be true that “the Church went its stately way along the road of broad interpretation,” this suppression of activity did not result from thousands of holiness Methodists leaving Methodism. It resulted from the shaming and punishing of those who advocated the doctrine. No doubt a great many who remained avoided any talk of holiness like the plague, except for the very few who had access to a safe place. It was the absence of a safe place that resulted in so many leaving. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival*, 232. Ferguson, *Organizing to Beat the Devil*, 284. Ferguson notes that the United Brethren Church—that merged with the Evangelical Association to form the Evangelical United Brethren (EUB) that united with the Methodist Church in 1968 to form the United Methodist Church—“held steadfastly and naturally to the Wesleyan belief in holiness.” Ferguson, 279. The primary founding figure of the Church of the Nazarene, Phineas Bresee, who left the MEC in 1895, noted that working within existing agencies was preferable to starting over with a new denomination ““single handed, mistrusted, misunderstood, and misrepresented.”” Bresee said ““nothing but dire necessity”” could explain such a course. Dieter, *Holiness Revival*, 246, n.142. After the mid-1890s, holiness advocates in the MECS found themselves in a hostile regional denomination. Meanwhile, their closest allies and friends were spread nationwide in a multid denominational movement. It is not surprising, then, that so many of the MECS leaders faced a “church” crisis.

college president entailed an attempt to enact this three-fold vision of reform through organizational/institutional means. That experience, trying to build with and around the holiness ethos, set him up to embrace holiness denominationalism, what Nazarene leader Phineas Bresee was calling “organized holiness.”⁶⁸

But despite the importance of his shift from journalism to education, college work had its limitations for Haynes. Professors shaped a few quite deeply and occupied posts that often allowed for tremendous and transformative long-term influence. But weekly editors could reach a much larger and more diverse audience, and do so immediately. Despite Peniel’s rural charms, Haynes was, by temperament, an active and energetic man, not a retiring one. The professorial life was perhaps not the best fit for one so accustomed to life in the connectional hub. To his surprise, his new denomination would quickly find ways to put his experience and talents—and the depth of his long reflection on what made for a Methodistic Methodism—to wider and more immediate use.

⁶⁸ Harold E. Raser, “Phineas Franklin Bresee: Recovering the Original Spirit of Methodism,” and John H. Wigger, “Where Have All the Asburys Gone?: Francis Asbury and Leadership in the Wesleyan, Holiness, and Pentecostal Traditions,” in Henry H. Knight III, ed., *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street: Wesleyan, Holiness and Pentecostal Visions of the New Creation* (XXXX: Pickwick Publications, 2010), 167-176, 63-71.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Nazarenes' Dissenting Methodist Shape

In the fall of 1911, shortly before his sixtieth birthday, B. F. Haynes left the MECS and joined the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene in Texas. Haynes's scope of responsibility in his new denomination expanded rapidly. Within just months of joining, his new coreligionists named him founding editor of the denomination's central paper, a most sensitive position tasked with being an anchor of Nazarene loyalty, and the unsurpassed herald of Nazarene conviction to the world. The third General Assembly—Nazarenes' equivalent to the MECS General Conference—met in Nashville, Tennessee, from October 5 to 14, 1911. On Saturday afternoon, October 7, Haynes was introduced to the Assembly as “the Rev. B. F. Haynes, Teacher of Theology in Texas Holiness University.”¹

Haynes's reputation had preceded him.² On Tuesday afternoon, October 10, Haynes led the assembly in a prayer of thanksgiving. That same afternoon, the chair nominated Haynes, H. B. Hosley, and J. O. McClurkan to draft a statement against “civic unrighteousness.” They made their report that afternoon. On Thursday morning, October 12, the General Assembly's “Standing Committee on Publishing Interests” nominated Haynes and six others to serve on its new general Board of Publication. During that same session, the Assembly cast its first ballot for the open office of ‘general superintendent,’ a Methodist synonym for ‘bishop’ that Nazarenes selected for its link to Wesley's usage and its more-modest and less-lordly connotations. Haynes

¹ *Official Minutes of the Third General Assembly of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene*. (Los Angeles, 1911), 16.

² C. B. Jernigan wrote that Haynes's *Tennessee Methodist* was “a paper that stood for old-time Methodism.” C. B. Jernigan, *Pioneer Days of the Holiness Movement in the Southwest*. (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1919), 13.

came in third in the balloting with seventeen votes, behind E. F. Walker and A. S. Cochran. Future general superintendent W. C. Wilson received four votes, and Nazarene founding figures C. W. Ruth, H. B. Hosley, and J. N. Short received one vote each. Former Presbyterian E. F. Walker was elected to serve with reelected general superintendents and former MEC clergy Phineas F. Bresee and Hiram F. Reynolds.³

At 1 pm on October 12, the Publishing Board met at 125 4th Avenue in Nashville and elected Haynes board president. Over 2.4 million Nazarenes worldwide now know metropolitan Kansas City as the headquarters city of the Church of the Nazarene. It was the Board of Publications chaired by Haynes, charged with selecting the location of the yet-to-be-founded Nazarene Publishing House (NPH) that made that decision on October 12, 1911. That decision was announced in the board's report the morning of the 13th that included a brief fundraising appeal by Haynes. The entire establishment of the general church, and a large concentration of Nazarene members and influential congregations grew up in orbit around the modest publishing house—and it was a *house*—at 2109 Troost Avenue in Kansas City, Missouri.⁴

The next morning, on the last day of the Assembly, Saturday, October 14, the chair seated Haynes as a ministerial delegate representing the Dallas district, replacing the absent R. T. Williams, a future general superintendent and, at age 28, Haynes's president at Texas Holiness

³ Minutes of the General Assembly, 1911, 23, 25. The seven board members were Haynes as President, Kinne as Manager, A. S. Cochran as Treasurer, Will T. McConnell as Secretary, L. D. Peavey, W. M. Creal, and DeLance Wallace. Bresee and Reynolds have warranted excellent modern biographies, e.g., Carl Bangs, *Phineas F. Bresee: His Life in Methodism, the Holiness Movement and the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1995), and Mary Lou Shea, *In Need of Your Prayers and Patience: The Life and Ministry of Hiram F. Reynolds and the Founding of the Church of the Nazarene*. (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2015).

⁴ Minutes of the General Assembly, 1911, 27. Publishing Board Minutes, Unprocessed Materials, Nazarene Archives. The General Assembly authorized the general superintendents to nominate "the Church Historian." They responded by electing E. F. Walker "General Historian," and four regional "church historians": H. B. Hosley for the "southern part of the eastern division," Fred A. Hillery for the "northern part of the eastern division," C. B. Jernigan for the "southern division" (which Jernigan more correctly called "the Southwest"), and Leslie Gay, Jr. the western division. Only Jernigan seems to have taken this task seriously.

University. Later that morning, the publications board made its second report. By the time the assembly adjourned, Haynes was in old familiar stride, making motions on the floor of the assembly. Haynes went back to his classes in Texas, but the board met often that fall, and on November 23, 1911, the board elected Haynes “editor-in-chief” of its new ‘central’ or ‘connectional’ organ, named the *Herald of Holiness*, with an annual salary of \$2000. They chose C. A. McConnell, previously editor of the now-to-be-closed *Pentecostal Advocate* in Texas, office editor.

The board hoped that each of the three existing regional papers would disband. The California *Nazarene Messenger* and Texas *Pentecostal Advocate* papers did close, selling their stock and equipment to the new venture. The leaders of the New England paper, *Beulah Christian*, refused, however, citing worries about the risky new venture. The cautious New Englanders even made plans to expand. Haynes, manager C. J. Kinne, and assistant editor C. A. McConnell meanwhile moved to Kansas City to begin operations, producing the first issue of the *Herald* on Wednesday, April 17, 1912. Haynes would occupy that post until April 1922, defending, articulating, and shaping the core commitments of the Nazarenes as a dissenting denomination in the Methodist tradition.⁵

The founding leadership trio of board president and editor Haynes, NPH manager Kinne, and assistant editor McConnell were all experienced in newspapers and publishing. They quickly established a reputation for hard work under impossible conditions. Their selection strengthened

⁵ Publishing Board Minutes. Floyd Cunningham, ed., with Stan Ingersol, Harold E. Raser, and David P. Whitelaw, *Our Watchword and Song: The Centennial History of the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 2009), 273-280. J. B. Chapman, *A History of the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1926), 110-111. Minutes of the General Assembly, 1911, 53. Timothy L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness: The Story of the Nazarenes*. (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962), 263-266. The Sixth General Assembly in 1923 dramatically altered the organization of the church, eliminating the various General Boards for a single General Board. It also made the *Herald* editor a position elected directly by the General Assembly itself. Chapman, *History*, 112-113. The first issue of the *Herald* appeared two days after the sinking of RMS Titanic.

ties to California and Texas Nazarenes, but left out the northeast. Haynes's selection added ties to holiness advocates in the southeast, including J. O. McClurkan's Pentecostal Mission. The rationale for holding the 1911 assembly in Nashville was to draw McClurkan's group into the denomination. Haynes had been on the original governing board of McClurkan's Pentecostal Alliance in 1898, and McClurkan had effectively taken over leadership of the holiness movement in Middle Tennessee from Haynes between 1898 and 1900. Yet Haynes's extensive editorial and educational experience, and reputation as a holiness stalwart provided abundant rationale for the choice.⁶

As the early habit of locating General Assemblies ecumenically suggests, the origins of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene lay not in schism. Nazarenes did not form a church after an organized walkout. Many early Nazarenes had spent several years in independent holiness associations, alliances, or individual congregations after they left older denominations and before joining the Nazarenes. The Nazarenes gleaned and gathered former members from a wide range of denominations and traditions. Though many of its early gains were mainline Methodist losses, the denomination was a union or "come-in" movement, not a secessionist "come-out" movement. Its origins lay in the dream of many holiness adherents to have a single, national, and united holiness church. Regionalism played an important role, as similar groups developed in different regions and possessed different characteristics. The denomination came together through a series of ecumenical mergers of regional holiness bodies that occurred over several years, most notably in 1907 and 1908. In 1907 at Chicago, the California-based and Methodistic "Church of the Nazarene" founded in 1895 and directed by Phineas F. Bresee merged first with the East Coast-based and Congregational and Presbyterial "Association of Pentecostal Churches

⁶ Bangs, *Bresee*, 256-257.

of America” to form the “Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene.” In 1919, the General Assembly voted to drop the word “Pentecostal” due to its emerging associations with glossolalia or speaking in tongues, a change that reinforced Nazarenes’ identity as a holiness-but-not-‘pentecostal’ or ‘tongues-speaking’ church. That historical development had later effects on Nazarenes’ memory of their origins. It implied that Bresee was the sole founder, since he was, in fact, the founder of the “Church of the Nazarene” in 1895. It further implied that social aspects, for example the lowly Nazarene (Jesus), were primary in the church’s origin. These two effects leaned Nazarene memory in a westerly direction, and tended to demote the eastern founding figures and institutions in later lore. The change also obscured the importance of the term ‘Pentecostal’ and its rich associations with high expectations of, and focus on, the presence, and saving and sanctifying power, of the Holy Spirit.

But in the Nazarene imagination the 1907 merger was preliminary. In 1908, the southern and southwestern Holiness Church of Christ—itsself a product of earlier mergers—joined the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene at Pilot Point, Texas. While the regionalism of the holiness movement is probably overstated, the movement did have divisions and diversity. But for Nazarenes, the fact that regional bodies were composed of different denominational backgrounds and characters proved more important than truly regionalized identities. Yet early Nazarenes could not have ignored the dominance of regionalism in American life, including imagined regionalism. Thus Nazarenes later decided to date officially the birth of the denomination not to the California Nazarene birthday of 1895, or when the East and West joined in 1907, but to 1908, when a truly ‘national’ union had been achieved, when the ‘North’ and ‘South’ joined hands. They celebrated 1908 as a great symbol that holiness of heart and life could overcome lingering sectional divisions and enmities that had long plagued the nation. They did so knowing that in

1908, the Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians remained in sectional churches. The holiness movement via the Pentecostal Nazarenes had reunited thirty-one years before the earliest major merger of sectional churches, Methodism in 1939. Early Nazarenes were ecumenical expansionists. They aggressively sought new groups that might join, including talks with representatives of the Louisiana and Mississippi Conferences of the Methodist Protestant Church during the 1911 General Assembly.⁷

Nazarenes' original ecumenism rallied around a distinctive banner of dissent. Edwin Scott Gaustad's exploration of the theme in his *Dissent in American Religion*, provides suggestions for understanding Nazarenes' particular form of dissenting. He lays out three major groups of dissenters in American religion, each with several specific types. The first major group are "The Schismatics: Sinners Against Love." The second, "The Heretics," are "Sinners Against Faith," while the third, "The Misfits," are "Sinners Against Society."⁸

Three specific types that Gaustad describes seem applicable to early Nazarenes. The first two fall under the category of "schismatics," those who "sin against love." Few early Nazarenes would have appreciated the labels "schismatic" or "sinner," but perhaps would have recognized the specific ideals, namely, that Nazarenes' motives for "sinning against love" were for "piety" and for "liberty." That is, as related to Nazarenes' religious and spiritual life, and the focus of their ministry, they sought piety, as Gaustad says, "not doctrinal declarations but existential awareness, not ecclesiastical bureaucracies but private epiphanies," or, "the direct, immediate, private, incontrovertible experience of God." While Nazarenes sought public as well as private

⁷ For the history of groups that eventually joined, see the modern standard history, Cunningham, *Our Watchword and Song*, Part I, 15-190, and the classic standard, Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 54-242. The growth through ecumenism slowed after 1911, however, a tale told in Smith, 229-234. Smith names polity confusion as a primary cause for the defeat of early ecumenical hopes.

⁸ Edwin Scott Gaustad, *Dissent in American Religion*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973).

experiences, the following from Bresee in the *Nazarene Messenger* in 1907 highlights the idea: “This church is not different from other churches in the general statements of doctrine, but it believes in the reality of the truths stated in the creed, and insists not only on the belief of the truth but in knowing the reality of the transforming power of the Spirit of God. *This is the doctrinal peculiarity of the Church of the Nazarene—it believes in the incarnation of the truth by the Holy Spirit in human hearts.*” Strictly, there was no doctrinal dissent. Nazarenes were not arguing with the official doctrinal standards of the ME churches. Nazarenes did not merely consent to, or contend for, Methodist doctrines; they expected to *experience* them.⁹

The second of Gaustad’s applicable types are those who “sin against love” for the sake of “liberty.” Nazarenes’ polity ideals involved dissent similar to the search for a “less autocratic, less authoritarian” Methodism that led to the creation of the Republican Methodist Church in the 1790s. Its name suggested its form of government, “open and democratic,” and contrasted with Bishop Francis Asbury’s supposedly autocratic or “federalist” style.¹⁰

The third type of dissent applicable to Nazarene origins—one that highlights the social and political, or ethical aspects of Nazarene dissent—comes from the category “The Misfits: Sinners Against Society,” specifically “the ridiculed.” Gaustad says that society reserves its ridicule for “those dissenters who stubbornly refuse to see that every day in every way we are getting better and better.” Stated differently, he notes that “philosophies of history are not readily refuted.” Nazarenes’ fusion of too progressively embracing woman preachers, officially, and a third-party Prohibition Party committed to woman suffrage and child labor reform, unofficially, joined with widespread if unofficial support for premillennial eschatology in a postmillennial

⁹ *Nazarene Messenger*, July 4, 1907, p. 5. Quoted, with emphasis, in Bangs, *Bresee*, 256-7.

¹⁰ Gaustad, *Dissent*, 12, 16. See also J. Timothy Allen, “Religion and Politics: James O’Kelly’s Republicanism and Francis Asbury’s Federalism,” *Methodist History* (44:3, April 2006), 153-165.

age, along with “regressively” insisting on the social stands of early Methodism marked them as decidedly unfashionable. While none of these positions lacked adherents at the time, Nazarenes’ particular mix went too far for some and not far enough for others. Taking Gaustad’s types together reveals that Nazarenes embodied a broad dissenting ethos. Nazarenes’ seriousness, “this refusal to let well-enough alone,” as Gaustad says, is “the role of dissent.”¹¹

Yet students of early Methodist history will recognize much of the above in the character of early Methodism. Nazarenes re-appropriated the religious and the social dissent that characterized ‘primitive’ or ‘Old-Time’ Methodism, while making amendments in polity. Nazarenes’ jeremiads against Methodists’ drift, and their appropriation of Methodists’ history of jeremiads against Methodists’ drift, acted out a distinctively ‘Methodistic’ dissent against what they perceived as an ever more unmethodistic Methodism.¹²

Understanding the heart of Nazarenes’ Methodistic dissent requires an appreciation of their religious aspirations and experience. Interpretations that employ socio-economic, political, and even doctrinal determinism to understand the Church of the Nazarene tend to downplay the most cherished priorities of early Nazarenes. Social, economic, and political frames of reference do have some explanatory power, but it is limited. Doctrinal frames also explain much but leave many aspects of early Nazarene history unexplained. Early Nazarenes prioritized the experience of divine saving grace, that is, prevenient, convicting, justifying, regenerating, adopting, and sanctifying grace. They sought to experience the presence of God, and worked that others would

¹¹ Gaustad, *Dissent*, 111-113, 4. This outsider status would escalate dramatically in the 1930s and 40s after Mencken and Scopes. Gaustad’s type suggests that isolated or outsider movements and groups do not always isolate themselves; they are often isolated by shifts in society and culture. Put simply, when matters. Gaustad’s description of Kierkegaard: “ever-discontented, ever-dissenting faith.” 6. For another example of the intensity of holiness piety, see Haynes’s touching remembrance of his mentor and father in the faith, see “Death of Dr. E. M. Bounds,” *Herald of Holiness*, September 3, 1913, 1.

¹² For early American Methodist zeal and counter-cultural position, see John H. Wigger, *Taking Heaven By Storm* (New York: Yale University Press, 1998).

have this experience as well. The heart of their fellowship, its priority, its main thing, were such experiences of saving grace. This liturgical and devotional center, this ‘optimism of grace,’ animated and reordered their lives.

Yet this search for a right state of soul, a heart filled with perfect love, and a life seasoned by grace, had extensive practical implications. For Haynes and many others, a vital spiritual life entailed and required a community of faith, an ordered spiritual house, or in Methodistic terms, a sanctified and sanctifying connection. Nazarenes disagreed with the way of holiness associations that had proved unable to keep the fruits of their ministry, continuously losing adherents to hostile succeeding clergy and lack of organizational and catechetical means. Thus, early Nazarene spirituality had an overwhelming polity impulse. It was not enough to seek the blessings of God. One needed to be a company of those committed and ordered to that pursuit together. Sanctifying grace required a sanctified ministry. A sanctified ministry required a sanctified conference, a holy connection, or in Bresee’s plain language, “organized holiness.”

Although they struggled to articulate it, early Nazarenes understood polity as a means of grace, or polity as a way through which God shaped and transformed the spiritual life of believers. As a means of grace, polity rightly practiced, more important than polity rightly conceived, protected, enabled, and furthered the experience of divine saving grace. Polity ordered a life together, polity was how decisions were made that furthered and protected the gracious encounter, and polity was how the bonds of trust, love, and loyalty among and between believers were created and sustained. These bonds were powerful, not fragile, but early Nazarenes understood how tender the bonds were, sensitive to what was said and done, and to *how* things were said and done. Nazarenes expressed not only an ‘optimism of grace’—that God can and does overcome sin and death—but they also sought and longed after an experience of

that gracious power that entailed a search for, and practicing of, polity as a means of grace. Charles Ferguson wrote a history of Methodism with a title, *Organizing to Beat the Devil*, that while stated negatively, captures this specific ideal and stands in contrast to the political metaphors and ideals of the mainline Methodist Episcopal churches at the time, the latter captured by David Hempton's title *Methodism: Empire of the Spirit*. Stated positively, embodying the methodistic ideal to know and experience, and spread knowledge and experience, of divine saving grace, or 'victory' over sin and the devil, entailed and required a method, a way, an ordering of life together.¹³

The practice of polity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century MEC and MECS, as many early Nazarenes felt they had experienced it, was not a practice of polity that aimed at experiencing saving grace but it instead used polity with order as its end, rather than as a means. Mainline Methodists had separated order from piety, even putting polity to use against piety, or connectionalism against holiness. This involved a pastoral failure of the bishops to shepherd their flock, since the Methodist tradition's notions of episcopacy specifically burdened bishops with the task of leading in uniting ways that encouraged loyalty. Instead, episcopal ordering produced schism and broke the bonds of loyalty. It also involved a spiritual failure, early Nazarenes believed, as mainline leaders had failed to prioritize the experience of divine saving grace. Faced with a choice of a gracious or ungracious approach, they had chosen the ungracious way. They had banned, driven out, or driven to silence many who eagerly sought experiences of

¹³ Methodists also struggled to articulate this understanding, even though they lived it out. See Richey, *Early American Methodism*, 65-81. In 1746 John Wesley said "what is the end of all *ecclesiastical order*? Is it not to bring souls from the power of Satan to God, and to build them up in his fear and love? *Order*, then, is so far valuable as it answers these ends; and if it answers them not, it is nothing worth." Cited in Thomas E. Frank, *Polity, Practice, and Mission of the United Methodist Church* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006), 42. Charles W. Ferguson, *Organizing to Beat the Devil: Methodists and the Making of America*. (New York: Doubleday, 1971). David Hempton, *Methodism: Empire of the Spirit*. (New York: Yale University Press, 2006).

saving grace.¹⁴

This reading of Nazarenes' polity ideal acknowledges that the means of grace included prayer, Bible reading and memorization, preaching, congregational worship, the sacraments, singing, "family religion," and the reading of devotional literature, including spiritual biography and autobiography, and death narratives of saints. But a perusal of the minutes of church meetings also suggests that Nazarenes experienced additional means of grace through their assembly and work together. Thus the means of grace also included "attending to" camp meetings, healing services, sacrificial giving, rebuking sin and enforcing discipline, being careful with others' reputations, evangelism, public testimony to divine grace in one's life, conferring together, working toward consensus, decision-making gatherings such as board meetings, committee meetings, annual district and quadrennial general assemblies, selecting a pastor, pastoral visitation, reading the connectional paper (the "weekly visitor"), conversations with others, forgiving and receiving forgiveness of sins and slights, bearing with others and trying not to occasion too much of their need to bear with you.¹⁵

Historian and Nazarene archivist Stan Ingersol has written often of Nazarenes' early characteristics. Rejecting the oft-repeated notion that Nazarenes are "Wesleyans but not

¹⁴ The significance of Nazarenes' early adoption of full lay and clergy rights for women can be seen in this light. Not only did it affirm, and testify to, the "Pentecostal" expectation that both sons and daughters would experience a call to preach the gospel, it also served as a rebuke of mainline Methodists' controlling ways regarding women's involvement in all phases of church ministry, whether as unrestricted lay Christian workers, as teachers and preachers in the pulpit, as decision-makers in General Conference, or as advocates of political reform. The early Nazarene position is best understood within eschatological, polity, ecumenical, and even partisan contexts. It was not motivated by an attempt to keep up with the times, to keep in step with the march of history and/or the advance of civilization, or metanarratives and philosophies of history that divined a right side of history. Many such notions early Nazarenes judged to be manifestly wicked and unscriptural. While Nazarenes have 'plundered' and borrowed along the way—Nazarenes have not been technological luddites for example—arguments appealing to the idea that 'this is the way the world is heading' would have generally received a very cold reception. Nazarenes sought to discern God's leading clearly and decisively. They did not seek to 'divine' the world's. They assumed those two paths more often diverged than converged.

¹⁵ Early General Assembly minutes show that such polity gatherings were experienced as powerful means of grace.

Methodists,” Ingersol contends that “Nazarenes are a believer’s church in the Methodist tradition.” Believer’s church is not a tradition per se, but rather a way of conceiving and embodying the relation of the church to the wider world, a way of understanding the church in social context. This way requires that all within the church are Christians, sets standards for what it means to be a Christian, and observes the boundaries between Christian and non-Christian practices and conduct. How strictly the boundaries are defined and how aggressively they are observed determines whether a believer’s church is moderate or radical.¹⁶

For Ingersol, Nazarenes, like the Church of the Brethren, Moravian Church, and Church of God (Anderson), fuse a moderate believer’s church “ecclesial style” with the “spiritual style” of pietists’ “religion of the heart.” While believer’s church sets the church in relation to society, pietism sets the church in relation to God, and often, to other churches or denominations. Pietists emphasize the way of salvation, justification, sanctification, prayer, testimony, witnessing, and missionary activity. Taken together, the moderate believer’s church way and the pietist way define much about Nazarene identity. Churches tied to camp meeting traditions, including Nazarenes, often reflect this fusion of believers’ church and pietist characteristics.¹⁷

Here, too, early Methodism showed such characteristics. The ME churches had been believer’s church fellowships, deeply influenced by the spiritual style of German pietists, particularly Moravians and the predecessors of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (EUB). Yet through explosive growth, lessening of disciplinary requirements for members, and the

¹⁶ Ingersol, *Past and Prospect*, xi, xii.

¹⁷ Ingersol, *Past and Prospect*, xi, xii. See also Ingersol, “Methodism and the Theological Identity of the Church of the Nazarene,” *Methodist History*, 43:1 (October 2004): 17-32, and Ingersol and Wesley Tracy, *Here We Stand: Where Nazarenes Fit in the Religious Marketplace*. (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1999), 22-23. For the believer’s church principle, see Donald F. Dumbaugh, *The Believer’s Church: The History and Character of Radical Protestantism* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1968). Such churches are often called “free churches” in Europe, language that does not apply in the United States where all churches are “free.”

influence of social, cultural, economic, and political uplift, the ME churches became broadly-encompassing churches with a custodial relationship to national life. Holiness advocates pressed a constant critique of the “worldliness” in the church, mainline Methodism’s nouveau relationship with society, its shift from camp meeting to Chautauqua.¹⁸

Nazarenes’ polity reform also had antecedents, most notably the Republican Methodists (1792), Methodist Protestant Church (1830), the Wesleyan Methodist Connection (1843), and the Free Methodist Church (1860). Like most Methodist bodies, they did not make normative claims for their polity, for example, that it constituted “real” or “true” or “the apostolic” or “the scriptural” form of church governance. While Nazarenes were part of a long tradition of modifying Episcopal Methodist polity, they did not name a particular moment in Methodism’s polity past that they sought to recover. Rather, they made a direct, practical amendment to the received polity of Episcopal Methodism.

Nazarenes adopted substantial reforms to the polity of Episcopal Methodism in the area of elections. The new polity sought to limit the potential for ecclesiastical bossism. Early Nazarenes made clergy leadership positions (pastors, district superintendents, that is, the ‘presiding elders’ of the ME churches, and general superintendents) elected positions that were subject to reelection, and were to be elected by as large a body of persons as practical. With memories of ME episcopal mistreatment still fresh, few Nazarenes needed convincing that appointment power inherently invited arrogation and abuse of power. Even boards and committees elected by assemblies were not always trusted to select leadership; when in doubt,

¹⁸ For the EUB, see Stephen O’Malley and Jason Vickers, eds., *Methodist and Pietist: Retrieving the Evangelical United Brethren Tradition*. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2011). The 1968 merger between the Methodist Church and the EUB brought the German influence formally into the mainline Methodist fold. But the influence had been there from the beginning, including the influence on John Wesley and Francis Asbury. Explorations of the similarities between Nazarene history and EUB history, both origins and later development, might be particularly fruitful for understanding the respective denominational histories and the believer’s church and pietist shaping of both mainline and dissenting Methodisms.

they preferred mass election by congregational membership meetings, seated district assembly delegations, and seated general assembly delegations. As polity reformers in the MECS had desired, consultation, accountability, and dispersal of decision-making became a core founding ideal and practice.

Yet Nazarenes' expressions of this ideal were often inaccurate and misleading.

Nazarenes did have a “representative form of government”; but so did the ME churches. The difference came not in embracing a “congregational” form of government, nor in a “best of” fusion of “episcopal” and “congregational” forms (the fusion theory that has been consistently claimed by Nazarenes from their early days), but in amending the polity of Episcopal Methodism in favor of the election and re-election of all clergy leadership positions.¹⁹ The ‘democratic’ or ‘republican’ demand that clergy leaders in executive positions be demonstrably and actually accountable to the respective bodies they served marked the early Church of the Nazarene as an *elective* Episcopal Methodism, not an *appointive* Episcopal Methodism.²⁰

¹⁹ A “congrescopol” or “episgregational” *denomination* could readily be imagined, having e.g., diocesan episcopacy but a simplified Reformed liturgy, or the converse, a high liturgical practice with no bishops. But when used to signify *polity* alone, these two terms represent polity extremes. Early Nazarenes were trying to say their polity blended the best of both while avoiding the weaknesses, and Nazarene polity did have such a blend between episcopal oversight (‘the need for a superintendency’) and the voice of laity and non-episcopal clergy. But the fusion theory formulation ignored the difference between Methodist episcopacy and Anglican episcopacy, and has confounded Nazarenes’ polity reflection ever since. When J. B. Chapman divided Christianity into three polities – Episcopal, Congregational, and Presbyterian—he missed that Methodism has a *distinct* form. Chapman’s statement that Bresee’s California Nazarenes were “quite inclined toward Episcopalianism” missed the mark in more ways than one. Chapman, *A History*, 74.

²⁰ The closest statement to this position is from J. B. Chapman’s clever, “Our Connectional Officers,” *Herald of Holiness*, August, 8, 1917, 6. Stan Ingersol’s characterization of Nazarenes as “A Democratic Methodism” is accurate, especially from an intra-Methodist ecumenical perspective. But the thrust of early Nazarenes’ polity dissent regarding superintendency had less to do with concern for inclusivity, i.e., that everyone gets a vote, and more to do with accountability and fears of autocratic and abusive leadership. The renaming of bishops as “general superintendents” reflected this rejection of entitled, unaccountable, and lordly power. The elective reform also had the additional benefit of providing opportunities to validate good leadership. Ingersol, *Past and Prospect*, 7-8. An elective system had one significant downside, namely the efficient and timely placement of pastors with congregations, an issue the Methodist Episcopal appointment system addressed directly and efficiently. District superintendents in one region were limited in their knowledge of pastors in another, perhaps especially younger pastors. Former ME clergy B. F. Haynes and H. D. Brown both wrote to General Superintendent H. F. Reynolds,

Whether because or in spite of this inheritance, Nazarenes had a Methodist problem. Nazarenes did not pit connectionalism versus holiness. Rather, early Nazarenes were swimming in deeply Methodistic spiritual and polity currents, building a methodistic connectionalism steeped *within* the Methodist tradition yet heavily informed by their dissent against particular practices of the Methodist Episcopal churches. They did not reject “Methodism” or “the Methodist tradition.” Rather, they sought to embody and practice it zealously. But they did this in spite of the fact that Nazarenes would come to obscure, distort, and truncate the memory of their own heritage by imagining they had a ‘congregational’ or ‘episcopal’ fusion polity (or worse, that they had no polity tradition at all, an “order” built upon ever-rootless, malleable, *de novo* whimsy). They also actively denied their parentage by aggressively substituting “Wesleyan” for “Methodist.” The fact that some mainline Methodists would deny Nazarenes a place at the pan-Methodist table contributed to this problem of misplaced memory.

This mutual delegitimizing, anti-ecumenism, and labeling and un-labeling so typical of intimate spats within traditions, eventually masked the fact that Nazarene origins are best located in disagreements that were internal to Methodism, in intra-Methodist dissent, and severely inhibited later Nazarene participation in various forms of intra-Methodist ecumenism and intra-Methodist conferencing. The family resemblances between the various Methodisms went well beyond their common doctrinal language, Protestant evangelical piety, or their general appreciation of John and Charles Wesley.²¹ Nevertheless, a Nazarene self-understanding

himself formerly MEC, wondering if he might intervene and help devise a better way of connecting pastors with congregations with open positions. Shea, *In Need of Your Prayers and Patience*, 156, 390.

²¹ “Evangelical” has many meanings historically. The authors of the four gospels are known as “Evangelists,” as the Greek word for gospel is the original word from which the English words evangelical, evangelism, etc derive. Thus “Gospel Music” could be called evangel music, or a gospel teacher an evangelical teacher. But there is also a Protestant anchoring to the term. For example, the largest Lutheran Church in the USA is called the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America—even though the term evangelical in its later American usage would not normally include the Lutheran family of churches. Evangelical theology in some cases refers to the theology of the major

unmindful and shorn of its fundamental Methodistic pedigree renders much of Nazarene history inexplicable and incoherent in any historical, ecumenical, or broader Christian context. Likewise, any understanding of the wider Methodist tradition minus Nazarene history makes the abundant evidence of the ubiquity of Methodists' essential practice—dissent, especially polity dissent, with polity understood as a spiritual means of grace—ever harder to perceive. It also undermines recognition of the parallel and common need among all the various Methodisms to develop more appropriate ways of addressing disagreement.

Yet early Nazarenes had not yet forgotten their intimate relation to the Methodist tradition, including practices that went beyond the particulars of Wesleyan theology. Haynes declared Nazarenes' Methodist inheritance in no uncertain terms in 1912: "The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, in point of doctrine, of experience, of evangelistic activity and missionary belief and endeavor, is Mr. Wesley's legitimate and historic offspring and the direct successor of the Wesleyan movement."²² For Haynes, the Church of the Nazarene "stood consistently for truths... to which the MECS was committed by her standards, but had abandoned entirely."²³

As late as 1933, the "Silver Jubilee" of the founding, Nazarene theologian and educator A. M. Hills reflected the original vision of a Methodistic Methodism when he declared the denomination "the fairest flower that has ever bloomed in the Methodist garden, the most promising ecclesiastical daughter the prolific Mother Methodism has ever given to the world."

Protestant reformers, perhaps especially that of Luther and Calvin. More commonly, evangelical refers to the wide range of Protestant churches traceable to, or shaped by, the Great Awakening or Evangelical Revival of the 18th century, including the evangelical ministry of John and Charles Wesley.

²² "The World is My Parish," *Herald of Holiness*, December 18, 1912 (insert, p. 3). Despite this, Haynes regularly noted his continuing friendships with Methodists, including those with no obvious record of holiness advocacy, e.g., his friendship with future bishop Horace DuBose, *Herald of Holiness*, November 17, 1915, p.3.

²³ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 246.

Hills encouraged Nazarenes to study Methodist history, saying “If we studiously cultivate our great parent’s virtues and prayerfully avoid her mistakes, no human mind can grasp and foretell what the future may have in store for us. Think from what a holy ancestry we have sprung!” Hills warned, “We Nazarenes are lineal descendants of Methodism, and God will expect us to live accordingly.”²⁴ As Melvin Dieter noted, “most of the groups that eventually organized out of the holiness revival retained a Methodist affinity in their articles of faith, structures, spirituality, and sense of mission which reached far beyond their fervent advocacy of Methodism’s central doctrine of entire sanctification.”²⁵

Haynes shaped Nazarene identity along these lines consistently through the pages of the *Herald*. Haynes quoted no less than the famed James Monroe Buckley, for thirty-two years editor of the New York *Christian Advocate*, the central organ for the MEC, who said in 1908, “I have listened to nearly all our bishops, secretaries, editors, college presidents and other men acknowledged to be our strongest and best... I have gone from their meetings with the feeling that God had given Methodism the strongest and best men in the world, but I never went from their meetings with the feeling that any one was in danger... To me the only solution is that while they honestly maintain the old standards as a sacred duty, and earnestly endeavor to make

²⁴ Cunningham, et.al., *Our Watchword and Song*, 293. The course of study for Nazarene ministers also placed heavy stress on classic Methodist authors and Methodist themes. The grandparent to grandchild metaphor is one of several that have been applied. The most prominent model is probably the *secession* narrative—that Methodists and Nazarenes split, permanently and finally to tread separate paths—a view that implies the only common ground is the ground *before* the split, and that the two bodies operate as alien or distantly related entities. This view does leave room for cooperation in historical enterprises exploring the history before the split, but little else. Another model is a *succession* narrative, one that assumes Nazarenes took the mantle of Methodism, leaving the older body as a mere formal shell, largely without any continued reason for existence. These models ignore the common ground that endures *after* a division between groups within the same religious tradition, and ignores useful insights by imagining each denominational narrative as self-contained unit. But if nations lie enmeshed in each other’s histories, so too might religious groups. The commonalities between the groups—their inseparability—suggested here envisions that commonality as a mislaid memory, like missing navigational charts full of forgotten and thus unutilized navigational aids, aids useful to any ship without reference to divisive things like flags and languages (or bitter memories).

²⁵ Dieter, *The Holiness Revival*, 265.

themselves believe the old teaching, deep in their hearts they do not believe them.”²⁶

Haynes commented extensively about the ME churches in the *Herald*. What Methodists did and said mattered to him. He reported on MEC and MECS General Conferences. Haynes just assumed that the sayings and doings of ME General Conferences would be of inherent interest to Nazarenes, for example the number of bishops to be elected and a commission to study church newspapers. This Methodist-marking ranged from sharp rebukes of the General Conference for not rejecting the “heretical teachings” of “bald Pelagianism” found in MEC Sunday School literature to praise for the MEC episcopal address that “bristled with many fine statements.”²⁷

Yet Nazarenes inherited much from the ecumenical range of American religion, the holiness movement, and the respective groups that joined the new denomination. That inheritance included two distinguishable but often interrelated tensions. The first tension was between connectionalism and independentism. The second tension was between churchly habits and sectarian habits.

Connectionalists wanted a strong denominational order, bound together and nourished by the two most important connectional ministries—general superintendency and the connectional paper—with colleges, missionary programs, compassionate ministries such as rest homes and orphanages, and other publishing interests also having connectional claims. Independents

²⁶ “The Old Time Pulpit,” *Herald of Holiness*, October 23, 1912, p.1. For more on links between an ideal ministry that stresses the Wesleyan movement as a missionary movement, see Haynes, “The Only Gospel that Saves,” *Herald of Holiness*, December 18, 1912, p. 3.

²⁷ *Herald of Holiness*, May 29, 1912, 3; and June 5, 1912, 3. MEC General Conferences were held in 1912, 1916, and 1920. MECS General Conferences were held 1914, 1918, and 1922. Haynes defended organized holiness and urged Nazarenes to organize new churches quickly in order to preserve holiness converts, saying “Away with this silly nonsense and pitiful rot of opposition to organized holiness! They are all but pleas for apostate churches which oppose holiness and would throttle every sanctified man and woman in Christendom today had they the power. Make no truce with such a gang!!” “A Concrete Illustration,” *Herald of Holiness*, February 15, 1922 pp. 1-2.

preferred to choose what ministries they wanted to support, including those of previous association outside the denomination. In this early stage, the most obvious dividing point was over superintendency, though all the connectional ministries had to assert their claims with varying levels of success.

Those with churchly habits had wider cultural and political openness, and more moderate and/or regulated disciplinary and social stands. Sectarian habits implied a more isolated and radical conception of the believer's church, entailing a sharper drawing of boundaries and a more vigorous enforcement of those boundaries. The churchly camp preferred that discipline cases be handled discreetly, with the initial assumption of innocence. Sometimes the difference fell on where to draw the line between immoral and imprudent conduct.

Many former ME clergy, including Haynes, Bresee, and veteran presiding elder/district superintendent H. D. Brown, were firmly churchly connectionalists, and often those with independent leanings were also of sectarian habits. But not always. Some former Congregationalists had pastored urban or county seat congregations with more open and cautious attitudes about disciplinary cases but with very independent notions about the near absolute freedom of clergy and laity regarding any ministry outside their own congregation. Nazarenes drew new members and clergy rapidly, started new congregations in areas influenced by various perspectives, and made appeals voiced by those who imagined a connectional church, and by those who envisioned a loose congregational association led by autonomous pastors. In short, Nazarenes were still in the process of discovering each other, a process that entailed not a few surprises, some painful, embarrassing, and dangerous. There would be many opportunities, especially during the 1915–1919 quadrennium, for Nazarenes to discover and practice a vigorous

intra-Nazarene dissent.²⁸

The winsome personality and bearing of P. F. Bresee held many of these tensions at bay. Bresee's personal style was gracious, hopeful, and irenic. He focused on points of agreement and consensus, carefully avoided giving unnecessary offense, and quickly addressed any misgivings. A particularly talented master of ceremonies, Bresee held the denomination together by leading in ways that encouraged trust. His focus on vital spirituality left little room for radicals to charge him with inattention to spiritual things, while his orderly and correct administrative style indicated to those fearful of chaos and "fanaticism" that he could be trusted to steer the ship. Bresee's leadership in worship settings was particularly notable, for Bresee's services at the western mother church, Los Angeles First, were joyous and *loud*, but they were not chaotic. Despite all the shouting, singing, and testifying, pastor Bresee insisted that the order of service be closely followed. Extemporaneous features would occur in their proper and assigned order.

As a general superintendent, Bresee would often allow those happy to obey him to choose their own course of action. When he was not willing to do this, he made his case carefully, often guiding others to decide as he had without making a demand. But part of his appeal lay in a lack of specificity on unsettled and potentially controversial topics. Bresee knew the inner features of Methodist Episcopal polity. He knew more precise terms were available than "superintendency" and "episcopal." He knew many former Congregationalists believed that the Church of the Nazarene had a "congregational form of government" or "a congregational form of government with a limited superintendency." But he also knew that correcting or arguing

²⁸ Haynes said he could tell an ex-Methodist in a General Assembly because their "old Methodist training" showed, especially in parliamentary matters. He mentioned Bresee, H. D. Brown, and H. F. Reynolds as specific examples of this. *Herald of Holiness*, October 20, 1915, 3. This statement reflects Haynes's bias in favor of Methodists, but it also illustrates that he had little sectional bias against the MEC. Brown and Bresee are westerners, Reynolds from New England. All three were former MEC clergy.

polity could easily become divisive. He decided to make some directive statements, always carefully worded, but he avoided using more precise language that would likely have given former Congregationalists pause. His aim was ecumenical unity around the mission, not precise and potentially divisive delimitations of polity. Churches typically worried about polity when they thought it was not working. For Bresee, Nazarene polity worked, at least well enough. At least as long as Bresee was around to hold it together.²⁹

Bresee and Haynes came from MEC and MECS polity traditions that made polity subservient to mission. Mechanisms for change and reform were internal features of the Episcopal Methodist polity tradition. Yet, traditions, no less than mission, required stability. Neither Haynes nor Bresee understood polity as open to be drastically remade every four years. Both also understood that polity mistakes were as often mistakes in practice or ‘administration’ as they were mistakes in form or structure. Whatever the system of polity, persons still made decisions. Lastly, they both understood that Methodist polity had developed over time, and often reflected mature wisdom acquired by hard trials and grievous error. Thus, radical changes in polity were to be openly debated and carefully weighed for unintended consequences, including attention to the various ministries and offices whose mission may be frustrated by reforms intended to ease the path for other ministries.

The ministerial records of Bresee and Haynes within the ME churches reveal remarkable similarities. Bresee served thirty-seven years as ME clergy; Haynes thirty-eight. Both had extensive pastoral experience in rural circuits, county seat stations, and large urban station charges, and both had experience with city missions. Both had been elected twice by their annual

²⁹ For an example of early Nazarene worries about Methodist style episcopacy, see Jas. J. Ballinger, “Some Reasons Why I Left the Methodist Church,” *Herald of Holiness*, May 20, 1914, 6-7. For extended biographical commentary on Bresee, see the remarkably effusive tribute issue that should be required reading for any student of Nazarene history, *Herald of Holiness*, November 24, 1915.

conferences to serve as delegates to General Conference. Each had once received the highest clergy vote total, an honor called “leading the delegation.” Both served as presiding elders (district superintendents), but neither had been an elected general officer (a “general secretary” or department head). Contrary to the normal expectations of holiness leaders and the experience of many early Nazarene ministers, neither had been a professional evangelist. Both interacted comfortably with rich and poor alike. Both were undoubtedly persons of episcopal caliber, or “bishop timber” in Haynes’s colorful language, and were the only former ME clergy to join the Nazarenes who had sufficient experience, success, and prominence to have had a chance to be elected bishop within the ME churches. Both sought an ecclesiastical home where “organized holiness,” that is, Methodism practiced correctly as they viewed it, would be normative.³⁰

But there were differences. Bresee started his ministry at a younger age and left the MEC earlier. Bresee lived longer. Both men experienced embarrassing financial downturns in middle age, Bresee due to a bad financial investment, Haynes due to episcopal demotion and his commitment to reform via his newspaper. While Haynes served twenty-one years as pastor of local MECS charges, Bresee served a whopping thirty-four years in local pastoral ministry. Bresee served three years as presiding elder, Haynes one. Bresee’s experience by type of ministry within the ME churches was narrower. He had extensive committee or trustee level experience with a wide range of connectional ministries, but he had never been placed in charge of a connectional assignment. Haynes had been a college president for seven years, and served one year as an agent for a connectional fund. Haynes had edited an official annual conference

³⁰ General Superintendent H. F. Reynolds received a good training in Vermont Methodism, but began ministry somewhat later in life, and left Methodism in his early 40s for the APCA in New York. He exercised high office gracefully and modestly, and played a vital role in influencing Nazarene polity in Methodist ways, but never achieved standing in ME churches comparable to that of Bresee and Haynes. For Reynolds, see Shea, *In Need of Your Prayers and Patience*.

newspaper for five years, and edited the paper for nine years altogether.

Bresee left the MEC as a “come-outer.” He could have continued serving prominent appointments as he had experienced only sporadic episcopal displeasure. Bresee decided to leave when his understanding of his own ministry changed. When he chose to focus on the poor and serve as pastor to the holiness people in southern California, his MEC colleagues were sad to see him go.

Haynes’s experience in the MECS was much rougher and more controversial. Bresee would have had no cause or justification to write an autobiography entitled “Tempest-Tossed on Methodist Seas.” Haynes had angered bishops long before he advocated holiness and, compared to the MEC, MECS bishops took a harsher and more aggressive position toward challenges to their authority. For years he had been the target of demotions, relentless attacks, and public shaming from bishops, the connectional editor, and a host of lesser rivals. Lastly, Haynes was a Tennessee Conference itinerant elder. Nashville was the headquarters city for the MECS. Bishops, the connectional editor, the publishing house, and the faculty of Vanderbilt University all resided there. Haynes pastored one of the largest churches in his denomination while still in his 30s. Bresee served in western conferences—in Iowa and Southern California—both booming and busting when he lived there, but far distant from the established eastern centers of power in the MEC. In 1890, Nashville had 76,000 people; Los Angeles, 50,000. Haynes had more intimate experience with leading connectional, educational, and intellectual ministries beyond the local church, and more experience with the insider workings of denominational politics and conflict. Bresee had more leadership experience in situations that were in rapid flux, where everything was possible. Each was well-suited to his role among Nazarenes, Bresee as a wise and confident shepherd to a booming young denomination with an unknown path ahead,

Haynes to the tough task of teaching a young and inexperienced denomination the hard disciplines of loyal connectionalism, reforming religious zeal, and moral courage.³¹

Haynes's determined connectionalism proved vital. Nazarenes were subject to powerful centrifugal forces. Deeply idealistic, born with regional and denominational bigotries in their imaginations, and well-versed in the dissenting arts and the croaker's craft, Nazarenes possessed more than enough potential for divisiveness, confusion, misunderstanding, and open schism. Certainly Haynes would do his part to reinforce idealistic dissent, but he was relatively free from the regional and denominational piques and bad manners that often characterized northern and southern denominational editors of his day. He aimed at human sin, not the imagined malice, idiocy, or pathologies persons of other regions or denominations were often expected to carry with them.

But this was not why Nazarenes needed him. They needed the connection, the binding and bonding, the shaping, encouraging, correcting, and catechizing only a connectional periodical with a strong editor could provide. Nazarenes needed to be weaned from their internal tendencies for going their own way or distrusting "those" people. Connectional breakdowns, either by weakening of connectional means (e.g., central organs, assemblies, frequency and length of episcopal visitation, gatherings of various kinds beyond the local, congregational, level) or abandoning or ignoring connectional means by focusing discussion, debate, and decision-making outside of such settings, were especially conducive to schism and chaotic

³¹ Given his location and prominent involvement in several controversies that rocked the MECS, Haynes had been a more important figure *in the MECS* than Bresee had been *in the MEC*. One could not tell a detailed story of Iowa or California Methodism without mentioning Bresee as a prominent, successful, respected, and largely conventional Methodist preacher. But Haynes's importance for the MECS was denomination-wide. Had Bresee not left the MEC, it is unlikely he would have appeared in any standard overview of Methodist history. Haynes would have been notable if he had never left the MECS, or even if he had never associated with holiness advocacy. His involvement at the center of the "conference rights" protest of the 1890s had repercussions for mainline Methodism that have nothing to do with Nazarene history.

debate, especially in idealistic traditions. Those lamenting division or lack of morale and motivation would often look to failures in attending to connectional practices specifically designed to prevent such maladies. The practices of binding Haynes and the *Herald* were tasked with in 1912 embodied connectional polity as a means of grace.

In both elective and appointive Episcopal Methodist polity, two general offices were especially charged with furthering connectionalism, and these two especially symbolized the means and mechanisms for unity: itinerant general superintendency and the editor of the sole, general, connectional paper. All other offices dealt with and presided over a part of the connection, e.g. district superintendents to their districts, boards and directors to their respective ministry areas, presidents to their colleges. In fact, even the general superintendents primarily presided over district superintendents and district assemblies. But the connectional editor addressed and represented the entire connection weekly. The two primary tasks of the chief editor were editorializing, or writing original content for the first two to four pages of the paper every week, and editing, i.e., securing, correcting, selecting, and arranging the various content of the paper. Haynes took his duties as editorialist and editor very seriously.³²

Connectionalism required connection to a common unifying conversation. But that conversation needed to be current, despite the fact that it could not happen in person. Thus a common conversation required a common text. This text—the pages of the connectional paper—provided a means through which comments, opinions, updates, news, and information were shared, and a common text over which to confer. The paper then served as a clearinghouse

³² The distinction was offices. The General Assembly/Conference was the supreme connectional means. Typically, all “general officers”—editor, various general secretaries, and publishing house leadership—were elected directly by the general conference. This provided each with a mandate distinct from that of the bishops. The general conference elected the top two layers of leadership, the general superintendents and the general officers or general secretaries. The bishops in appointive episcopal Methodism appointed all other clergy leadership positions.

for news, information, and discussion. In short, the *Herald of Holiness* functioned in many respects like a General Assembly held weekly.

It also functioned like weekly a pastoral visit, a quick theology lecture, a weekly devotional, and a motivational spark. Its regularity and stability provided readers with a common weekly religious discipline or practice, reading the official paper. In addition to informing and inspiring, church periodicals also provided a vital and primary means of reflecting and shaping a common identity. Editors of “central” or “official organ” (denomination-wide) church papers were often the most influential persons in their denominations, many functioning as bishop-editors and doctors or teachers of the faith. Haynes held just such a position, teaching with clarity and authority on a wide range of topics. He did not borrow, or appeal to, the authority of Bresee or any other general superintendent. Further, such bishop-editors were often the primary representatives of their denominations to other Christians and the society at large. Often editors had the best knowledge of events and opinions in other denominations, since they usually took the papers of other denominations too.³³

Haynes’s greeted the church in the first issue in April 17, 1912, saying, “It is encouraging to read the good wishes of the many who send in business letters and add a few words of cheer. We appreciate the prayers and good will of our brethren. We as a Church have undertaken a great work and one which means much to the world at large. We of ourselves are not sufficient

³³ Nazarene “general editors,” as the editors of the *Herald* were sometimes officially or unofficially called, have been somewhat different in background from those often selected in the MEC and MECS traditions. Haynes established the position, and set its pattern in many ways. Of the twelve to hold this role, at least nine have served as professors and/or presidents in higher education, with at least seven holding research-oriented doctoral degrees. Methodist editors were often chosen directly from the ranks of pastors, particularly pastors noted for skill in writing and/or preaching. In terms of resume, Methodist editor E. E. Hoss, who worked primarily in higher education, fit more closely the pattern among Nazarene editors. Biographically, Haynes stands out among his Nazarene editorial peers for his age at election, extensive pastoral experience, his extensive previous editorial experience, and his lack of an earned academic degree.

for these things, but as we rely upon God for our wisdom and strength we expect to succeed in His name.”³⁴ The paper began as a sixteen page weekly. A subscription cost \$1 US, \$1.50 international.

Readers routinely sent notes of praise and thanks. The congregation at Lowell, Massachusetts devoted a Tuesday night prayer meeting to “public testimony to the helpfulness of the paper.” Those who anticipated a “dry and uninteresting service” found instead one “full of life and enthusiasm.” The writer summarized the nearly eighty testimonies by noting three themes. First that the paper was “bringing truth to new converts in such clear, definite teaching” that it was “helping them become intelligently established in holiness.” The secondly, the paper was “stirring” the well-established members to “greater zeal and courage and usefulness.” Thirdly, the writer said the paper was “binding our church throughout the world more closely together, keeping us in touch with each other and helping us to be neighbors rather than strangers.” The writer added that many who had little time for reading said that “the condensed way in which the paper is written” enabled them to “get help from five minute snatches of reading now and then.” The writer concluded that the “whole spirit” of the meeting was “praise and thanksgiving for such a paper as the HERALD OF HOLINESS.” As readers of the *Tennessee Methodist* had, N. B. Herrell of Boise, Idaho even penned an ode to the *Herald* that abounded with appreciation for its usefulness. Herrell’s poem expressed clearly that reading the paper was a powerful and inspirational means of grace, a transformative religious experience.³⁵

³⁴ *Herald of Holiness*, April 17, 1912, 1.

³⁵ “Lowell, Mass.,” *Herald of Holiness*, May 7, 1913, p. 12. For a large number of tributes in one issue, see *Herald of Holiness*, January 19, 1916, p.3. N. B. Herrell’s ode: “HERALD OF HOLINESS, a family tie, a table spread for the passerby. We feast, and feast, we feast some more, and yet there seems abundant store. Its pages beam with burning truth, for middle aged, for old, for youth. There is no end to thought sublime, to help the faithful pilgrim climb. Dr. Haynes seems to grow, his editorials all aglow, with lighting truth he makes his point, old Satan’s lies to disjoint. Then articles from here and yon, with thoughts to bless us every one. Now, presto, veto, comes a change,

The *Herald* also provided church leaders with a means of official or pastoral communication. Reynolds even used the *Herald* to communicate to his fellow general superintendents a notice requesting a change in the time of their annual meeting, perhaps having no idea where they were but having confidence wherever they were they were reading the *Herald*. The *Herald* printed the mailing address for all general and district superintendents regularly. Bresee used the paper to reinforce an open and optimistic tone. Articles and announcements from general superintendents appeared frequently. However, they did not displace the editor. Haynes's editorials always appeared first, and material from the general superintendents appeared in the section appropriate to its type. For example, articles not from the editor followed the editor's comments, while newsy items, reports, testimonies from the field, announcements, and even help wanted ads appeared at the end of the paper. This reinforced the general superintendents' role as fellow laborers. Like a pastor in her pulpit, the editor had a right to the editorial pages of his assignment. The general superintendents did not tread on this editorial privilege. Throughout Haynes's editorship, his voice was unmistakably his own.³⁶

Perhaps even more than other ministries of the church, the connectional paper depended on support, promotion, and good will. Nazarenes struggled to grasp adequately the importance of the central organ. But Haynes understood its priority. Six weeks into his duties, Haynes declared "A Colossal Opportunity Neglected," and noted that "all the great churches are finding

we read the news from foreign range. Of missionaries and their work, we feel we can no longer shirk. With thoughtful minds we turn a page, we find reports where battles rage. From Districts, churches, not a few, they seem so say 'we're going through.' We catch the vision, join the chorus, we shout Hosanna till almost hoarse. And thus we close in blessedness, of reading the HERALD OF HOLINESS." N. B. Herrell, "Herald of Holiness," *Herald of Holiness*, September 12, 1917, p.11.

³⁶ [Reynolds] "Important Notice," *Herald of Holiness*, September 12, 1917, p. 11. Bresee's comment about the progress of Nazarene polity indicates the openness: "That this has as yet been fully accomplished, and all things wrought out in full, harmonious unity, cannot I think be claimed; but that a good beginning has been made, all must admit" *Herald of Holiness*, June 5, 1912, p. 5. The regular section in which this appeared was called "The Open Parliament."

it exceedingly difficult to float their church organs, even where they resort to taking commercial advertising to help support them.” The son and brother of professional publishers, editors, and journalists, and long-time occupant of an editor’s desk himself, Haynes informed the young church that “it is very rare that a church paper is self-supporting.” Urging that religious papers must not be financially dependent on commercial advertising and other non-religious material, Haynes boldly declared “our solution is to endow the church paper.” “It is a notorious fact,” he said, “that the income from subscriptions to the paper will not pay the cost of production.” Reminding Nazarenes that “we endow colleges and universities,” he called on “the benevolently inclined” to answer this “opportunity for an abundant harvest of gracious results” that he concluded, “We do not know to exist in any other field.” Remarkably, Haynes quoted the words of his old tormentor Hoss who said “with force and with truth” that endowment of the connectional paper was the essential solution to the financial question.³⁷

Haynes returned to the topic declaring that “The Most Hopeless of All Problems” was the “difficulty of arousing the membership of a denomination to an appreciation of the power and necessity and influence of the church paper,” and, “the duty of the membership and the ministry to put the paper into the hands of the people.” Haynes announced that “the church paper presents the hardest of all problems for solution,” and that “lethargy and indifference” on the issue was the “gravest problem with which we could be confronted.” He said, “the church periodical and book literature” was “at once the most vital ecclesiastical problem.” Indeed, Haynes contended that “neglect of the church periodical duty” was “the most fatal stab which can be aimed at any church.” He informed his readers that the MEC, with its “three and a half million members,” was

³⁷ “A Colossal Opportunity Neglected,” *Herald of Holiness*, May 29, 1912, 1-2. Hoss included a list of the high (and rare) qualifications needed by editors, adding that any such men so qualified “should be pressed into service.” That Hoss was quoted more than once, with approval, in the pages of a Nazarene paper edited by Haynes without a hint of their former struggles is simply stunning.

still “losing a quarter of a million dollars a quadrennium on their church papers.” Drawing to the heart of the question, Haynes asserted the connectional primacy of publication ministry on the basis that only this connectional ministry existed to serve all the others, including the local church. Leaving little doubt about his meaning, Haynes declared that publication was “of far greater importance to the church than the mission question, the educational interest or any other question or interest or all others combined.” The church literature and paper was “back of all of these,” and was, he instructed, “the chief producer and educator of sentiment on all these questions.” All the other ministries of the church, local churches, districts, colleges, missions programs, and evangelists, all used its pages to broadcast their efforts, instruct their charges, and declare their needs, including their financial needs. It was even used to warn the churches of an unworthy person not to be trusted. Without the paper, gossip, rumor, malaise, and ignorance would flourish.³⁸

Haynes, who could always be counted on for zeal, played a key role in keeping the young denomination energized and disciplined, and retaining the feel of a movement. Through the *Herald*, Haynes engaged in pastoral visitation and pastoral teaching—6000–8000 ‘calls’ a week—a feat no pastor or even general superintendent could ever hope to match. Only editors had such reach. Haynes, as editor of the central or general organ, the only connectional paper, was the keeper, holder, and articulator of the Nazarene center, of the Nazarene consensus. The tent would be as broad as the editor was. Little would remain important that was not evidently important to the editor. Pet pieties and opinions not part of the consensus were not absent from

³⁸ “Most Hopeless of All Problems,” *Herald of Holiness*, November 13, 1912, 1. See also *Herald of Holiness*, October 20, 1915 p.3-4. “Special notice,” *Herald of Holiness*, March 14, 1917 p.13, a brief note from Texas that names a man “altogether unworthy of recognition as a Christian worker.” It was signed by four persons, including prominent early leader J. B. Chapman.

the *Herald*, but they were voiced as part of the breadth of the conversation, not as essential characteristics or core marks.³⁹

Haynes practiced moderation on contested points among Nazarenes, but pressed vigorously and zealously on all matters of agreement. However, controversial articles from Haynes appeared regularly if not frequently. Sometimes he vigorously argued for his own position on contested matters. Haynes occasionally responded to critics in the *Herald*. The publishing board minutes reveal regular if not frequent rebukes regarding the publication of controversial topics. Haynes noted but did not always obey that ban. Most of his critics probably did not know how restrained his political commentary was compared to the *Tennessee Methodist*. While Nazarenes did not agree on eschatology, political matters, or whether or not members of labor unions should be allowed to work at the publishing house, such topics were usually not banned from discussion during his editorship. The topics mattered; thus, there should be no gag rule. Haynes seems to have thought that such topics should be discussed less frequently than matters agreed to, but not banned altogether. Nazarenes would make a serious, open, and reforming church. They needed a tolerant and open editor like Haynes.⁴⁰

Like many journalists of his day, Haynes believed that people and organizations worked best with a free press to provide “ventilation” or “airing” of issues. Any sense of secrecy and silence would leave room for doubt and suspicion, or result in poor decision-making, a recipe for

³⁹ For the policy of the managing editor on submission policy and complaints about non-admission see “Contributed Articles,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 19, 1916, p.2. The editors declared the paper was published for its readers, not its writers. Proposals on polity changes that had an appropriate tone would be published “at the proper time for such discussion.” Articles advocating positions on non-essentials would not be published “frequently.”

⁴⁰ Union members were allowed. For an example of Haynes responding to criticism, in this case about supposed partisan political comments, see “Taken to Task, *Herald of Holiness*, November 6, 1918, 2. Early Nazarenes were divided on eschatology; if banned from discussion entirely, young Nazarenes might grow up thinking eschatology unimportant, an appalling outcome for those who believe in resurrection and hope in the life to come. Without some discussion, a vacuum would have been created. Further, Nazarenes agreed to disagree on eschatology because they took it so seriously, not because they thought it was irrelevant.

misunderstanding, hurt feelings, and injury to the church. Haynes's *Herald* contained editorials of topical breadth every week, with its pages open to the airing of "diverse—even competing" opinions. Early Nazarenes' attempts to "get it right," encouraged and required ongoing discussion, carried out through the pages of the *Herald*.

When he feared Nazarenes were failing to make use of this essential connectional means of grace, Haynes sent a remarkably ecumenical rebuke to the entire denomination less than a year after he left office, asking "Why This Silence?" Surprised that the contributed columns had been silent on proposed changes in advance of the September 1923 General Assembly seven months away, Haynes declared that "There should have been numerous articles in this paper on desired changes" followed by "discussion of the proposed changes." Was the church's official book, the *Manual*, "infallible," he asked? "Needed changes," he asserted, "should always be proposed and discussed through the Church Organ." The opposite plan entailed "springing" changes "on the floor," thus "causing haste and confusion which often results in ill-considered legislation and sometimes egregious blunders." Haynes drew extended comparison to the habits of the ME churches, whose "central official Church Organ is burdened with articles," beginning "nearly a year" before the General Conference. In effect, Haynes accused Nazarenes of caring less about making good church law than ME churches did. He concluded, "Wake up brethren and sisters and get busy." Haynes's young successor, J. B. Chapman, responded by inviting an open forum for General Assembly debate and discussion that ran over the summer, concluding with the August 29th issue.⁴¹

As "the connectional editor," Haynes filled the same position O. P. Fitzgerald and E. E. Hoss had in the MECS. Haynes's position as *Herald* editor was unlike his role as editor of a

⁴¹ B. F. Haynes, "Why This Silence?" *Herald of Holiness*, February 14, 1923, 4. "Getting the Last Word," *Herald of Holiness*, September 5, 1923, p. 2.

dissenting or independent paper in the MECS. Haynes and Fitzgerald were more irenic and pastoral than Hoss, but Haynes was less humorous than the easy, calm, and confident Fitzgerald. Haynes and Hoss were somewhat more creative, and did more of their own proposing of ideas for improvement. Hoss's early tone was combative, giving way to a more elegant approach in later years. Haynes's articles were intelligent, not elegant, though they were sometimes beautiful, as Hoss's and Fitzgerald's sometimes were. Haynes often received praise for his clear and definite teaching. Fitzgerald and Haynes, both older than Hoss at the time of election, were also more experienced in pastoral and editorial work. They addressed critics of their work fairly. Fitzgerald was usually calmer and less vigorous than were Haynes or Hoss. Haynes and Fitzgerald seemed to understand that sometimes an editor had to let people grumble a bit, or as Fitzgerald put it, let the frogs croak in the "frog pond," without feeling the need to answer every charge or complaint. Haynes admired the work of MEC connectional editor Buckley. But unlike Buckley, Haynes rarely criticized specific persons in the *Herald*. As skilled in argumentation as Buckley and Hoss were, Haynes did not seem to enjoy such contests with other religious editors as they did. As *Herald* editor, his work was remarkably lacking in spats with other editors.

As *Herald* editor, Haynes did not face the kind of incessant criticism he faced as editor of the *Tennessee Methodist*. He had Nazarene critics, but he was not a lightning rod for dissent or criticism as in his MECS years. For that reason, and perhaps some mellowing as he grew older, his *Herald* years were much less combative and defensive. He rarely used heavy sarcasm when correcting fellow evangelical Protestants. Rebukes of Nazarenes were always firm, clear, and vigorously argued, but were less provocative, and especially less reckless, than those of many other religious editors of the time, including the younger Haynes. Haynes regarded his fellow religious editors warmly. He believed, as Hoss did, that few persons possessed the rare

combination of qualities needed in an editor, and defended Buckley from those who whispered that Buckley had never been elected bishop, saying, “Buckley would long ago have been made Bishop but for his preeminent gifts and qualification as an editor. He was too great an editor to be made a Bishop. Bishop timber is far more plentiful than editorial timber.” Haynes probably thought of himself as the equal of any bishop. But he did not think editors were superior to bishops or that their work was inherently harder. Rather, he held that more persons were suited to episcopal work than were suited to editorial work.⁴²

Editors of weeklies produced an extraordinary volume of editorials, perhaps between 2000 to 4000 words per issue, in short pieces usually between 500 to 1000 words each, on specific and varied topics. It was a format poorly suited to long-winded exposition, repetition, or banal filler material. Some editors—both earlier Methodists and later Nazarenes—occasionally resorted to lighter or more trivial filler, comments about their personal preferences on small topics or the sights seen on a recent trip. Haynes avoided this. He consistently wrote in a serious and substantial way on demanding moral, spiritual, social, and political matters in 700-900 word pieces. His weekly discipline included reading a considerable volume of other newspapers—religious and otherwise—as evidenced by his awareness of current events and comments made by others in the press. For nineteen years he kept these habits, a life that consumed and produced a staggering volume of words, and all under the pressure of weekly deadlines. His 1000 pages of extended writing in his four published books paled in comparison to his voluminous editorial

⁴² *Herald of Holiness*, June 5, 1912, p.3. Haynes reserved his harshest language for his standard quartet of villains: the leadership of the Roman Church, those who profited in any way from the liquor trade (which he viewed as organized crime), any perpetrator of extra-legal violence, e.g. lynchers and anarchists, and lastly, millionaires, the latter being corrupt and wicked almost by definition in Haynes’s view.

production. For two of those nineteen years, he was also a pastor or college president.⁴³

Despite Haynes's attempts to help his fellow Nazarenes understand the importance of the central paper, Nazarene conception and practice concerning the other supremely unitive and unifying connectional office—iterant general superintendency—would advance first. It took time for this inherited practice to become a true reality among Nazarenes. Nazarenes awakened to the importance of two particular aspects of this form of leadership. First, in this understanding of episcopacy, bishops have general responsibility for the whole connection. General Superintendents are not regional or jurisdictional superintendents to be elected only by part and/or serve only part of the connection. But that general responsibility was meaningless if they did not actually travel and preside throughout the connection, if they did not iterate wherever there were Nazarenes. Their actual circuit must, eventually, be as large as the connection itself. As with a nineteenth century Methodist itinerant, it takes time to complete the circuit. But this work was vital to the unifying pastoral role of itinerant general superintendency in denominations with an episcopal Methodist polity.⁴⁴

The second major realization involved establishing that each general superintendent

⁴³ Stan Ingersol, *Nazarene Roots: Pastors, Prophets, Revivalists, and Reformers*. (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 2009), 129. Haynes is unusual among early Nazarenes for not lamenting his lack of early education. But Haynes's formal collegiate education was slight, better than many, but less than others had, only a few weeks of study at Emory and Henry College in Virginia, and a brief time at Vanderbilt. The difference lay in the "academic" education in the classics he received, of the sort usually received in an "academy," along with his professional apprenticeship in the family's journalistic business, and a brief exposure to reading law. Most colleges of the day assumed that students would have already studied the classical authors in Greek and Latin, a pre-collegiate experience that highlighted a privileged status, and contributed to intellectual confidence. The latter is quite evident in his work. Haynes usually published his first draft of an article without revision, both a remarkable feat and a good discipline for the editor of a "weekly." A fast and zealous reader with a quick mind and good memory, his theological and civic education was continuous. He completed the four year course of study required of Methodist ministers in two years. As was common of newspaper editors, Haynes had subscriptions to many other newspapers, many probably reciprocal, and the pages of his papers often included quotations—usually with his introductory comment—of items published elsewhere.

⁴⁴ As Nazarene activity outside the North America grew, this need for episcopal itinerancy throughout the connection would have to be reinforced. Reynolds was particularly important in insisting that all the general superintendents engage in that practice.

would be accountable to the full “board of general superintendents” (BGS). Major decisions with broad implications or sensitivity needed to be made together. The church required leaders who knew the whole connection because they had visited throughout, and who determined significant policy together, with the expectation that once a course was decided upon, no general superintendent will act or speak as an individual against that consensus (a discipline both ME and Nazarene general superintendents occasionally found hard to maintain). Each of these reforms came from experience more than reflection, and each brought Nazarene polity closer to the model of itinerant general superintendency inherited from Episcopal Methodism.⁴⁵

In August 1915, Bresee addressed General Assembly delegates in advance of the assembly on the topic of “The General Superintendency.” Just three months before his death, Bresee affirmed the enduring and unifying value of general superintendency and mentioned several positives which were “patent to every observer and need no discussion.” But Bresee asserted his desire that a unified general superintendency “be maintained.” He rejected permanent administrative silos, whether by personal decision, types of work, or geographical area, and demanded first, “that whatever number be elected, they always act as one man,” and second, “that any tendency toward Division Superintendency—if there should ever be such a tendency—be avoided.” Bresee held that “The greatest unity of the church—so essential to its largest success—is best served by a General Superintendency that is a unit in all its work.” The preeminent founder and senior General Superintendent had made his dying wishes known.

⁴⁵ Bangs, *Bresee*, 174. Bresee served on the Committee on Episcopacy during the 1892 General Conference of the MEC. The leader of his delegation, (i.e., highest votes received), the Committee voted to continue to have “an itinerant general superintendency.” It has yet to be fully recognized as the theory, doctrine, or philosophy among Nazarenes, despite the fact that they practice it more consistently than do present day United Methodists, who inherited the jurisdictional or regional model from the 1939 merger, and have largely located their bishops through eight and twelve year terms in residence in one or two annual conferences. Regionally elected and narrowly serving bishops are neither itinerant nor general superintendents. In the United Methodist case, the conception is developed, but the practice has been abandoned.

Bresee wanted a unified and unifying board of general superintendents who served and itinerated throughout, and worked out any differences between themselves.⁴⁶

Having set out what he felt he could clearly assert as unchanging, Bresee said “it falls to the General Assembly to say how many General Superintendents shall be elected, and to arrange in some sense for their work,” adding that “the parts of the church in which they shall live, that they may be convenient for extra service and care of the church, might be, possibly, prescribed.” The number—Bresee suggested either two or four—would determine the type and extent of “extra service and care of the church.” Two adequately-funded, ideally “in middle life, who could travel alone,” could suffice provided their service was confined to presiding over district assemblies. Otherwise, four would be best—perhaps assigned one each to East, South, Center, and West—provided they would remain free for other work to “supplement” their support. The choice was a very limited general superintendency unable to render “extra service and care of the church,” or a larger one, perhaps not fully-paid, but resident in each region and ready and able to push on the work.⁴⁷

Bresee, in one short article, had laid out what he felt was permanent—a unified and unifying itinerant general superintendency presiding at annual district assemblies—and what was malleable according to the needs and preferences of the General Assembly, that is, the number and place of residence of the general superintendents, or, stated differently, the question of how

⁴⁶ P. F. Bresee, “The General Superintendency,” *Herald of Holiness*, August 4, 1915, p. 6. The positives “patent to every observer and need no discussion” included the superintendency’s “importance and necessity to our work, in adding to the forces which are making us one homogeneous body; the over-looking and helping all departments of church work and arrangements for its accomplishment, the pushing on of the work in all ways and places, etc.”

⁴⁷ P. F. Bresee, “The General Superintendency,” *Herald of Holiness*, August 4, 1915, p. 6. It is possible that Bresee preferred two, adequately-paid. That option would suggest that both Bresee and Walker retire at the 1915 assembly and a younger person be elected to serve with Reynolds. A Reynolds-Wilson option probably would have suited Bresee’s intention. Within the ME churches, choosing the number to be elected was a right of General Conference, not a right of the bishops.

much help and oversight the church needed from its general superintendents. Lower levels of the church were not asked to conform to the number or needs of the general superintendents. The needs of the connection came first, not the needs of the general superintendents. The only need of the general superintendents Bresee asked the church to attend to was their financial support. If the church needed more help, as it surely would as it grew, it should elect more general superintendents.⁴⁸

The 1915 General Assembly met in Kansas City September 30 to October 11 and took up Bresee's charge. The Standing Committee on Superintendency, including Haynes, as a clergy delegate from the Kansas District, decided to strengthen Nazarenes' elective Episcopal Methodist polity by changing the requirement for election from the ME standard, a majority, to a higher elective standard, two-thirds. It also recommended four general superintendents be elected, fully aware that only three would remain after Bresee's imminent death to serve a denomination of 40,000 members. Lastly, it recommended the four general superintendents reside (but not preside exclusively) in four separate, specified, geographical areas. A motion prevailed to allow the general superintendents to choose their individual zone of residence in order of their seniority in office. The assembly reelected Bresee, Reynolds, and Walker on the first ballot. Hunting for a younger person, and realizing that the BGS trio continued from 1911 lacked anyone with southern ties, the delegates elected the 46 year old E. P. Ellyson again, who had been elected in 1908 but resigned in 1911 to return to higher education. Ellyson declined,

⁴⁸ General Superintendents in this period usually had another position that provided support. Reynolds led the missionary department, Bresee pastored Los Angeles First for part of that time, and Walker served in college presidency. For Nazarene general superintendency and the number question, see Ingersol, *Past and Prospect*, 101-117. While the Church of the Nazarene has grown rapidly outside North America since 1960, the number of general superintendents has remained at six since that time. Ingersol calls for an increase in the number, and charges that "maintaining this status quo constitutes a neo-colonial project," and "the tail wagging the ecclesiastical dog." 107. If the ratio of 1915 (minus Bresee) of 3 to every 40,000 members had been maintained, today's Nazarenes would have c. 150 general superintendents.

and the delegates chose 49 year old Kentuckian and Bresee lieutenant W. C. Wilson instead.⁴⁹

Bresee read the General Superintendents' report that he had prepared. He praised the publishing house for its "remarkable success," its "great work," and the "marvelous" results it had achieved despite being "greatly handicapped" by lack of capital. The Standing Committee on Publication recommended that "a vote of thanks be given to our publishing force. We owe a debt of gratitude to them that we can never repay." The committee avowed, "We look with suspicion upon any preacher who circulates other religious papers to the impoverishment of our own." They called attention to the "unusual financial depression" that had threatened "our infant institution," whose "capital consists not so much in money as in good will." They said "each church is requested to make it a rule that every person or family belonging to the church shall receive the church paper as a right of church membership, and that the subscription price be made part of the annual budget to be raised in the same manner as other expenses." They exclaimed "Oh, that we could grasp the infinite possibilities and the far-reaching consequences of this work!" A session was held celebrating the publishing work and employees who had achieved it. C. J. Kinne, manager of the publishing house, was given a standing ovation.⁵⁰

It had been a stirring and encouraging display of support for the Nazarene Publishing House team. The paper and House were celebrated by Bresee and the Standing Committee, the

⁴⁹ *Proceedings of the Fourth General Assembly*, 1915, 34. The sixty-four year old Haynes was the ninth highest on the balloting for the fourth general superintendent with 15 votes, outpacing Jernigan's 2, and Brown, Ruth, and Wiley with 1 each, but behind Wilson at 92, Ellyson at 52, Williams at 42, W. E. Fisher at 23, Seth C. Rees at 20, and W. E. Shepard, J. W. Goodwin, and W. H. Hoople, each with 16. The four zones were precisely defined. West of meridian 110 West was the western zone. South of the northern borders of NC, TN, AR, and OK and east of 110 West was the southern zone. The eastern zone included all areas east of meridian 90 West (roughly east of the Mississippi River) and north of the northern borders of NC, TN, and AR. The central division was that north of the southern borderline and between 110 West and 90 West. It was an unmistakably western-heavy arrangement. Denver was "central." Chicago was "eastern." By those lines, at least three of the four could have lived west of the Mississippi. But it would not have allowed multiple general superintendents in southern California, a situation that had previously occurred. *Proceedings of the Fourth General Assembly*, 1915, 30, 54.

⁵⁰ *Proceedings of the Fourth General Assembly*, 1915, 50, 60, 28-29.

latter even rebuking any independent attitudes toward the connectional paper. The connectional spirit abounded. General Superintendency had been both strengthened and reformed in elective ways, and a good succession put in place. In fact the election process had worked out remarkably well. Delegates had first elected a former Quaker with light ties to the South, then elected a young former ME from Kentucky who had been under Bresee's tutelage in California, an ideal choice given the circumstances. The General Assembly had been well practiced as a powerful means of grace. And the two most important offices for sustaining connectionalism had been affirmed and straightened. But a great crisis lay ahead.

CHAPTER NINE

Nazarene Crises over Connectional Offices

Nazarene polity origins were followed by a Nazarene history unsettled by acute polity crises that threatened the very survival of the denomination. Those crises focused on two essential connectional offices, the general superintendency and the connectional editor. The death of Phineas F. Bresee on November 13, 1915 saddened but did not surprise the church. The remaining general superintendents, Hiram F. Reynolds, Edward F. Walker, and William C. Wilson, conferred and decided no election was needed, as the Assembly had clearly anticipated Bresee's death. But one month later, on December 19, 1915, Wilson died, only three days short of his forty-ninth birthday. Shocked, church leaders decided they not only needed to elect a replacement, they had better elect two. A lengthy round of mail balloting by the district superintendents resulted in the election of John W. Goodwin and Roy T. Williams, ages 47 and 33, respectively.

During a critical period in Nazarene history, 1912 through 1922, leadership stability was hard to come by as only two people occupied general connectional positions throughout those ten years. One was General Superintendent H. F. Reynolds. The other was Editor B. F. Haynes. In those ten years, there were three different General Secretaries and four different Publishing House managers. Haynes was editor for six different General Superintendents in those ten years, three of whom died in office during his tenure (Bresee and Wilson in 1915, and Walker in 1918). The relative instability stands out compared to the ten year period from Walker's death in 1918 to James Blaine (J. B.) Chapman's election to the episcopacy in 1928, when the General Superintendency was entirely stable: Hiram Reynolds, John Goodwin, and Roy Williams.

Not everything would be stable for the connectional editor. On March 29, 1916, Olivet University in Illinois, one of several young Nazarene colleges, elected him president, replacing General Superintendent Walker. Haynes moved to Illinois in April 1916. A brief announcement of his election by Olivet board president Milton Williams named him “one of the strongest theologians in the movement and a school man of many years’ experience.” His time at Olivet lasted just over one year, ending due to a disagreement with three faculty members who had close ties to the board of trustees. The professors offered their resignations to Haynes for unclear reasons, which he accepted. On June 1, 1917, the board intervened and questioned the professors and Haynes. When the board chose to overrule Haynes by asking the parties to work out their differences or face immediate dismissal, Haynes resigned immediately. While Haynes does not seem to have had previous trouble with faculty, he did have differences with the trustees at Asbury that also resulted in his resignation. As with the Asbury board, Haynes refused to accept personal responsibility for administration of the school when trustees with slight educational experience were really in control. The conflict was likely less about president-faculty relations and more about president-trustee relations. The same faculty members were in significant leadership positions in the years after Haynes left. In addition, Olivet ultimately went through a staggering fourteen presidents in its first ten years, including two current or former general superintendents. Leslie Parrott’s history of Olivet labels this era “The board versus the presidents.”¹

¹ *Herald of Holiness*, April 12, 1916, 16. Leslie Parrott, *The Olivet Story* (Newburg: Barclay Press, 1993), 12. Haynes reported on the “Olivet University Commencement and Campmeeting,” *Herald of Holiness*, June 14, 1916, 14. The school and the district superintendent were working in concert, and planned the next year to hold the district assembly to coincide with commencement in the spring, while holding the district campmeeting to coincide with the opening of the school in September. The commencement speaker doubled as the evangelist for the campmeeting—Rev. John Matthews of Kansas City First, the host of the 1915 General Assembly. “A Great Commencement,” *Herald of Holiness*, June 21, 1916, 12. Olivet had four majors during this era: a B.S. in Science (including philosophy), a B.Mus. in Music, a B.D. in Divinity, and a B.A. in Classics. For Nazarene colleges and

Haynes had good reason to take the Olivet presidency, however. During an evening session on February 22, 1916, five weeks *before* Haynes was elected president of Olivet, the new Publishing Board cut his salary from \$2000 to \$1000, stripped him of control for arrangement, general content, and overall appearance of the paper, and cut his space allotted for editorials from the first four pages down to the first two pages. The next day, the board, probably fearing that its action would provoke Haynes to resign, offered to pay him an extra \$200 to write some Sunday School materials too.²

During the 1911–1915 quadrennium, Haynes was editor-in-chief, president of board of publication, and a member of board’s executive committee. But Haynes was not on the publication board or executive committee after the 1915 General Assembly, probably due to general concerns that employees should not serve on the governing board, a concern reflected frequently in 1916–1917. Plant manager C. J. Kinne took the opposite route to meeting that standard. Kinne had stepped down as manager, and had been selected to be president of the Publishing Board, the only experienced publisher that served on the new board. It was 46 year old new board president Kinne, with 55 year old assistant editor C. A. McConnell playing a lesser role, who led the board to cut 64 year old Haynes’s salary and take back 50 percent of his editorial space. Kinne and the board did so apparently without the previous knowledge, advice,

education concern, see full education issue, *Herald of Holiness*, July 26, 1916. A history of the early years at Olivet reported that Haynes’ salary was \$1500 plus room and board. Carl S. McClain, *I Remember: My Fifty-Seven Years at Olivet Nazarene College*. (Kansas City: Pedestal Press, 1983), 51-52. Haynes’s recollections in 1920 do not reference disagreements, but rather focus on the chapel services where he preached for 30 minutes daily. He reported that “the Lord poured out His blessings upon preaching, President and student body. Interruptions by shouts of holy joy from students were common, and finally a mighty pentecostal revival broke out which swept almost the entire student body into the Kingdom of Redeeming Grace.” Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 247-248.

² Minutes of the Publishing Board, 1911-1918, Nazarene Archives.

or approval of the General Superintendents or the General Assembly.³

Why? The minutes of the publication board meetings in February 1916 provide only slight clues, including worries about money, and Kinne's demand that the editor must maintain an office in the house. But the minutes for the February 1915 meetings included the full text of the officers' reports, and reveal a contest over available space and content of the paper. Assistant Editor McConnell's report lamented the poor quality of the contributed articles and recommended that pay be made available to secure better writers. He reported feeling pressured from contributors to print their submissions unedited and from "the other side"—perhaps Haynes—to "cut down" reports. McConnell stated "personally, your assistant editor would like more room to give the field." Twelve of the sixteen weekly pages was not enough room.⁴

Kinne proposed "some improvements or changes so that" the *Herald* "will come a little nearer to the life of the Common people who constitute the majority of those to whom we are sent." Kinne suggested that the popularity of the human interest reports from missionaries in the missionary paper *Other Sheep* "hindered" the circulation of the *Herald*. He proposed the missionary paper be dropped. McConnell was the editor of the *Other Sheep*. McConnell, the son of a publisher and experienced secular and religious editor, hailed from the upper and western Midwest—Iowa, Minnesota, and the Dakotas. An active prohibitionist, he had been an original state legislator in South Dakota, moving to Texas when his father's health failed. While

³ The Publishing Board in February of 1916 included four of the seven original members—Kinne, Creal, Peavey, and future NPH manager 1919–1922, DeLance Wallace. The new members were A. G. Crockett, named Vice-President, J. F. Sanders, NPH manager and Secretary-Treasurer of the board, and W. E. Fisher, who would take over the board after Kinne's resignation in 1917. The three members who left the board were treasurer A. S. Cochran, secretary W. T. McConnell, and president B. F. Haynes.

⁴ Nazarene Publishing Board Minutes. Kinne's suggestion about the editor's presence in the building is reasonable from the perspective of a plant manager. But the house was a basement, floor, and attic. Exactly where he expected the editor to think, to read, and to write 4000 words a week free from the noise and smell of an active printing operation is unclear.

McConnell's 1931 remembrance of Haynes was overwhelmingly positive, he said that "Dr. Haynes was a patrician to the finger tips of his gloves and his walking stick." McConnell declared him "an elegant, scholarly man," and noted that "although a scion of the old slaveholding aristocracy of the South, he had the rare good fortune to have forebears who were God-fearing, God-honoring folks."⁵

In response to the Kinne and McConnell proposals, Haynes's fourteen-paragraph report declared that while the paper should serve as a "bulletin," it must avoid "destroying its life and force as a great evangelistic voice and conscience on fire for God and souls." The urge to "officialize it to death," must be resisted. Haynes warned of the "capital blunder of many church periodicals" that included "seeking to popularize them and to make the demands for news and of popular literature," thereby having "abdicated their distinctive and peculiar province of subserving the religious and spiritual needs of their constituencies." Having addressed the content revolt, Haynes defended the paper and himself from the financial demands that likely were the primary cause for the content issue.⁶

Haynes informed the board that the "universal fate" to be "published at a loss as nearly every church paper is" did not mean that the paper had no value to the church. In four paragraphs of artful defense, he successively displayed that the *Herald* was "a producer of returns" that "compensate" via its advertising for the books that did sell at a profit, that "the

⁵ Nazarene Publishing Board Minutes, 1911–1918. Charles Allen McConnell, "Early Nazarene Leaders—Rev. B. F. Haynes, D.D.," *The Young People's Journal*, 5-6. Kinne would resign from the board in January 1917 because he had lost his way spiritually. Leaders decided that Kinne would no longer be president, but should remain on the board. His confession that he had "backslidden" and had devoted himself "to the Lord's work, rather than devoting myself to the Lord," includes some suggestion that his relationships had also been strained. In later years, Kinne would invest two decades of his life founding a missionary hospital in China, making Kinne an important figure in the history of Nazarene publishing, missions, and social ministry. C. J. Kinne, "A Confession," *Herald of Holiness*, January 24, 1917, 10.

⁶ Nazarene Publishing Board Minutes, 1911–1918.

church organ pays an immense yield” in “sentiment and loyalty” and “of material and financial benefit.” Building from the lesser to the greater, Haynes then began to remind them why churches had publishing ministries, and stated that a church paper “properly conducted and edited” was “a maker and encourager of a spirit of loyalty to the church.” Haynes said “it tends to cement and fuse the membership,” and “diffuses knowledge” and “informs the members of movements and trends and needs,” and “of the claims of every interest demanding support at the hands of the membership.” Haynes said readers “invariably make the most liberal and enthusiastic” members, and “without such a weekly reminder and educator along these lines,” Nazarenes “would grope hopelessly along and make poor advance as a church.”⁷

“Besides this,” he preached, “the church paper stands as an advocate and defender of the faith for which we stand as a church, thus occupying a place and performing a work which it would be impossible to do through any other agency.” He urged, “So that if Church papers cost a deficit twice the sum which they generally do, they would be the best and most profitable investment the church makes in the way of literature.” He stated, “This is a principle universally recognized and which has made the great churches stand by their papers in the face of the most stupendous [deficit] in their income as compared with the cost of their production.”⁸

The debate importantly occurred in the context of great financial anxiety. The publishing board reported serious shortages and price spikes in paper, linen thread, ink and other essential supplies due to “the European War” in March of 1916, reports that warned of “a paper famine,” and rapidly escalating costs in producing the *Herald* that might force a shutdown of production. The board said that the *Herald* had always cost at least \$1.35 a year to produce against the

⁷ Nazarene Publishing Board Minutes, 1911–1918.

⁸ Nazarene Publishing Board Minutes, 1911–1918.

subscription price of \$1.00. The board even recommended subscription price hikes to cover the actual cost of production. While the publication board was in full panic mode, the editors were responding to inquiries from pastors wondering why the *Herald* could not pay them \$0.50 commissions for each subscriber they secured. McConnell's response was sharp and unambiguous. First, "the paper is published as a necessity for the church. No organic church life would be possible without it." Pastors' "self-interest" should be enough. Secondly, other papers can afford to pay because they make tens of thousands of dollars per year in commercial ads. Lastly, McConnell declared that if *Herald* could afford to pay commissions, it would give the paper "to the people for a lower price" instead. "Surely it is plain to all our readers," said the managing editor, "that the publication of the HERALD OF HOLINESS is not a money making venture, but is more in the nature of a missionary enterprise."⁹

On February 16, 1916, less than one week before the Publishing Board's decision, Haynes made a personal appeal to readers generally, and to Nazarenes specifically, that they support the paper. Haynes informed readers of the experience that "all other religious papers have and always have," and stated, "the trouble is to hold the subscribers." Haynes rebuked fickle readers who subscribed intermittently, and worried about their "restless spirit" and "unsettled convictions" regarding their "needs and wants spiritually." Haynes urged the value of consistency and noted "the children get familiar with its appearance and contents" establishing "a tie between them and the paper which is silently helpful to them in their religious education and training." It was "far better" to keep to "the old friend" and "learn to love it and be blessed by its holy teachings and spiritual administrations." Then Haynes addressed Nazarenes. He declared he could not understand "the brand of loyalty" of those members who would drop the

⁹ "A Time of Trial," *Herald of Holiness*, March 15, 1916, p. 12. "The Paper Situation," *Herald of Holiness*, March 29, 1916, 12. "Why Not?," *Herald of Holiness*, March 29, 1915, 10.

paper. “As the paper prospers the other departments will prosper,” he said. He then warned “As you cripple the central organ you cripple the whole enterprise vitally and that far hinder the mighty work,” one that “God wants pushed and spread until the whole earth feels the influence of this great plant in Kansas City.” His urged that Nazarenes “stand by” Nazarene publishing house by “sticking to it [the paper] from year to year.” He preached “do not cast it aside.” Haynes concluded, “we need the united and unvarying and the pronounced support of every Nazarene in the whole world.” Every other ministry of the church at every level, and of every kind, expected access to the *Herald’s* pages to use to advertise and encourage their interests. No other ministry in the church focused on serving the other ministries like the religious paper did, and yet no other ministry had such meager support from those other ministries. No other ministry was so poorly understood, so abandoned to its own devices as the religious paper. Papers had saved colleges, kept missionaries from being sent home, urged greater pastoral support, advertised evangelists itineraries, backed bishops and general superintendents, and even saved publishing houses. But often papers received inadequate support in return.¹⁰

As the publishing board grew more anxious over financial matters, it exercised more direct control over the editorial policy of the paper. A year before the 1916 decision, while Haynes was still president, the board had decided that “the editorial policy of the Herald of Holiness and the matter of determining the Departmental assignments of space in the paper shall be the exclusive prerogative of the staff of editors.” But a year later, the board under former manager Kinne and new manager Sanders was asserting itself. The growing problem with this approach lay in the lack of editorial, writing experience, and broad perspective present among

¹⁰ “A Special Personal Word With Our Readers,” *Herald of Holiness*, February 16, 1916, 2. For an account of a Nazarene evangelist actively pressing a paper in direct competition with the *Herald* and critical of the denomination, see Charles A. Gibson, “With Us, But Not of Us,” *Herald of Holiness*, January 3, 1917, 7; see also page 9 of January 3, 1917 issue for resolution from Georgia District aggressively supporting *Herald*.

the board members. Rev. Kinne was Bresee's old plant manager, not Bresee's editorialist (Bresee himself). Kinne handled the details, and fixed what needed fixing. He was not the writer or vision caster. Board members asked the general superintendents what the policy should be. The general superintendents, none of whom had been editors either, said the board had full control to "direct" the editor. Walker went so far as to declare Haynes an employee of the board, not "an officer of the church." The episcopal deliberations included the publishing board, but not the editor. By October 1923, the General Assembly repealed this micromanagement, making the editor a position elected by the General Assembly itself. In December 1923, Haynes's successor and future General Superintendent J. B. Chapman secured for the office of editor veto power over all content of the paper. The manager only had control over the advertising and the assignment of who did what work. Chapman also secured for the office of editor the right to be answerable for editorial content related to denominational doctrine and polity only to the board of General Superintendents, one of several empowering freedoms and promotions in stature he gave to his successor H. Orton Wiley that Haynes never enjoyed.¹¹

The minutes of the 1916 meeting do not provide a vote breakdown. But DeLance Wallace's correspondence with Reynolds suggests that at least one board member was uncomfortable with the treatment of Haynes. Wallace said "it is not mine to suggest nominations" for the board, "but a lot of folks have wondered why Dr. Haynes was left off the Board, and unless it be the policy to have no member of the Board other than the treasurer employed at the Publishing House," Wallace opined, "I know of no one whose experience and esteem of the people would better fit for one of the vacancies than Dr. Haynes." The following

¹¹ *Publishing Board Minutes*, February 20, 1915. E. F. Walker to H. F. Reynolds, February 19, 1917, Reynolds Correspondence, 175-58, Nazarene Archives. *Journal of the Seventh General Assembly*, 1928, 272, 86.

week Wallace worried again that enforcement of the no-employee policy “would eliminate Dr. Haynes from membership on the Board if he still continues as Editor, which I sincerely hope will be the case.” Then Wallace said, “Will say that in all my observations and inquiries (and they have been quite extensive) never an objection to him remaining as Editor, but his Editorials win for us more subscriptions than any other department of the work, as well as holds them.” Wallace stated, “It keeps me studying to keep up with the folks who comment with such favor on his articles.”¹²

The first news that Nazarenes heard of the changes came on April 5, 1916, when Haynes wrote meekly on page 1 that the publication board had decided “I am only to write the first two pages of editorial matter in the future, beginning with next issue.” Haynes confessed that he had “labored and prayed and studied” with the highest ideals in mind and would continue to do so in the future. He mentioned the financial trials the publishing house faced and made no mention of any content disputes. He noted that the board will have future decisions to make that were “outside of my department.”¹³

But readers were led to assume that Haynes had left for Olivet, provoking the board to make such changes—changes that would be perfectly reasonable only if one assumed that Haynes’s Olivet decision preceded the board’s decision. But that reversal was what was presented when on page 14 of the very same issue, Haynes’s election as President of Olivet was announced, an election that occurred March 29 but was not known to Haynes when he wrote the April 5 notice. The publishing house announcement of these changes appeared in the same issue but made no mention of Haynes’s acceptance of the Olivet presidency, or the board’s own role in

¹² DeLance Wallace to H. F. Reynolds, January 27, 1917, Reynolds Correspondence, 175-58, Nazarene Archives. DeLance Wallace to H. F. Reynolds, February 3, 1917, Reynolds Correspondence, 175-58, Nazarene Archives.

¹³ “Personal,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 5, 1916, 1.

provoking that move. In fact, the report written by Kinne said “in the interests of economy and efficiency...we make some little changes in our method of conducting the paper,” and noted that they were for the sake of “excellence” and to make it “*better than ever*.” The next week Kinne told the church that “we may expect [the *Herald*] to improve in quality and increase in usefulness.” No method could have so effectively announced to the church that in the judgment of the board, Haynes’s editorials held an inverse relationship to excellence, quality, and usefulness. Careful readers might even have assumed that Kinne was the one who might have hurt feelings over Haynes’s imagined greedy abandonment of the paper to go to Olivet. In the first content article following the announcement of the change Haynes wrote of “Perfect Love and Humility.”¹⁴

Even General Superintendent Reynolds misunderstood. He typed a letter to Haynes while on an evening train in Cuba “in route for Havana de Cuba” on April 27, saying he had “eagerly devoured” the April 5 and 12 issues of the *Herald* waiting for him at “Santiago de Cuba...as a hungry man after a hard days labor, devours a good dinner.” Reynolds declared he was “delighted, in that you are to remain the Editor of the HERALD OF HOLINESS poorly expresses the deep feeling of assurance I have in my heart, that, by our being able to retain you, in that relation, means continued and increasing success, for Our Church Organ, and the rapid spread of Scriptural Holiness in all Lands, and in the Many islands of the sea.” Reynolds continued his appeal “M[a]y the Precious Lord Jesus Christ, who fully understands, what it has me[a]nt for You and Your Good Wife, to stand by our Church Paper in the Past and at the Present crucial Moment, greatly sustain both of you and abundantly reward each of you is my

¹⁴ “Personal,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 5, 1916, 1; “Publishers Announcement,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 5, 1916, 11; “Olivet University,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 5, 1916, 14; “The Fourth Annual Meeting,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 12, 1916, 8-9. “Perfect Love and Humility,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 5, 1916, 1.

heart-felt-prayer.” Reynolds—an Olivet trustee—seemingly had no idea the Olivet board had fired General Superintendent Walker and hired *Herald* editor Haynes one month earlier.

Reynolds pleaded “I am greatly elated (properly so I trust) that we are so favored as to have you fill these two important places in our Church Work for the Master.”¹⁵

Haynes took only two sentences to reply to Reynolds’ two long paragraphs of praise and pleading. Haynes wrote back a warm letter, thanked Reynolds for his “confidence,” prayed vulnerably “that I may never live to disappoint you,” and changed the subject to Reynolds’ haste in travelling west to deal with “grave educational problems.” Haynes declared himself “glad your hands will be on this problem, for no one in the church could be called upon who would bring more to the complex and difficult trouble more equipoise, a calmer or more judicial temperament, and sounder or more discriminating judgment than yourself.” Haynes mentioned he had wired “President Wiley” but had not received a reply. Reynolds was not complementing Haynes in order to reassure him at a low moment. He was telling him that the *Herald* was where Reynolds wanted and needed Haynes. Haynes wrote back hoping Reynolds would not be ashamed of him. It was warm and loving miscommunication with both men telling the other that their place in their respective connectional offices was vital to the denomination’s well-being.¹⁶

There is some evidence that rumors had begun about Haynes abandoning the *Herald* for monetary reasons, that he had almost embarrassed the denomination. These rumors would be deeply ironic, as Haynes had, in fact, been embarrassed by the publishing board who seemed unable to make the connection between the content and extent of Haynes’s editorials and the claims of their advertising that the *Herald* was “evangelistic, evangelical, a spiritual tonic, and is

¹⁵ H. F. Reynolds to B. F. Haynes, April 27, 1916, Reynolds Correspondence, Nazarene Archives. 175-49.

¹⁶ B. F. Haynes to H. F. Reynolds, May 11, 1916, Reynolds Correspondence, Nazarene Archives, 175-49.

a soul winning preacher of a full gospel.”¹⁷

On April 26, a long letter of “Congratulation” to Olivet appeared from F. W. Johnson, Tennessee District Superintendent, former Tennessee Conference minister, and a friend of the Haynes family for many years in Tennessee. Johnson declared Haynes well qualified, and said of him, “in refinement, culture, and education, he has few equals.” Johnson then declared, “Morally he is pure from his youth up. Religiously, entirely devoted to Christ and his brethren.” Johnson testified “we have known him all our life, and been intimately acquainted with him twenty-eight years. Have never known him to swerve from what he considered his duty, nor to compromise his conviction. He knows no limit in sacrificing for the cause he represents.” Then, Johnson, in a one sentence paragraph, stated directly “In his stand for holiness he has never permitted money, place, nor prestige to control him for a moment.” Johnson recounted Haynes’s holiness advocacy through the *Tennessee Methodist*, reminded the readers of his “hard toil,” and loss of “prestige,” and declared “our church today is indebted to the pioneer work which that paper did.” Johnson recounted a conversation, some fifteen years earlier, in which Haynes had expressed regret, not that he had lost all his own money, but that he had lost his wife’s inheritance and reduced her to poverty. Johnson recalled that Mrs. Haynes turned to her husband and said, ““Mr. Haynes, please don’t say that any more, for I have nothing to live for but you and the cause you represent.””¹⁸

The board also took action to address the revenue side of the publishing house’s finances. The subscription price went up 50 percent to \$1.50 per year, a change that seems to have halted the slow but steady growth in subscriptions of the previous four years. The board even increased it to \$2 later. C. A. McConnell, named managing editor, was now responsible for editing

¹⁷ *Herald of Holiness*, July 26, 1916, 24.

¹⁸ F. W. Johnson, “Congratulation,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 26, 1916, p. 14. Johnson was congratulating Olivet, not Haynes. The conversation he recounts occurred while Haynes was president of Martin Female College, 1902–1905. Felix W. Johnson withdrew from the MECS in 1898.

contributions, correspondence, and general layout. From April 12 through the end of May, the arrangements for the first several pages were changed drastically. Contrary to announcements, McConnell's material appeared on the first two pages, with Haynes's material occupying pages three and four, and sometimes five. Framed large-font quoted poems took up the entirety of page one, replacing perhaps 1000 words of content. Mast heads were inexplicably repeated, the location of the date moved to the bottom of the first page, and the locations of particular features—where readers would expect to find particular items—were shuffled variously. Font style was changed and made smaller, with more space in the margins. By June, the unattractive and disorienting experimentation had finally settled down, with editorials from Haynes on pages two and three, and decorative, full-page quoted inspirational ditties on page one. By the following spring, lead editorials were back on page one, and C. A. McConnell was no longer managing editor.¹⁹

In just one month's time, anxieties about tight finances led the publishing board to take two separate decisions that weakened connectionalism by weakening its salient means, the connectional paper. The price hike undercut growth in reach and readership. The reduction of Haynes's position as supreme connectionalist voice led him away from the connectional city, the hub. Never again did Haynes live in the connectional city as a fulltime connectional editor, the chief journalist and sentry at the center of the action. After Olivet, Haynes and his wife lived in Nashville, Tennessee, and Jacksonville, Florida, alternately living with one of their children in the winter, another in the summer.

¹⁹ Kinne believed the publication of *Other Sheep*, the missions-themed paper founded and edited by McConnell, provided an unintended challenge to the *Herald*. See "The Other Sheep," *Herald of Holiness*, July 12, 1916, p. 13. McConnell, a veteran 'newspaper man,' was in his mid-fifties in the summer of 1916; evidence points to his role in the format changes, but they would be surprising from a man of his experience. The founding trio of C. J. Kinne, C. A. McConnell, and B. F. Haynes was broken up in 1915, when an exhausted Kinne went back to California. But he served on the Publishing Board that made these decisions. McConnell shifted to other NPH duties. From 1912 to 1915, all three were in Kansas City and associated with the *Herald*. By the end of 1916, none were.

But neither of those decisions addressed the most important fiscal issue, namely the complete lack of capital that forced managers to use borrowed money for daily operations and purchase of supplies, a situation that resulted in thousands of dollars annually in interest payments. Neither addressed the funding solution that Haynes proposed in 1912—endowment. Neither addressed the volume solution proposed by the General Assembly Standing Committee in 1915—local churches rolling membership subscriptions for all members into the local budget. The publishing board was telling Haynes and the publishing team to run the paper and the house at a profit with no capital, no endowment, no patron/s, and no paid ads (commercial or connectional). After the 1916 decisions, and inhospitable wartime conditions, there would be no growth in subscriptions as well. While the 1915–1919 board, later led by new member William E. Fisher, attempted to raise capital, later solutions focused on eliminating debt and, again running at a profit, still without capital or endowment. Olivet received a good president, briefly, as an unintended, but direct consequence. But Kansas City and the publishing house lost the presence of Nazarenes’ most experienced connectionalist. It was a serious weakening of a vital connectional means undertaken with the hope of strengthening that means.

But Haynes stood by the *Herald* as Reynolds had asked him to do. Haynes also stood by Reynolds and the general superintendents—and Bresee’s vision of general superintendency. Perhaps Reynolds’ loving request and prayers had kept him. But it seems that not even Reynolds understood the depth of Haynes’s loyalty, how deeply he loved the Church of the Nazarene. The February 1917 Board of Publication meeting revealed the framework under which Haynes functioned for the majority of his remaining time as editor. The board passed a resolution that “all editorial utterances in the Herald of Holiness shall conform to the spirit of the Manual, so as to avoid controversial questions upon which the church remains neutral.” The board offered him

\$1000, “allowing him pages one and two.” Haynes was “invited to appear,” accepted the offer, while the gag rule resolution “was also read and explained to him, and he fully agreed to the same.” Perhaps realizing how tasteless the whole situation was, DeLance Wallace motioned that “we extend to Dr. B. F. Haynes an expression of thanks for his sacrifice in attending this meeting, and for his hearty co-operation with us and his helpful services during the past year.” The motion prevailed and was ordered to be copied to Haynes and published in the *Herald*. Haynes responded to the embarrassments of 1916–1917 by declaring to the entire denomination that “The Board of Publication deserves congratulations and thanks for their faithfulness,” and had served “without cause for a just criticism.” Nazarenes owed the Board “a definite debt of gratitude,” a point Haynes declared he wished to stress “for we know whereof we affirm.”²⁰

When Nazarenes gathered for the 1919 General Assembly in Kansas City, the mood was joyful and confident. That fact alone was astonishing. For the 1915–1919 quadrennium saw perhaps the most serious crisis in the denomination’s history. The delegates had survived war, price spikes, pandemic, and the death of three general superintendents since they had met last. Haynes’s meekness in the spring of 1916 probably avoided a dangerous scandal. But the publications board’s weakening of the paper came just before a firestorm of internal dissent, a near meltdown of denominational confidence, a threatened discrediting of Nazarenes’ original vision. A controversy had been developing in California that threatened to split the church. Many in the period 1916–1919 felt it was uncertain that the denomination would survive.

Seth C. Rees, a former Quaker in his early sixties and person of stature in the holiness

²⁰ Minutes of the Board of Publication, February 24, 1917. “Our Fifth Anniversary!,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 4, 1917, 2. Haynes looked back on his first seven years as editor and declared “it gives us pleasure to record that the paper has pursued a pathway of peace. It has sought to avoid and discourage controversy. Remembering that our God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, we have sought to cultivate and practice peace and love among the brethren in the spirit of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. This purpose has not deterred us from condemning the wrong, which hurts the church and humanity, and standing by all which seek the welfare of these sacred interests.” “Our Seventh Anniversary,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 2, 1919, 1.

movement, pastored the University Church in Los Angeles, the third largest church in the denomination. Nazarene University, the California college, shared its campus with University Church, giving Rees considerable influence with students, perhaps half of whom attended his congregation. Rees, who had joined the denomination in 1912 when he accepted the church, was critical of Bresee, accusing him of “hiding sin” in disciplinary cases. Rees mocked the convention of clergy receiving honorary D.D. degrees as Bresee and Haynes had done. A good example of radical believer’s church ideals, Rees held both to independent and sectarian ways, and embodied a congregational pastor’s unfettered rights over members, including the right to define sin sharply and discipline vigorously. But his methods included exposing the errors of pastors and faculty in publicly embarrassing ways that many felt fell outside of orderly connectional means. Further, Rees’ stricter definitions and inattention to the rights of the accused meant that any thus labeled might be immediately expelled from membership and position, a method that sought neither repentance nor settlement. Rees’ influence with impressionable college students made the situation more sensitive. After the death of Bresee, held in special adoration by the Californians, his critiques seemed all the more unseemly and offensive.²¹

The college trustees donated land to the church in hopes that some distancing might help. District superintendent and former ME Howard Eckel heard that new church property had been deeded to a member, a violation of Nazarenes’ Methodistic denominational-ownership of church properties, and strong indicator of schismatic, and perhaps even criminal, intent. With the

²¹ Discussion dependent on Cunningham, et al, *Our Watchword and Song*, 204-213. Tried for causing dissention, Rees contacted the local papers, and when the vote to convict fell short of unanimity, celebrated his victory with a parade while his supporters gave interviews to the media. The two most serious early secessions were over polity-discipline issues involving former Quakers with strong notions of congregational (i.e., pastoral) independence—H. B. Hosley in Washington, D.C., and Seth Rees in Los Angeles. However, the Ellysons were also former Quakers.

approval of General Superintendent Walker, Eckel appeared at the church service on February 25, 1917 and announced that he was disorganizing the congregation for its discordant ways.

As word spread beyond California of Eckel's action and Walker's approval, an outcry began. The Eckel decision cut right to the rhetorical heart of Nazarenes' polity self-understanding. Advocates of congregationalist liberty were terrified and outraged; their suspicions of episcopal autocracy had proved true. Old Methodists noted that they had at least been tried before they had been expelled. It did not matter that Nazarenes did not have a congregational polity, not even a "congrescopal" one. Many believed they did. The 1907 Plan of Union had promised eastern congregationalists they could keep their properties but it did not apply to University Church. The framers had not adequately specified the nature of "superintendency" or the respective duties and powers of the board of general superintendents, an individual general superintendent, or an individual district superintendent.

The weakness in the merger strategy was evident. The 1903 definition of Nazarenes as "Old fashioned Methodism with a congregational form of government" by Bresee ally and ambassador for merger C. W. Ruth was an effective pro-union sales pitch and slogan, not a thought-out theory of polity. It had the further demerit of being misleading. With meager general polity philosophy or theory from which to reason to the specific, peace-seekers searched desperately through the *Manual's* thin list of polity rules, hoping that someone might have anticipated the problem. Meanwhile irate former Congregationalists and Presbyterians wondered if they had been sold an autocratic bill of goods. Eckel probably felt much as Methodist bishop R. K. Hargrove had in 1890, namely, that something must be done immediately to solve a dangerous problem. But like Hargrove before him, Eckel picked an abrupt and severe method that touched off a firestorm of polity protest and outrage.

But unlike the Tennesseans' response to Hargrove, the Californians backed Eckel, reelecting him in 1918, and backed Walker, warmly eulogizing him when he died. They knew the facts and history of the Rees' case, and Eckel and Walker had wisely conducted a reassuring three hour question and answer session for the district. President of the Northwest college in Idaho, an admirer of both Bresee *and* Rees, H. Orton Wiley, worked to keep Rees's Pilgrim Church, as his followers came to be called, from taking over the college there.

The polity crisis came at an especially dangerous time. With Bresee dead, the general superintendent with seniority was H. F. Reynolds. Unfortunately, "matters of polity and power were particularly perplexing for Reynolds," writes biographer Mary Lou Shea, noting that Reynolds had "often deferred to General Superintendent Bresee's wisdom on such matters." Worse still, Walker, the eldest of the four bishops, had been experiencing "a slow downward spiral," exhibiting "odd" and "bitter" behavior, including a disagreement with E. P. Ellyson at Olivet, and contending with Reynolds, Goodwin, and Williams over episcopal appointments. He had shocked the 1915 General Assembly by resigning the general superintendency and even membership in the denomination, before being convinced by emotional appeal to undo his action. Complaints about his erratic administration of district assemblies came in before and after the Rees controversy. Only Walker's sudden death on May 6, 1918 at age sixty-six eased concerns.²²

What early Nazarenes lacked in careful development of a philosophy or conception of

²² Shea, *In Need of Your Prayers and Patience*, 263, 270-294. Shea suggests that feelings of being overworked, underappreciated, and disrespected were part of Walker's trouble. He suffered a bout of "exhaustion" after his overseas travels in 1914, and Haynes and others felt he had, for years, been in need of a slower pace. Competing oral traditions hold that Bresee made comments during the 1915 General Assembly that the church only had one "real" G.S. (Reynolds), or that it had one who was "almost dead" and another who was out of his mind. Cunningham, *Watchword*, 654, n9. See May 22, 1918 issue of the *Herald of Holiness* devoted to eulogizing Walker. Kinne's 1919 General Assembly eulogy noted Walker's "very sensitive nature." *Journal of the General Assembly*, 1919, 51. Chapman remembered Walker as "friendly and considerate, yet frank and transparent, almost to a fault," Chapman, *A History*, 139.

general superintendency, they made up for by careful episcopal practice. Reynolds, among others, worked tirelessly behind the scenes to mend fences, ease tensions, and back Nazarenes away from a potentially explosive schism. Serious mistakes in administration and polity development might have destroyed the church in its infancy but for the bonds of personal trust earned by Reynolds' episcopal style. Meek and modest, yet diligent and courageous, Reynolds led the two younger general superintendents in their collective rebuke of Walker, resisted panic, investigated carefully, corresponded with an anxious host, and eased a resistant Walker toward an embrace of Reynolds's leadership and the oversight of the board of general superintendents.

There were losses. Former Kansas City First pastor and darling of the 1915 General Assembly, John Matthews, wrote a book entitled *Rise and Fall of the Nazarene Movement*. C. A. McConnell resigned from his post as managing editor the day after the dissolution of University Church. Harry Hays, pastor in San Diego, and perhaps most ironically, Wilmot Stone, president of *Bresee* College in Kansas, all went the Pilgrim way. Evangelist Bud Robinson stayed; but his wife joined the Pilgrim Church. Some would come back, among them Matthews, who insisted he be given a chance to apologize through the pages of the *Herald*. But the denomination suffered a net loss in members and in every clergy category for 1917. The global stresses of World War I, Walker's death in May 1918, and the shock of the influenza epidemic in the fall of 1918 that postponed assemblies, disrupted correspondence and delivery of the *Herald*, closed churches, and killed the superintendent of the Florida district, Homer Goodell—and Haynes's old editorial rival, E. E. Hoss—added to the anxiety.²³

²³ For disruptions due to influenza and war-related conditions, see October 23, 1918 and October 30, 1918 issues of the *Herald of Holiness*. The Pilgrim Church merged with the International Holiness Church to form the Pilgrim Holiness Church. Later that body joined with the Wesleyan Methodists to form the Wesleyan Church. The Wesleyan Church and the Free Methodist Church are the two churches usually thought most similar to the Church of the Nazarene.

Haynes and the *Herald* had played a vital and underappreciated role. Haynes had been publishing wide-ranging defenses of connectionalism for years. His careful and enduring affirmations of connectionalism proved prophetic and timely as he issued such calls repeatedly in advance of the coming storm. His cultured reputation, lack of strong western ties to Bresee, his indisputable record as a fearless critic of episcopal abuse of power, and repeated defense of rank and file clergy against episcopal overreaching gave Haynes, perhaps more than any other, a special credibility and power to declare the fitness of persons for general superintendency. During the period of great crisis, Haynes became the primary celebrant of superintendency generally and the general superintendents individually. He was no king maker; but he became the architect of their legitimacy, the chief liturgist of their installations.

When Goodwin and Williams were elected in early 1916, Haynes's introductions strongly affirmed the choice. He announced that they were "called by the suffrages of their brethren of the District Superintendency, and, through them, representatively of the church at large." Haynes declared J. W. Goodwin "loyal to the church," a faithful "servant" and "successful minister," a "strong preacher," with a "most pleasing personality" such that "one is instinctively drawn to him at first meeting as a man of God, sweet-spirited and without guile and solely devoted to the work of the Master." Haynes stated "his personality is pleasing and smooth and gentle and gentlemanly and dignified." Goodwin's preaching was "of a kind that will win and attract," and his "presidency of deliberative bodies," said Haynes, "will be gentle but firm, just and expeditious but careful and painstaking, and withal satisfactory to all concerned." Haynes declared, "there has been no mistake in the selection of this kind-hearted, courteous gentleman."²⁴

²⁴ "The New General Superintendents," *Herald of Holiness*, February 2, 1916, 1-2.

R. T. Williams, though young, was “a tried and true man of God,” with “quite an experience in positions tantamount to presidential duties.” Williams’ presidency of Peniel University (as Texas Holiness University had been renamed) gave “eminent satisfaction;” Williams had “made good in that position.” A “fine preacher, clear, logical, and convincing,” Williams had a personality “most engaging and dignified and attractive, yet simple and humble as a child.” Haynes staked his own reputation when he said “We promise for these two gifted brethren that the church will never have cause to regret their choice but will be thankful they have been put into this position of great and grave responsibility.” Recalling the “new-made graves” of Bresee and Wilson, Haynes pleaded “We pray that their mantle may fall on them.” “Now,” Haynes preached, “let us all feel a personal responsibility of praying for all these four brethren and let us hold up their hands while they, in long absences from home and in privations and faithful service, endeavor to lead the charge against the bulwarks of the enemy.”²⁵

So powerful had been Haynes’s statement, that H. F. Reynolds’ brother, E. E. Reynolds, a MEC pastor in Florida and friend and former pastoral neighbor and colleague of Goodwin’s in Haverhill, Massachusetts, wrote to Haynes and said “your fine introductory announcement, accompanying his picture, most worthily characterizes the man. Your words were well chosen. They well describe the John W. Goodwin I have known and loved for twenty years.” Recalling their “sweet fellowship,” E. E. Reynolds testified that Goodwin “was a true man of God and worthy of all the confidence and honor the church might bestow upon him.” On Sunday February 6, 1916, Haynes and several other clergy performed an unofficial and impromptu installation service at Kansas City First Church that included “laying on of hands” and praying

²⁵ “The New General Superintendents,” *Herald of Holiness*, February 2, 1916, 1-2.

for the two new general superintendents.²⁶

Haynes appealed for greater sympathy for district and general superintendents eleven days before Eckel disbanded University Church. Declaring Nazarene polity had been “wrought well,” he stated “Our General Superintendency avoids the autocratic evils of episcopacy and also the ruin of anarchic independentism.” Haynes believed Nazarenes had chosen their leaders well, and said that “we could not have been connectional without the twofold superintendency.” He used words such as “beautifully,” “unify,” “solidify,” “cohesive,” and “amalgamating,” to urge Nazarenes to cooperate more fully with their general and district superintendents. Haynes noted that “we should remember, too, that they are our creatures, elevated to the office... by our suffrage, and not appointed to their positions as is the case in Methodism,” a fact that should “bind them the closer to us.” Haynes wondered “whether we pray for our General and District Superintendents as much as we should.”²⁷

Haynes’s 1918 eulogy for E. F. Walker recalled that when Haynes had been called to replace Walker as Olivet president, rather than coolness “this man of God put his arms around our neck and said words of tenderness and good wishes which linger with us till this day as ointment poured forth.” Haynes joyfully recalled Walker’s “wonderful familiarity with Wesley’s teachings,” and that he was “equally well informed on the positions of other founders and

²⁶ E. E. Reynolds, “On the New General Superintendents,” *Herald of Holiness*, February 23, 1916, 6. *Herald of Holiness*, February 9, 1916, 2; and February 16, 1916, 3.

²⁷ “Our Superintendency,” *Herald of Holiness*, February 14, 1917, 2-3. For Haynes and others pressing connectionalism through the *Herald*, see B. F. Haynes, “A High and Holy Duty,” June 5, 1912, 2, which called for “loyalty of the truest and loftiest type,” summarizes and defends Nazarene theology as “apostolic and scriptural;” Haynes, “Not a Caterer But a Conscience,” July 2, 1913, 1, argued that papers should remain faithful to their religious duties; Haynes, “One of Our Greatest Needs,” June 4, 1913, 1, argued for denominational loyalty; Haynes, “The Need of the Church,” May 1, 1912, 1, a call for connectionalism and loyalty; and C. J. Kinne, “Our Own Responsibilities,” December 4, 1912, 5, Kinne’s sharp rebuke of pastors who viewed the publishing house as beyond the range of their “own” duty. E. J. Fleming, “The Pastor and Connectional Interests,” *Herald of Holiness*, March 21, 1917, 3-4.

framers of Methodism. How he used to confound the Methodists' fraternity with his quotations from these authorities." Haynes stated "We fear Dr. Walker was the victim of overwork." Yet, he said, "His soul is at rest with the God who gave it, and in joy unalloyed he basks in the sunlight of heaven." On the same page, Haynes wrote "the LEGACY of a godly life is a monument that will outlive granite."²⁸

On the eve of the 1919 General Assembly, the *Herald* contained a wide range of discussion items in preparation. The September 24, 1919 issue displayed a full page portrait gallery of all the general superintendents that had served along with their dates of service. Bresee's picture was centered and many times larger than the others who were stacked on either side. It was an episcopal veneration perhaps unimaginable in the spring of 1917, or 1907. Haynes issued to the Assembly a warning to behave. He reminded delegates not to get in a hurry when considering legislation. He urged that all things be done "decently and in order." He suggested delegates arrive with "a keen sense of their own limitations." They must avoid "parliamentary pride." "We should remember," Haynes noted, "that there is a possibility that we *may be mistaken*."²⁹

J. F. Sanders addressed the Publishing ministries and noted that "we fear that the Publishing House has been looked upon by some as purely a cold-blooded business enterprise." Sanders declared NPH a "soul-saving institution, preaching the gospel through the medium of

²⁸ *Herald of Holiness*, May 22, 1918, 2.

²⁹ *Herald of Holiness*, September 24, 1919, 1. "Assembly Deliberations," *Herald of Holiness*, September 24, 1919, 4. One reader suggested illustrations be added to the paper: "Is there not a sanctified cartoonist?" *Herald of Holiness*, September 17, 1919, 14; One contributor urged that Nazarenes maintain the balance between "the superintendency" and "the democracy." H. T. Agnew, "Policy of Government," September 17, 1919, 9, 16; The publishing committee of the Chicago Central District declared the *Herald* "perhaps the very best holiness paper published. Its editorials are of the very high order, both in doctrine and sentiment. We find nothing today that is sound, clear, up-to-date, and at the same time eminently scholarly that surpasses, if equals, the editorials in the HERALD OF HOLINESS." September 17, 1919, 10.

the printed page to larger congregations than all of our local churches.” Sanders said the *Herald* was “our most valuable asset in promoting the connectional life of our church.” Sanders reported “only a slight increase” in subscriptions from 1915 to 1919, and said that with war conditions and price spikes “it was found necessary to increase the subscription price of the paper, which undoubtedly affected the subscription list. This has been a cause of much disappointment and financial loss.”³⁰

The 1919 General Assembly at Kansas City addressed two issues related to superintendency and the Rees controversy. It determined that a church could be disbanded at the request of the district superintendent and by “the action and formal pronouncement of the Board of General Superintendents.” It thus restricted the power of a lone district or general superintendent, while reaffirming, even strengthening, the broad authority of superintendency.³¹

Another debate swirled regarding the placement of pastors. Nazarenes utilized the call system, wherein local congregations selected or ‘called’ their own pastors, with the district superintendents acting as matchmakers. But that process was often slow, leaving unemployed pastors and unpastored congregations. H. D. Brown drafted a memorial for the North Pacific District that proposed the creation of a district board of approval composed of the district superintendent, plus two laypersons and two clergy elected by the District Assembly. The board of approval would advise the General Superintendent, who would appoint pastors to their various charges.³²

A resolution from the Tennessee District opposed any movements toward an episcopal

³⁰ J. F. Sanders, “The Church and Its Publishing Interests,” *Herald of Holiness*, September 24, 1919, 6-7.

³¹ Cunningham, *Watchword*, 213.

³² H. D. Brown, “Personal Statement,” *Herald of Holiness*, September 3, 1919, 9-10. Brown provided an extensive explanation of his reasoning that concluded with the text of the memorial.

form of government. It specifically opposed the Brown/North Pacific District memorial that would institute appointment of pastors in place of call. Referencing their understanding of the 1911 General Assembly in Nashville and believing that episcopal government was “detrimental to deep spirituality,” the Tennesseans worried that moves toward episcopal government would “place us more under law than under grace.” An active assembly, the delegates voted to drop the word “Pentecostal” from the denominational name. There was even a wedding ceremony during an evening service.³³

Haynes’s highpoint among Nazarenes might have come during the 1919 General Assembly. His new church had survived, and the general superintendents he had lauded and defended had worn the office well. Even the thirty-six year old Williams had proved himself. Haynes had become the senior figure, the steady voice, and an anchor of Nazarenes’ denominational pride. He came to the 1919 General Assembly as the leader of the Tennessee District delegation, having received 112 out of 130 votes cast. It was a warm endorsement of his many years of service to the holiness people of Middle Tennessee, who joined the Nazarenes after J. O. McClurkan’s death in 1914. It was his 5th and final time representing his annual conference or district as a quadrennial delegate. Haynes was chosen for several boards. He served on the General Court of Appeals with H. D. Brown, E. A. Girvin, J. B. Chapman, and E. E. Angell. He was chosen for the Committee of Manuscripts with H. D. Brown and Olive Winchester. A commission to conduct a substantial editorial revision of the Manual was requested; E. A. Girvin, B. F. Haynes, and J. E. L. Moore were entrusted with this task, one separate from the regular Manual editing committee. Given his many years of close attention to the episcopal office in the MECS and among the Nazarenes, it was fitting validation that Haynes

³³ *Herald of Holiness*, October 1, 1919, p. 21. Journal of General Assembly 1919, 32.

was chosen for the standing committee on superintendency.³⁴

But Haynes was unwell, the start of a sharp decline in his overall health 1919–1920. In a section of his autobiography where he said he was writing in October 1920, Haynes stated “the past fourteen months I have been sick almost continuously,” or from August of 1919. In February or late January of 1922, he said “I have had much varied experiences in personal sickness the last two years,” or from January or February of 1920. He endured two “breakdowns,” the second, a “violent illness,” occurred on October 24, 1921, just one week before his 70th birthday. It was so severe that Haynes spent a month in a rural sanitarium in Madison, Tennessee. Over Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year’s, he missed three months of editorial work. Consulting physicians recommended that he and his wife needed “a milder climate than Tennessee,” and they moved to 1623 Dellwood Avenue in Jacksonville, Florida.³⁵

In the session immediately following the General Superintendents’ Report, Haynes preached the opening sermon, entitled “A Challenge to the Nazarenes,” to the General Assembly. It was the evening of September 25, 1919, his and Lula’s 46th wedding anniversary. Haynes came to the pulpit using crutches and in obvious pain. The sermon was ordered the next day to be published in the *Herald* and “in tract form for general circulation.”³⁶

Haynes utilized the opportunity to inspire Nazarenes in their mission. But he also played a high-profile role in affirming the bishops individually and the office of general superintendent

³⁴ Minutes of the Tennessee District Assembly, 1919, 14. Journal of General Assembly 1919, 58. Journal of General Assembly 1919, 63; Journal of General Assembly 1919, 48. Moore was president of Olivet. 53. The 1919 Assembly voted to remove the ex-officio membership of a General Superintendent from this court of appeals.

³⁵ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 248. “Editorial Correspondence,” *Herald of Holiness*, February 8, 1922, pp.1-2. At the time of the 1919 General Assembly, Haynes was living in Nashville, his address given as Windsor Apartments, Nashville and as 18th Ave and Acklen, a location near Belmont University.

³⁶ *Herald of Holiness*, October 1, 1919, p. 7. Reprinted in full, “The Challenge of the Nazarenes,” *Herald of Holiness*, October 8, 1919, pp. 3-4, 16. Journal of General Assembly 1919, 23.

broadly. Haynes and C. J. Kinne memorialized E. F. Walker. Haynes offered the prayer of consecration at the installation service for re-elected General Superintendents Reynolds, Goodwin, and Williams. Haynes then used the *Herald* to praise the three general superintendents upon their reelection for “their uniform courtesy, fairness, and kindness in their presidency and general administration.” He also congratulated them for their “patient, tender, and careful” leadership while chairing the assembly. Haynes also praised the delegates that they could “surrender gracefully when overcome by a majority vote.” Despite his illness, the 1919 General Assembly had been a wonderfully gracious and uplifting experience.³⁷

The content of the General Superintendents’ address raised questions, however. It began well enough, labelling 1915–1919 “a period of consolidation and crystallization.” “The church is taking on a real personality, a solidity that indicates a oneness of motive, oneness of ideal, unity of purpose,” they declared. The growth rate of the church had slowed sharply in these years; the General Superintendents suggested it was due to closer examination and accuracy in the church membership rolls. The general superintendents declared “Old Age looks backward and youth lives in the future.” With that thought in mind they labeled the denomination “a sturdy, hopeful, healthful, ruddy youth, tingling with life, with a clear vision of the divine commission given from God, and is looking into the future.”³⁸

Yet in the session right before Haynes’s opening sermon, the bishops had announced “We would call attention to the fact that the net loss in the operating of our Publishing House from January 1, 1915 to June 30, 1919 has been \$14,463, while the loss on the *Herald of*

³⁷ Journal of General Assembly 1919, 51, 52. “A Merited Indorsement,” *Herald of Holiness*, October 8, 1919, p. 2. “An Epochal General Assembly,” *Herald of Holiness*, October 8, 1919, p. 1.

³⁸ Journal of General Assembly 1919, 66, 68.

Holiness during this same period has been \$21,046.30.” They declared “Had the *Herald* been able to pay its own way, the plant would have shown a surplus of \$6,582.99.”³⁹

Why would the general superintendents single out a ministry for failure in a formal address on the floor of the General Assembly? Any number of ways might have been found to state this more graciously and supportively. Interestingly, the publishing board report used exactly the same language. That report appeared earlier, and bore the rhetorical marks of board president William E. Fisher, formerly superintendent of the San Antonio District. Fisher’s announcement in the *Herald* regarding editorial policy during the Rees controversy began “It is high time the true position of the Publishing House was coming to be understood by our people.” Fisher informed readers that neither the manager nor the editor had any say over the editorial policies that were the sole prerogative of the publishing board. Those who demanded access during the Rees controversy could stop “fuming and fussing till doomsday” at the manager and the editor for “They have absolutely no prerogatives there....Let it for ever be understood,” declared the board president, “the policies of the House and paper are not shaped by the Editor or General Manager, but by the Board of Publication.” Fisher’s wise and well-reasoned rationale for excluding controversial material was stated in calmer language than his strutting assertion of the powerlessness of the editor in editing the paper.⁴⁰

The Publication Board’s 1919 financial statements show that the *Herald’s* sales in dollars grew from around \$7300 in 1915 to an estimated \$11,600 in 1919. However, the number of copies produced dropped from 468,000 in 1916 to an estimated 435,000 in 1919. The Board had

³⁹ Journal of General Assembly, 1919, 65.

⁴⁰ The Board of Publication Report appeared in the Journal of the General Assembly, 1919, 75. Fisher’s statement of *Herald* editorial policy, “An Explanation,” *Herald of Holiness*, May 16, 1917, 11.

raised the price of the paper twice during the quadrennium from \$1.50 in 1916 to \$2 in March of 1919. The *Herald* had 8300 subscribers in the summer of 1916. It had 7400 in October of 1919. Given even the modest growth of that troubled 4 years, the reach of the *Herald* dropped from a ratio of 1 subscriber for every 4 Nazarenes to 1 for every 4.74.⁴¹

October 4, 1919, at the publishing board's post-Assembly meeting, the board reduced the price of the *Herald* to \$1.50, per the order of the General Assembly, which had ordered the price cut at the urging of the Standing Committee on Publishing Interests. Memorials had appeared at Assembly to remove the duty of electing the editor from the Publishing Board, but they did not pass the Committee. On October 7, 1919, Haynes made recommendations to the board and asked for a raise. They offered him \$2250 a year to edit four different Sunday school publications, an action that would have ended his editorship of the *Herald*. Haynes offered to resign as editor of the *Herald*. The board offered editing of the *Bible Teacher* and *Herald* for a combined \$1750 on October 8, which Haynes accepted. As membership and finances rebounded, on February 19, 1920, Haynes's salary as *Herald* editor was raised to \$1800 and he was given three pages of material, the third page for editorial survey (reprinting with introductory comment items in other papers).⁴²

Having worked through elements of its connectional crisis over general superintendency, Nazarene leaders still struggled to understand the vitality of publishing for its connectional piety, and in particular, the necessary powers and valuing of the connectional office editor of the *Herald of Holiness*. Recognizing Haynes's age and poor health, the spring 1921 meeting of the

⁴¹ Journal of General Assembly 1919, 78, 80. Chapman, *A History*, 112. Minutes of the Board of Publication, March 12, 1919.

⁴² Journal of General Assembly 1919, 58, 106. Minutes of the Board of Publication, October 4, 7, and 8, 1919, and February 19, 1920.

publishing board elected C. A. McConnell co-editor to return to the paper to serve with and eventually succeed the ailing Haynes as chief editor. McConnell declined the election, making the way for J. B. Chapman's election and eventual succession in 1922 at a salary of \$1500. Chapman came to the 1923 General Assembly as an incumbent only in office one or two years. The delegates elected him editor by an overwhelming vote, thereby making the editorship of the *Herald* a true general office, a connectional office not to be managed as merely a hired hand of a specialty board that possessed no specialists. The Assembly also set his salary at \$1800, a further rebuke of the salary meddling of the publications board. Haynes had fared poorly in the matter of prerogatives and privileges of office. But the Editor-Board of Publications and Editor-NPH Manager relationships that had served to demote the office in the teens showed the need for reforms that finally came under Chapman, who, strengthened by Assembly validation and a jump in subscriptions, zealously guarded the connectional turf that had always been implied by the office. Haynes began with the right to editorialize and the right to edit, while answerable to a board of which he was president, subject to annual reelection. From 1916 on, he had only the right to editorialize, a right also increasingly restricted, and answered to a board he had to be invited to consult, and which could remake his duties or fire him at will. Chapman received a full restoration of the editing rights Haynes had originally, and was answerable only to the Board of General Superintendents for his editorials and only to the General Assembly for his office. It was a dramatic strengthening of the editor's power as a connectional officer.⁴³

But it came too late for Haynes, and it came too late for his reputation. The Board of General Superintendents played an unintended role in undermining Haynes and the connectional office. The same bishops that singled out the *Herald* for not being able to "pay its own way" in

⁴³ Journal of the Sixth General Assembly, 1923, 91-93.

1919, Reynolds, Goodwin, Williams, repeated their mistake four years later after Haynes left office. In listing the reasons for the financial trouble of the publishing house said in 1923 that “The HERALD OF HOLINESS has always been published at a loss.” They added, “this fact is well known to our people.” In their list of recommendations, they urged the house to “build up a business sufficiently large” to support itself “and at the same time create a fund that would greatly help in the endowment of our educational interests and in aiding our wornout preachers.” “We pray,” the general superintendents said, “that the House may ever be an asset to us and never a liability.” The report of the Committee on Re-organization, set up to work with the bishops in addressing the chronic fiscal jeopardy of the house, stated that for the 1922–1923 year “every department showed a reasonable profit, except in the publishing of the HERALD OF HOLINESS. The loss, however, in this department is very small compared to other years, it amounts to \$1900.”⁴⁴

A simple narrative developed. Haynes failed, in came Jim Chapman resulting in instant staggering success. Biographer of the *Herald* editors Ivan Beals concluded that at the end of Haynes’s term the denomination needed but did not have “a strong periodical” and therefore the church was “hardly an integrated force by 1921.”⁴⁵ But the reports of the re-organization committee and bishops, the Publishing Board and Publishing House financial reports from 1915, 1919, and 1923, the statistical reports of the General Statistical Secretary from 1923, and J. B. Chapman’s *History* (1926) paint a different picture.

The standard story presents the following facts. In the year ending in 1919, the *Herald* had 7400 subscribers. In the year ending in 1923, it had 20,500 subscribers. In monetary terms,

⁴⁴ *Herald of Holiness*, October 3, 1923, 10, 12. *Herald of Holiness*, October 3, 1923, 23. The re-organization committee included J. M. Messenger, J. T. Benson, and E. G. Anderson.

⁴⁵ Ivan A. Beals, *Heralding Scriptural Holiness* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1987), 38.

the standard narrative goes, the *Herald* lost \$21,046 during the 1918–1919 year. It lost only \$1904 in the 1922–1923 year. Chapman became co-editor in 1921, and sole editor in 1922. Thus, Chapman’s editorials and editing of the paper tripled its subscribers and gained \$20,000 a year for the House at \$1.50 per subscriber. The math even works, for 13,100 more subscribers at \$1.50 each equals \$19,650 more in subscription revenue.

A close look at the *Herald* losses reported, *Herald* sales revenue reported, and the *Herald* postage costs reported suggests a different, more complex, story. The postage costs of the *Herald* in 1915 were \$732.73. In 1916, after the price hike to \$1.50, the postage costs were \$568.49, while its revenue increased modestly from \$7290.35 to \$8517.36, results consistent with a loss of customers but greater yield from those remaining. But from mid- to late-1916 through to the 1921–1922 year, the year Haynes and Chapman shared editorship, both *Herald* sales revenue and *Herald* postage costs grew each year. Postage costs grew from \$568.49 to \$1313.41, while sales revenue grew from \$8517.36 to \$17,944.68. *Herald* postage costs did not “recover” from the 1916 shock until the 1919–1920 year, which would be consistent with a fast drop in subscriptions (and perhaps less shaping from Haynes, as Wallace suggested in 1917) and a slow recovery that was aggravated by war-inspired price spikes, famine, and schism.

But in the year that Chapman took over, 1922–1923, the year that reported a whopping 20,500 subscribers, *Herald* postage costs actually dropped from \$1313.41 to \$1209.06. Comparing Chapman’s first sole editor year, 1922–1923, to Haynes’s last year sans Chapman, 1920–1921, the postage costs increased from \$1136.76 to \$1209.06 while *Herald* sales revenue increased from \$17,461.34 to \$20,247.10. But how are we to reconcile these modest increases with a staggering jump in subscriptions from the last full Haynes year, 8000, to the first full Chapman year, 20,500? The most obvious answer seems to be a change in sales method from

encouraging various pastors and leaders to press for subscriptions singly to mailing out *Herald* issues in bulk and taking subscriptions at mass events, or perhaps more likely, mailing issues in bulk to congregations and asking pastors and church boards to raise or donate the money to cover them. Such a method might explain a modest increase in revenue (since the *Herald* was floating these subscribers for a time), an actual drop in postage costs, and a dramatic increase in reported subscriptions. Such a method would change pastors' duty from having to plead with parishioners to "take" the *Herald* to being fundraisers with boards or congregations, or bill collectors with individual members who were already receiving, and perhaps already benefitting from, the item for which they were being asked to pay. It also may have helped solve the problem of dropped subscriptions, as the House could keep mailing issues and let local leaders sort out the persons and dollars, a solution not far from the 1915 suggestion of the Standing Committee that local churches provide the *Herald* as a membership right. If so, it worked beautifully, and along with the General Assembly's and Chapman's defense of the editorial office, resulted in a great strengthening of the connectional paper. By 1924, 25,000 subscribers were reported. In December 1925, the *Herald* expanded from 16 pages to 32 pages. In 1928, the General Assembly moved Chapman from the editors' desk to the episcopal seat.

But this alone does not explain the financial boost credited to the change from Haynes to Chapman. That change is explained by the report of the Reorganization Committee, that of the Statistical Secretary, and Chapman's *History*. The committee, reporting on dramatic changes they had taken to save the House, claimed that the cuts in personnel made during Chapman's first year, 1922–1923, "reduced the overhead expense over \$20,000 a year." It is clear that *Herald* "expenses" in previous years included personnel costs, an expense that was reported perhaps somewhat randomly or haphazardly. For example, between 1919–1920 and 1920–1921

Herald sales revenue increased sharply from \$13,829 to \$17,461. But the 1923 Publishing Board report stated that *Herald* “losses” increased from \$13,385.44 to \$17,163.37. It seems the *House’s* overhead that led the committee to declare “we were operating at almost a maximum operating cost,” had been passed on to the *Herald’s* bottom line and its editor’s reputation. So, when the 1922–1923 committee’s changes resulted in “at least \$25,000 a year” in savings that, too, was passed on to the *Herald’s* bottom line and its new editor’s reputation. Membership and overall financial strength also boomed around the time Chapman took office. In the 1918–1919 year, Nazarenes “raised for all purposes” (RAP) \$1,321,196. In 1922–1923, they raised \$2,697,533. Between 1914–1915 and 1918–1919, Nazarene membership inched up from 33,129 to 34,305. From 1918–1919 to 1922–1923 it boomed from 34,305 to 55,142. Chapman noted that “the business of the Publishing House in 1924 was more than four times as large as it was in 1915.” It might finally be worth noting that neither Haynes nor Chapman even lived in Kansas City between 1916 and 1924 when so many of these changes occurred. It might be fairer to both of them to judge them as editors on the editorials they wrote, Haynes 1912–1922, and Chapman 1921–1928, and the contributions Haynes controlled as full-time resident editor with editing power from April 1912 to April 1916, and which Chapman controlled as full-time resident editor with editing power from 1924 to 1928.⁴⁶

The language used by the general superintendents on the floor of the 1919 and 1923 General Assemblies, “pay its own way,” “published at a loss,” the burden of endowing colleges and pensions, and perhaps most unfortunately, “liability,” shaped the recollection of Haynes’s editorship, and less directly, the three House managers who had served during his time, Kinne, Sanders, and Wallace. According to the bishops, if the House was a “liability,” it was the failure

⁴⁶ *Herald of Holiness*, October 3, 1923, 22-23. Chapman, *A History*, 111-112.

of the *Herald* to “pay its own way” that made it so. While those who had read the reports closely might have come to other conclusions, the weight of episcopal disappointment fell on Haynes. None of the managers or board members were the face of House failure when the *Herald* was named so conspicuously. The name above the fold was B. F. Haynes, Editor. What the general superintendents surely meant to spur greater support among Nazarenes could as easily been read as a rejection of Haynes’s service.

It was a sharp change in tone from the celebrations of publishing leaders in 1915. But the financial crises in connectional institutions of 1916–1922 had made leaders anxious. Their mistake was to view the House and perhaps especially the *Herald*, as businesses or sources of income. The idea, given the financial history of the House, that it would be burdened with funding the colleges seems laughable. What thought had been given to what the colleges might owe the House or the *Herald* is unclear. The colleges increasingly represented regional bases of power that engaged in sharp and unruly competition with each other. These regional bases of power operated outside the connectional system, and often against connectional institutions like the connectional paper and, later, the connectional seminary, through competing publications or degree programs. They were not ministries of the general church as with missions and publishing, but rather ministries legally and otherwise accountable to local or regional boards. But their influence and power in connectional life—as in mainline Methodism—far outstripped their accountability to connectional processes and sensibilities. Given Nazarenes’ inherited regionalism, the colleges were dangerously likely to become means of schism and means of weakening and/or ignoring truly connectional ministries.

Early Nazarenes never fully committed to the connectional paper during Haynes’s time as editor, still caught in the growing pains of the shift between ill-formed but vital movement and

connectional denomination. Nazarene publishing was still treated as if it were outside “us,” an auxiliary of the connectional wheel, whose highest purpose was to fund more important—and narrower—age-group ministries. They had failed to understand that the House, and especially the *Herald*, were the axle that supported and served the entire system, a connectional ministration that became more obvious as the *Herald* and the office of editor grew stronger during Chapman’s editorship. Of the seven general superintendents in the first twenty years, 1908–1928, only Bresee had edited a church paper charged with connectional duties in a connectional system, but one in which he held almost every connectional office. The 1919 and 1923 bishops were Reynolds, Goodwin, and Williams. The three layer structure of local churches, districts, and the general church occupied their minds most directly, and the trio of publishing, higher education, and missions were not evenly represented among these three.

Given the financial travails and extensive efforts undertaken to consolidate and stabilize higher education, their fiscal caution about church enterprises was understandable. But they understood the *Herald* as a business; not as the connectional organ, the only ministry that bound all the others together. The *Herald* did not have a defender among them, and the missionary concern even had its own paper, a creep toward each department of the church having its own competing publication, an enduring problem in both mainline and dissenting Methodist bodies. The combination of continuing loyalties to other papers, financial anxieties, and a weak understanding of the way connectional papers functioned in connectional systems weakened the paper. Within a decade of Haynes’s 1912 call for the church to endow its central organ, the general superintendents were demanding the paper endow multiple other connectional ministries. In 1889, the MECS’s central paper, the Nashville *Christian Advocate* had 27,000 subscriptions to 1,177,150 denominational members, or one subscription for every forty-four members. Its editor

was elected bishop the next year.⁴⁷ In 1916, the *Herald* had 8,300 subscriptions to 33,267 denominational members, or one subscription for every four members, a staggering achievement. But the *Herald's* editor had his pay cut in half, was stripped of editing power and editorial range, and was singled out for negative special notice on the floor of two consecutive General Assemblies by the general superintendents. Haynes and his *Herald* had become the scapegoat for early fiscal missteps. While Haynes's editorials were recognized as robust in content, he had been falsely labeled as unsuccessful or unpopular (by which was meant fiscally unsuccessful) when, in fact, the paper Haynes and his colleagues produced was much stronger than early Nazarenes understood.

Generational turnover played a role, and helps explain, in part, this early failing of conception and practice. Chapman's rise to editor in 1922 was one of several important positions that fell into the hands of youthful denominational loyalists in the late teens and early twenties just at the moment when the denomination's fiscal state was rebounding from the economic shocks of World War I. As a group, they were perhaps unenlightened, but also unencumbered, by old denominational experiences in broad churches. Tim Smith noted both their "war on bureaucracy and waste," and their "loyalty and enthusiasm." They would build a denomination by streamlining its administration, sharply reducing the range of its involvements, and pushing hard for the success of a smaller number of fiscally-sustainable ministries.⁴⁸

Among the General Superintendents, Goodwin (1916–1940) and Williams (1916–1946) succeeded Bresee and Walker by 1918. Chapman replaced Haynes as editorial general officer in

⁴⁷ May 1890: 27,000 according to the Journal of the 1890 General Conference, 242. The NCA used commercial and connectional advertising. The book advertising of the MECS publishing house put it just over the top as profitable. See also *NCA*, May 31, 1890, 10.

⁴⁸ Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 341, 322.

1922, a man thirty-three years his senior. The 1928 General Assembly elected Chapman (1928–1947) general superintendent. H. Orton Wiley became pre-eminent as college administrator through the Rees controversy in 1917, replacing the legendary A. M. Hills twenty-nine years senior, eventually becoming *Herald* editor himself in 1928. E. J. Fleming (1919–1940) remade the office of General Secretary as the conduit for efficient communications between the board of general superintendents and the newly created combined General Board. Mervel Lunn became the new general treasurer (1926–1932) and manager of the publishing house (1922–1960), replacing E. G. Anderson, and DeLance Wallace, respectively.

This youth movement fit the youthfulness of the denomination. A boom in several ministries followed, aided by financial recovery, even as social ministries were sharply reduced in number. While supposed external fundamentalist theological influence has often been asserted as the primary cause for the decline in both social ministries and social commentary, the internal financial instability of connectional institutions and the generational shift played a more decisive role in the “reversal.” Tim Smith suggested as much when he noted that “the reigns of authority passed to young men who had known neither bishops nor councils, nor a church broadly responsible for the welfare of society.” Chapman’s truncating of theological and social topics was its own form of tightening the belt, pressing on fewer items, those more readily accessible and fit for a denomination of young adults. Chapman jettisoned Haynes’s and McConnell’s open parliament style and added a question and answer feature that proved both popular and enduring. But the change signaled a shift from editorials and paper functioning as a spark for discussion and reflection among serious adult leaders to a feature that displayed a youthful church taking catechetical instruction from its forty-year old general editor.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 271.

The leadership corps most responsible for the voice of the denomination, the board of general superintendents plus the connectional editor, experienced a dramatic shift in age. At the start of the 1915 General Assembly, the old corps of Bresee, Reynolds, Walker, and Haynes averaged sixty-six years old, almost sixty-three if not counting the seventy-seven year old Bresee. All were over sixty years old. At the start of the 1923 General Assembly, the new corps of Reynolds, Goodwin, Williams, and Chapman averaged fifty and one half years old. Subtracting the sixty-nine year old Reynolds, the youth group was only forty-four.⁵⁰ Goodwin, Williams, and Chapman cut their ministerial teeth *within* ‘micro-denominationalism.’ The denomination they served would grow up with their voice in its ear, with thousands of new members who knew neither Bresee nor Haynes. Goodwin served twenty-four years in the corps. Williams served thirty years in it. Chapman served twenty five. The effect on popular denominational memory was to obscure the labors and importance of Reynolds, Walker, and Haynes in favor of the Goodwin, Williams, Chapman trio, perhaps especially Williams and Chapman. Enough adoring westerners remained to reinvent Bresee as sole founder and sole fount of experience, and with the help of later admiring scholars, secure H. Orton Wiley’s stature as well, in the process obscuring the theological and educational leadership of Haynes, Walker, A. M. Hills, C. A. McConnell, C. E. Cornell, and E. P. and Emily Ellyson, among others.⁵¹

⁵⁰ A similar dramatic shift in leaders occurred in the 1940s when they left, or died in, office.

⁵¹ Tim Smith posited rural versus urban and northern versus southern divides in Nazarene history. If geographical aspects within the United States are important at all, it might be worth considering the importance of an eastern versus western divide, east or west of the Mississippi River. In that light, Texans and Oklahomans are fellow westerners with Californians and Idahoans, while the New England, Ohio, Olivet, and Southeastern traditions sit together as easterners. In denominational memory, the “easterners”—Reynolds, Haynes, and Hills among others—have not fared as well. This framework reveals that two-thirds of the original three groups merging by 1908 were primarily western, and suggests that the early links between Texas, Oklahoma, and California were enhanced during the migrations of the 1930s. East of the Mississippi River, the cultural divisions between the northeast, the Great Lakes states, and the southeast had no similar alignment. So, too, the connections between the colleges in the west—Pasadena in California, Northwest in Idaho, and Bethany-Peniel in Texas and Oklahoma—seem much stronger than

Haynes may have felt slighted or disrespected. But if so, there remains little evidence he ever acted on such feelings. Haynes obeyed Reynolds's wishes that he stand by the paper. He came to every annual meeting of the Board of Publication, including while it was composed of those who made the 1916 decision. He waited for them to summon him for his report, but occasionally was allowed to sit in on sessions. It seems he was as helpful to them as they would allow him to be, and eager to be more so. His autobiography, primarily written in the early part of the 1900s decade, was released in 1921. The chapter "Later Movements" recounted his life from 1905 to 1920 in only 17 pages, some of which relate events before 1905. The earlier defiant and defensive tone reflected during a low and painful point in his life was not reflected in what few letters exist from his time among Nazarenes, or the portions of his autobiography that were clearly written during his Nazarene years. Haynes's October 1920 declaration that "I desire only to be in the will of the Lord," was followed by "Long ago I ceased making plans. I only seek and desire to have my life a plan of God. This cannot be if I am constantly planning for myself." A different perspective had come, and Haynes testified "I am living by the day, willing to obey the Master's command lead where, when, and as it may. I have never had happier work, or work in more congenial atmosphere than on the tripod of Herald of Holiness." For, Haynes declared, "the Church of the Nazarene stands for what I believe with all my soul."⁵²

the ties between the three eastern colleges—Olivet in Illinois, Eastern in Massachusetts, and Trevecca in Tennessee. It may also be true that the western two thirds were more eager for connectional polity than the APCA in the northeast and Pentecostal Mission in Nashville, both more eager to protect congregational (in this case read as local) prerogatives. Immediately following the 1915 General Assembly, three of the four general superintendents were living in California. This reading recasts Chapman and Williams not as second-generation stereotyped "southerners"—born in Illinois, Chapman's parents named him after failed Republican presidential candidate James G. Blaine of Maine—but as *westerners*, like Bresee who spent his adult life west of the Mississippi River. In 1923, Reynolds was living in Kansas City, Goodwin was in California, and Williams was living in Dallas, Texas.

⁵² Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 257. His autobiography includes thirty-two commendations from readers of the *Herald*. Of the 21 identified by location, 7 are from Texas. Geographically, 14 are from states west of the Mississippi but east of the Rocky Mountains; 5 are from east of the Mississippi, 2 from the Northwest. Mrs. E. G. Eaton: "Everywhere in my travels I heard the dear Herald of Holiness so highly spoken of. Out in rural districts, where battles are hard and prejudice is great, where mothers and fathers are weary in the effort to train their children, I

The Tennessee District issued praises of Haynes in 1920 and 1921 as his health was failing. In September of 1920, with Haynes unable to be present, E. A. Girvin read a message from Haynes to the preachers of the Tennessee District: “Preach the Word.” E. P. Ellyson then read a paper he had written with Girvin that praised Haynes’s editorial work for the *Herald* that was of “untold value to the Church of the Nazarene,” and noted his “sane advice” had been of “inestimable worth.” The paper included praise that he had been spared “to cheer us with his presence, and guide us by his ripe experience and wise counsel.” Ellyson and Girvin stated that while in Nashville in the 1880s and 1890s Haynes “so resisted the principalities and powers, the rulers of darkness of this world, and the wicked spirits in high places, and so fought for and witnessed to the cause of Holiness, the Kingdom of Christ, and the eternal and immutable principles of righteousness, as to bring upon himself financial ruin and ecclesiastical martyrdom.” Girvin and Ellyson declared Haynes “an eloquent and powerful preacher,” and “an evangelist of rare ability and exceptional success,” and “a scholar, author, and writer” of “marvelously original thought, as well as exquisite style and diction.” Mrs. Haynes sent a “very appreciative letter” to the Assembly. Haynes reprinted the resolution in *Tempest-Tossed*.⁵³

Haynes did attend the September 1921 Tennessee District Assembly. His report was accepted “by a rising vote.” Emily Ellyson “paid high tribute to Dr. Haynes’s editorial utterances, and stated that they had brought rich blessings to her soul.” The Assembly unanimously directed the Secretary to send greetings to Lula. The Publishing Interests Committee spoke of “our dearly beloved Dr. B. F. Haynes [...] the senior editor,” and

have been told by these parents over and over how grateful they were for the helpful, inspiring messages from the editor’s pen.” *Tempest-Tossed*, 249-250. For an ad that presents its title as “A Sketch of My Life,” see *Herald of Holiness*, March 2, 1921, 15.

⁵³ Minutes of the Tennessee District Assembly, 1920, 12-13, 26-27.

recommended that NPH set aside a day for “the Dr. B. F. Haynes Subscription Memorial to the Herald of Holiness,” intended to “greatly extend the circulation” of the paper “as an appreciation for the work Dr. Haynes as editor of our church paper since its beginning.” Meanwhile, Haynes continued his defense of the paper and its connectional importance.⁵⁴

Haynes’s last issue as editor came on March 29, 1922. It was Volume 10, No. 52, ten full years as editor of Nazarenes’ central organ. His last two editorials as editor reflected the concerns he carried at that stage in his life. The first, a farewell entitled “A Last Word,” thanked those thousands of readers whose words of appreciation had “often strengthened weary hands and encouraged a heavy heart, as they were being consecrated to a high and holy task.” He reported that those nearest to him “by ties of blood and grace” had long urged him to rest. Yet his next lines announced his intention to finish a half-written book on the “Premillennial Second Coming of our Lord,” and testified that “This Blessed Hope is a fundamental truth of the Inspired Word, which is very dear to my heart.” He announced that he needed the strength to finish it and money to “bring it out.” Having aspired that his words would bear “truth, spiritual life, and power,” he told readers that he had ardently committed his editorial labors through “many precious seasons of prayer and communion with Him,” and declared he was ready to “meet at the Judgment” what he had written in the *Herald*. He repeated his thanks to the readers, prayed future blessings on the paper, and asked that his friends pray that “my sun may remain shining in a cloudless sky to the very end.” His second editorial noted negative trends in the doctrines expressed by missionaries of the mainline churches, highlighted the importance of Nazarenes’ own General Board of Foreign Missions, and urged Nazarenes to give more, and pray both for the “blind” missionaries that “God may wake them up and open their eyes,” and for

⁵⁴ Minutes of the Tennessee District Assembly, 1921, 15, 38. “Church Papers,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 13, 1921, 2.

Nazarene missionaries. “Pray for our Mission Board and all the interests of our Zion,” he urged, ending “*Let us Pray!!!*”⁵⁵

The next issue began with Chapman’s full page large font salute to “his venerable predecessor.” Haynes “has won and held the high esteem of our people and friends everywhere,” Chapman wrote, and had “long been considered one of the strongest editorial writers in the whole field of holiness journalism.” Chapman held that “the Church of the Nazarene and the holiness movement generally owe a debt to this ‘hero of the tripod’ that can never be repaid.” Chapman noted that “Dr. Haynes never sounded an uncertain note on any thing.” Chapman directed that “every reader should immediately order a copy of Dr. Haynes’s Autobiography, and ask for a list of his published books.” Chapman declared, “there are mines of yellow gold in these publications that none of us can afford to lose.”⁵⁶

But Haynes was not quite through with Nazarenes. He remained a contributing editor. E. G. Anderson at the 1923 General Assembly moved that an absent Haynes be elected a member of the Assembly representing the Committee on Manuscripts. After debate, the delegates elected him. Anderson then immediately moved that Miss Olive Winchester be seated “as an alternate in the stead of Dr. B. F. Haynes.” It was a symbolic honor, granting Haynes a sixth membership in a quadrennial gathering. But Haynes sent “an interesting letter” to the 1923 General Assembly that began with salutations and ended with at least four proposals for reorganizing the Board of Publications. H. D. Brown moved that congratulations be wired to the B. F. and Lula in honor of their golden wedding anniversary. The secretary reported that “a golden expression of the love of

⁵⁵ “A Last Word,” and “Sending Out the Blind to Hunt For the Lost,” *Herald of Holiness*, March 29, 1922, 1-2.

⁵⁶ J. B. Chapman, “Dr. Haynes Retires as Editor,” *Herald of Holiness*, April 5, 1922, 1.

the church for these faithful ones amounted to \$100.”⁵⁷

Haynes had proposed a field officer for the *Herald* and a “Preacher’s Colportage Society;” both proposals were referred to the appropriate committee. His proposal for a smaller Board of Publication was amended to five instead of the original seven member board of 1911. His proposal “limiting the membership of the Board of Publication to those who had not heretofore been members” received nonconcurrence. Chapman’s election (or confirmation) as editor of the *Herald* immediately preceded the first news of Haynes’s “extreme illness”—a stroke. R. T. Williams moved the Secretary cast the ballot of the Assembly electing Dr. Haynes Editor emeritus, “as a token of the high regard in which the beloved former Editor is held.”⁵⁸

Haynes died at 9:30 pm the evening of October 2, during the last session of the 1923 General Assembly that closed at 1:20am on October 3. As delegates were rushing to complete business, telegrams from Nashville came in warning of his decline. Responses to his death in the *Herald* were delayed due to the normal overflow of General Assembly reporting that followed quadrennial meetings, and, in a case of awkward timing, Chapman’s commentary about his own election by the Assembly and the growing subscription lists under his watch.⁵⁹

C. A. McConnell went on to teach theology at Bethany Nazarene College in Oklahoma for many years. In honor of leading figures in the early church while celebrating the

⁵⁷ Journal of the Sixth General Assembly, 1923, 30, 53, 54. The delegates defeated Memorials from six different districts—mostly in the Midwest and the South, proposing that the name of the paper be changed to “Nazarene Messenger.” The Committee had proposed “Nazarene Messenger: A Herald of Holiness.” Journal, 91.

⁵⁸ Journal of General Assembly, 1923, 94, 124. Haynes’s resolutions were labeled No. 342. The General Assembly voted for E. P. Ellyson as Sunday School periodicals editor instead of incumbent C. J. Kinne who had been chosen by the Board of Publication.

⁵⁹ “The General Assembly Special,” *Herald of Holiness*, September 19, 1923, 2. “A Word of Appreciation” that gives the exact votes he received, and “The Herald of Holiness Subscription List,” both *Herald of Holiness*, October 17, 1923, 2.

denomination's silver jubilee in 1933, J. B. Chapman, then both General Superintendent and also editor of the *Preacher's Magazine*, published a partial version of McConnell's 1931 tribute to Haynes. McConnell declared "Dr. Haynes was a born bishop—a bishop in ability and training; a bishop in all but election." But McConnell thought Haynes's "great service to the cause of Christ lies rather in his work as editor," for "His editorials are classics, not only of chaste, vigorous, illuminative English, but of scriptural doctrine so clear, so complete, that they deserve to be preserved to future generations as authoritatively setting forth the fundamentals of the Church of the Nazarene."⁶⁰

No such reverent preservation, recollection, compiling, or authoritative status developed. Chapman had been Haynes's student at Texas Holiness University, then followed Haynes as Dean of Theology there. In 1921, Chapman joined Haynes again as co-editor, before replacing him in 1922. Chapman became one of the most important writers and polity thinkers in the

⁶⁰ McConnell's tribute as printed by Chapman: "B. F. HAYNES, the first editor-in-chief of the Herald of Holiness, cast his lot with the newly launched Church of the Nazarene a few days before the General Assembly which convened at Nashville, Tennessee, in 1911. It was in his later maturity that Dr. Haynes came to us and his service to the church spanned a brief decade, yet the church will always be the gainer from his ripe wisdom, stern probity, and intense passion for the truth of God. While Dr. Haynes did not receive academic degrees, yet he was a scholar of wide learning and a profound thinker. As college president and instructor in Tennessee, and at Olivet and Peniel, he put his impress upon many who were to become leaders in the cause of Christ and the Church of the Nazarene. Dr. Haynes was a born bishop—a bishop in ability and training; a bishop in all but election. As pastor of Old McKendree, the greatest church in Southern Methodism, he proved himself a master preacher. Yet his great service to the cause of Christ lies rather in his work as editor. It was his good fortune to receive the very best of training for that exalted position, that is, in the practical workings of a country newspaper office. As editor of the conference organ, the Tennessee Methodist, the name of Dr. Haynes became one of the best known in Southern Methodism. So it was that when, shortly after his uniting with the Church of the Nazarene, the General Assembly at Nashville decided to establish a general church organ, the Herald of Holiness, Dr. Haynes was the outstanding one in mind of all to head the editorial staff. To this great work he gave the remaining years of his life. His editorials are classics, not only of chaste, vigorous, illuminative English, but of scriptural doctrine so clear, so complete, that they deserve to be preserved to future generations as authoritatively setting forth the fundamentals of the Church of the Nazarene." *Preacher's Magazine*, October 1933, Vol 8, No. 10. Abridged biographical sketches of early Nazarene leaders taken from Vol. 6 of *The Young People's Journal*, 1931. The first four editors who followed Haynes—Chapman, Wiley, Corlett, and White, an editorial group whose service spanned to 1960—would have known Haynes as editor of the *Herald*. Chapman was a student at Texas Holiness University the year Haynes was dean of theology; then Chapman followed Haynes as dean of theology. Chapman co-edited the paper with Haynes for one year, before again succeeding him. Editor S. S. White graduated from THU in 1911 and married Mary McConnell, C. A. McConnell's daughter, in 1914; Haynes officiated the wedding. White was a ministerial student at Drew and Brown, and president at Trevecca all while Haynes was editor. White was ordained by Bresee and married by Haynes. Beals, *Heralding Scriptural Holiness*, 36-37, 47-49, 61-62, 75.

denomination's history. His advocacy for higher education generally, and the founding of a graduate seminary specifically, shaped the denomination's history long after his death in 1947. Despite Chapman's own endorsement of his mentor Haynes for the 'debt that can never be repaid' for the 'mines of yellow gold' that the 'venerable' 'hero of the tripod' left behind 'that none of us can afford to lose,' Chapman was not only Haynes's student and successor. Despite Chapman's repeated attempts to point Nazarenes to Haynes's contributions, Chapman displaced and unseated Haynes, virtually erased him, in the selective popular memory of later Nazarenes.

CONCLUSION

Denominations have origins and histories. The later remembrances of those who once lived also show such development and negotiation. The memory of B. F. Haynes has been no exception. J. B. Chapman's and C. A. McConnell's tributes were characterizations, recollections, and summaries of the originating virtues of the founding generation that Haynes embodied. Chapman and McConnell offered this memory to a booming denomination of bustling youth that did not know P. F. Bresee or Haynes and urged them to look to their example. They pointed Nazarenes to the full range of Haynes's writing. But to date, this has been a losing cause. As has been the fate of most newspaper editors, Haynes's primary contributions were printed weekly on inexpensive paper, granting them great contemporary influence and power, and fleeting hope of being remembered by institutions once their editorials no longer arrived as an authoritative weekly visitor. Nor would Haynes find a sympathetic patron. The Tennessee Conference of the MECS alternately ignored or disowned him as a schismatic in their twentieth century accounts. Haynes had no college that would choose to take special charge of sustaining his memory, not Martin, Asbury, or Olivet; not even Trevecca in Nashville, where the memory of J. O. McClurkan has been carefully nourished. He established no regional wing of the church he would be remembered for in founding myths that stressed ecumenical achievement, and missed his chance at election to General Superintendent in 1911 or even 1908 because he stayed in the MECS so long. With no institutional base committed to retelling his story or keeping his writings in print, Haynes would soon be largely forgotten. While the *Herald* has remained available for researchers, his *Tennessee Methodist* from the early to mid-1890s has only recently become available. Despite Chapman's urging, no library maintained the full collection of his

books. Even bibliographers have struggled to list them correctly.¹

This project has focused on denominations and dissent, and thus has stressed and highlighted conflict, contention, and argument at the expense of agreements, affirmations, and qualities. An affirmative history could have been written, but a story of disagreement was written. That decision has invariably cast the personalities involved in a contentious light. So a word about Haynes as a person, speaker, and writer seems appropriate.

For readers, the relative inaccessibility of Haynes's writings has been unfortunate. For among his MECS and Nazarene peers his writings were consistently mature, direct, and candid. There were mercifully clear and understandable. Haynes thought carefully and spoke boldly. He addressed himself to his readers, and wrote for his readers. He was an unambiguously confident writer. There is little evidence that he viewed anyone living as his intellectual superior. Yet for someone who wrote so many words for public consumption under the pressures of relentless deadlines and sometimes merciless criticism, his articles were curiously free from rash, indulgent, or sloppy utterances. Writing in a newspaper format that was so often prone to idle commentary, flashes of temper, and silly personal feuding, compared to other writers of his time who were as brave, zealous, vigorous, and clever as he was, Haynes's self-discipline, the things he did not let himself say, stands out.

But when he thundered, no one would have misunderstood his meaning. His editorials were frequently stunning. Anyone who read his writings would understand why friends would use the metaphors of artillery fire or trumpet blast to describe them. His authorial voice was loud

¹ Nazarene archivist and historian Stan Ingersol, interested in the southern holiness movement and the author of a 1989 dissertation on southern holiness leader Mary Lee Cagle, had the extant issues of the *Tennessee Methodist* preserved in concert with United Methodist Tennessee Conference archivist and historian, Von Unruh. Ingersol has written many short biographical sketches of early leaders for denominational publications, including several on Haynes beginning in the mid-1980s. Unruh and Ingersol generously provided the essential early building blocks, historical insights and perspective, and encouragement for this project.

and clear, or “definite” as his celebrants would most often and most accurately say. It was unmistakably forceful, direct, and disciplined. He simply threw no glancing blows. He hit his target squarely and with force. His praise was warm and deep and often powerfully affecting. His rebuke was unambiguous and sometimes devastating, and likely to provoke either immediate wrath or instant repentance. He did not trifle with words. He enjoyed them, reveled in them, and understood them. But mostly he used them powerfully, such that Haynes’s thoughts could be hatefully rejected or happily affirmed, but not easily ignored.

He was a man of tremendous moral courage and deeply idealistic moral conviction. It seems he was incapable of apathy. His capacity for moral outrage was wed to a vocabulary rich enough to express it. Haynes possessed a remarkable skill for clear and concise written expression, but he occasionally struggled to find words to express righteous indignation *moderately*. Given even his own condemnations of infallibility doctrines, Haynes was surely wrong at times. Certainly his critics, and even some of his friends, thought he went too far at times. But his mistakes were made head first, openly, and without prevarication. Whether that made him a foolish crank or a noble hero is in the eye of the beholder. But he was not a petty scribbler or an indifferent observer.

Accounts of Haynes as a person as opposed to as a speaker or author almost universally noted his hardworking energy and well-developed moral sensibilities. This is especially true of later biographical sketches from younger observers who likely found that combination rather forceful. But many who encountered him on peer terms described him as polite, cultured, curious, and thoroughly devout. Some even used words like tender and sweet-spirited. In his thirties, he had been a favorite and social companion of bishops and other senior colleagues. Compared to other prominent clergy of his time, including a few of his friends and associates,

Haynes was not personally eccentric or flamboyant. He was a serious and dignified patrician, whose children became or married naval officers, teachers, physicians, clergy, and business managers. Few letters have survived, perhaps a casualty of the 1904 fire at Martin College or a newspaper editor's discretion regarding hot-tempered or litigious correspondents. Those few that survive are intimate and candid, even vulnerable. Many of those who wrote privately and publically in his defense wrote as if Haynes felt deeply the criticisms leveled against him.²

He did feel deeply. While this project has focused on conflict, and especially the ideas and offices over which various parties contended, a truly biographical project would have paid close attention to the role of suffering, his own and others', in Haynes's thought. His earliest political experiences entail enslaved African Americans' fearful pleading with Haynes's father not to sell them to another master. They entail walking the Franklin battlefield long before the field was cleared of its carnage and converted to a tourist site. His mother lost multiple children in Haynes's youth, but his public writings say nothing of his siblings' deaths. For someone who loathed violence and bloodshed, he witnessed more than his share. As he came to middle age, the menace of lynching and other politically-motivated killing was ongoing. He was fourteen when Abraham Lincoln was murdered, thirty when James Garfield was murdered, and fifty when

² While his articles did often show a warmer and compassionate side, his three non-biographical books, i.e. *The Sanctified Life; Facts, Faith and Fire*; and *Beauty for Ashes* reflect that caring pastoral tone most readily. Outside of his autobiography *Tempest-Tossed on Methodist Seas*, which was written for his friends and family, Haynes's writings show remarkably little interest in himself or his own life. The children of pioneer Nazarene district superintendent C. B. Jernigan (1863-1930) believed the Pentecostal Mission benefitted from McClurkan's and Haynes's leadership—"both of these men were princely in appearance, but each had the humility of a servant"—that attracted support from prominent business leaders like John T. Benson, R. B. Mitchum, Tim Moore, and A. S. Ransom. "Cultured aristocrats, heads of business firms, down to humble laborers all felt at home," they recalled. Johnny Jernigan and Margaret Jernigan Ramsey, *Courageous Jernigan: Pioneer Nazarene Leader in the South* (Kansas City, Nazarene Publishing House, 1974), 52. Jernigan's personal style was unlike that of Haynes and McClurkan. Where they travelled less and operated readily in cultured settings, Jernigan was called the "Daniel Boone of the Church of the Nazarene." He organized 130 local churches, including organizing the first local Nazarene congregation in 7 different states. He was especially important in establishing Nazarene strength in Oklahoma between 1908 and 1924.

William McKinley was murdered. He was ten when the Civil War started; he was sixty-three when the Great War began. He lost children, grandchildren, and mentors, he lost wealth, reputation, and friends. He knew the bitter loss of trust and fellowship.

Yet Haynes would come to be remembered by more recent Nazarenes in two very different ways. One group of scholars, including Tim Smith, Paul Bassett, and Randall Stephens among others, would interpret Haynes's theological shift toward premillennialism as key to, in Bassett's words, the "fundamentalist leavening" of early Nazarene identity. In this view, premillennialism led to the loss of Nazarenes' interest in social ministries, social reform, and social concern that occurred after 1920 but was showing signs of weakening during Haynes's editorship. Several have argued directly that Haynes's interest in social and political matters was cooled by his growing interest in premillennialism. This they placed in contrast to the true Wesleyan concern for abolition, temperance, and other reforms among northern holiness Methodists whose postmillennial eschatology inspired them to believe souls and society alike could be perfected. Premillennialism, and the alien fundamentalist Calvinist infection it represents, became a way to explain Nazarenes' abandonment of the Wesleyan, and specifically holiness, inheritance of reform. Despite Haynes's defense of several forms of theological orthodoxy and propriety that might find favor among many Nazarene theologians, many have remembered Haynes not as a principled denominational dissenter, nor as the movement's powerful writer, but as the Calvinist and Fundamentalist infector of Nazarene theology, and the suppressor of Nazarene social reform. Taken to its extreme, this view might conclude that Haynes was not loyalist denominational wordsmith and journalist; he was a heterodox and treasonous fifth columnist.³

³ Paul M. Bassett, "The Fundamentalist Leavening of the Holiness Movement, 1914-1940: The Church of the

Another group would look to Haynes as a prominent example of social concern among early Nazarenes. Rather than the means through which the denomination lost its early traditions of rest homes, orphanages, social critique, open political activity, and concern for the poor, these Nazarenes would appeal to Haynes's memory, along with Bresee's, as models for a recovery, or 'greening,' of Nazarenes' social or 'compassionate' ministries that began in the 1970s and flowered by the mid-1980s. Having brought Haynes's earlier social and political concerns in the 1880s and 1890s to light, this study suggests that Haynes was likely the most aggressive early social and political dissenter in the Church of the Nazarene. While a full review of his social and political commentary fell beyond the denominational and polity-oriented scope of this project, Haynes should be remembered as Nazarenes' undisputed dean of social concern, whether or not some of his views were utilized by later generations who served in a later ages to justify abandonment of concerns Haynes embodied. Nazarene historians have noted his "thorough sense of custodianship for society," and his successors never approached the level of social concern evidenced in the first ten years of the *Herald*. Even the theologically astute and sophisticated H. Orton Wiley, editor from 1928–1936, who labored against fundamentalism, left many social and ethical issues "untouched." But Haynes's political and social protesting is loud and consistent over at least thirty-five years. An intense critic of social, political, and economic sin and vice, by his own testimony, he always voted for a reform third party over the last forty years of his life. Those who perceive a cooling in his social concern in the early 1920s may be missing two points of context, namely, the total collapse of his health, and the truly radical politics of movements in the early 1920s that went beyond the scope of his own views. He routinely and loudly criticized management and capitalists, thundered against 'mammonism,'

Nazarene—A Case Study," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, 13 (Spring 1978): 65-91.

railed against political corruption, warned against the insidious influence of money in higher education, encouraged cross-cultural missionary activity, opposed lynching and the Ku Klux Klan, praised ministries to the poor and victimized, decried militarism and preached isolationism, defended equal pay for women, supported child labor and prohibition reforms, and espoused a series of issues that made him advanced for his time among Protestant clergy. He may be labeled an English-speaking ‘Christian socialist,’ though there is only brief evidence he espoused that label. But he was emphatically not a continental anarchist or Marxist, and both continental immigration from predominantly Catholic countries and the vice-laden sensualizing and commercializing of early 1920s popular culture worried him.⁴

Here, too, Haynes is remembered in a different context from the one he most strongly suggested in his autobiography. Haynes was a strong writer and a brave critic, he was a serious thinker about theological topics, and he was a sincere and passionate social reformer. It is true that he envisioned a church that bore a faithful witness to the world in sound writing, sound doctrine, loving missionary and evangelistic ministries, compassionate social concern, and vigilant political action. But he wrote most often of the church’s internal vitality, and imagined that vitality was particularly threatened by a lack of prayer and poor attention to Christian ethics. His first dissent against the church’s ways railed against worldliness and mammonism in the church and called the church to anguished prayer. Yet his second dissent came when he refused to help a bishop mistreat a fellow minister, when he and his colleagues decried an ungracious administration of polity. For both United Methodists and Nazarenes, that story of dissent and the

⁴ Floyd Cunningham, ed., *Our Watchword and Song*, 278, 280. See also, M. Brandon Winstead, *There All Along: Black Participation in the Church of the Nazarene, 1914-1969* (Lexington: Emeth Press, 2013), 8-9. Very late in his term as editor, and even more so in the last year or so of his life in retirement, his writings became much less focused and crisp. Several historians noting a shift in his political and theological commentary have drawn from his writings in that very late and infirm period of his life. Given the timing of his illnesses from 1919-1923 and 1923 death, Haynes is a poor source for arguing a pre-1920 versus post-1920 thesis.

1890s warring over episcopal autocracy that followed, suggests polity histories may be worth revisiting. Connectionalism has been messy at times, and ‘connectional troubles’ appear to be a recurring feature of Methodistic denominationalism. The choice to tell that story in its manifestations both in MECS history *and* in Nazarene history intended to show the ubiquity of dissent within idealistic and connectional traditions, and to highlight the commonness, the family-resemblance, of denominations that remember themselves as radically unlike one another. The memory of Haynes’s career both in the MECS and among the Nazarenes is just part of a much longer, and very poorly remembered, history of Methodist polity. For denominations whose origins are so deeply consumed with and shaped by polity ideals, memories of polity wounds, polity negotiations, and near-fatal polity crises, such polity traditionlessness and amnesia, such denying both of origins and histories, is surprising.

Historians of religion may take away yet other ‘recollections’ of Haynes. One set of thoughts operates mostly as surprise, for Haynes and his MECS and Nazarene coreligionists have been consistently surprising. Haynes’s life has offered a fascinating tale of two cities, a comparing and contrasting of two very different and yet very similar religious bodies. How many persons were, like Haynes, major players in, and articulate witnesses to, the most important crises in a half century for two separate denominational stories? For historians who favor a dramatic story full of diverse characters and rolling conflict, this project may have sufficient merit. While private letters provide a much richer and often more candid view of motives and aspirations, this study’s focus on newspapers allowed for a raucous tale of dissenting bishops and editors contending vigorously and railing away at each other ‘in broad daylight.’ The MECS crisis, in particular, reveals that Methodists were entirely capable of expressing full-throated and unambiguous disagreement in the public pages of their own newspapers.

Individually, Haynes was one of the South's important late nineteenth century religious and political dissenters, perhaps even an archetypal dissenter. In one denomination, he was rising star before becoming its most despised critic of the denominational power structure. In another denomination, he was the weathered but still zealous articulator and defender of the denomination's inspirational center, including the very episcopal office he had previously decried. While the argument has been that the 1910s Nazarene 'Court' did embody a very different ethos from that of the 1890s MECS Court (Bresee, Reynolds, and Goodwin were particularly unlike Haygood, Hargrove, and Keener), and thus the content of his advocacy retained continuity, Haynes went from opposition party leader to court defender.

Haynes's expressed political and social concerns seem surprisingly current. Jeremiads against autocratic leadership, political corruption and deceit, abusive labor practices, extra-legal violence, crushing economic inequality, and the spiritual and moral wreckage of addiction and greed are abundant today. So too are religionists' debates about bishops and general superintendency, worldliness in the church, nominal religion, tensions between centers and peripheries, and other topics Haynes engaged so passionately a century ago. While part of broad sweeping movement of preachers drawn into the public sphere, he was always a more vigorous critic of the church's foibles and failings, ever the prophet come to name Zion's sins and call the churches away from nominal religion. While contending that dissent was an essential building block of denominational unity and expansion, this study denies that religious conservatism and social reform were contrary impulses, and supports other studies that have shown strong links between republican ideas, traditionalist religious dissent, and reformist political activity. Religious restorationism and innovative political reform were allies in this era. Indeed, historians should pay closer attention to religious restorationists going on about the supposedly

narrow denominational minutiae of things like ‘itinerancy and episcopacy.’ They might be engaging religion with political ideas in an effort to justify engaging politics with religious ones.

Yet as interesting, surprising, and revealing as Haynes was, his dissent had an effect worthy of historians’ attention. Haynes came as close as any MECS minister in the period to embodying the whole intra-Methodist dissenting platform. His high stature enabled him to make his paper a switchboard for the vocalizing, fostering, and delivery of dissent. It may be on this point that his importance for southern religious and political dissent becomes most obvious, for the columns of his *Tennessee Methodist* newspaper provide historians with a veritable directory of religious and political dissenters, especially southern Methodist dissenters. It is true that he had a powerful authorial voice, and was probably the unrecognized principal shaper of Nazarenes’ esprit de corps, and was many Methodist dissenters’ joie de vivre. But ideas, insights, and connections were made and reworked through him. His willingness to speak out drew and enabled other dissenting voices, and his character and assertions provoked thoughts and actions that had lacked a champion and a conduit without him. To be clear, Haynes did not create dissenters. But the testimonies from his time made it abundantly clear that he symbolized, inspired, and encouraged them, a fact that made the critics of criticism all the more anxious. His dissenting stature enabled unlikely sources to say unlikely, and remarkably surprising things, as when Haynes received a letter from Mrs. W. R. Hendricks. She wrote to Haynes from Iowa, and announced, “Although I am an old Methodist I believe in Holy Ghost religion.”⁵

Recollections from early Nazarenes stressed the *religious* aspects of Haynes’s religious leadership. They noted skills, talents, and qualities, and passionate zeal. But beyond dissent, beyond writing ability or intelligence, or even skillful leadership of dissent, they remembered his

⁵ Haynes, *Tempest-Tossed*, 252.

faith. Chapman first replied to the news of Haynes's death by declaring that Nazarenes and "the friends of righteousness who knew this valiant old battler for God and truth will stand with uncovered heads to acknowledge that a 'Prince and a mighty man' has been called from the ranks of the Church militant." Chapman later applied John Mott's definition of vision to Haynes, "vision is seeing what others do not see, seeing further than others see, and seeing before others see." Chapman said Haynes's autobiography "should be read by all who cherish the memory of good and great men." In 1926, Chapman provided eight biographical sketches at the end of his *History*, one for each of the seven general superintendents, and one for B. F. Haynes. Chapman's own assessment declared Haynes "by nature and grace an uncompromising champion for all that the Word of God and the holiness people stand for, and before the face of man he was utterly unafraid." "A man of scholarly attainments and organizing ability," Chapman recalled, "under his direction the paper became widely read and was everywhere classed as being strong in its presentation of the 'Faith of the Fathers.'" Chapman lauded Haynes as a mature theologian and outstanding writer, who set the standard for the Nazarene writers to follow.⁶

The 1924 Tennessee District memorial declared Haynes one of Nazarenes' "master intellects" who was "alive to every interest of the Kingdom," and always ready to give "a strong

⁶ *Herald of Holiness*, October 10, 1923, p. 2. J. B. Chapman, "A Man of Zeal and Courage," *Herald of Holiness*, October 24, 1923 p.1. Chapman, *A History*, 154-156. "Dr. Haynes not only did a great work personally through his preaching and writing, but he gave a tone to the literature of the Church of the Nazarene that it would have been impossible for a less experienced theologian and less mature thinker to have given. He was possessed of clear convictions, a wide and beautiful vocabulary, a sound Christian character and stainless reputation, a wide acquaintance with literature in general and with current religious thought in particular. With him only the best was good enough. He was a careful and painstaking worker and all his products bore a finish and a completeness that literary and journalistic critics were always compelled to see and acknowledge. In fact, he was and shall remain the unit for measuring writers and his work will remain the example with which the writings of others in our movement must be compared." Similarly, thirty-three years after his death, James McGraw, professor at Nazarene Theological Seminary, would remember Haynes as "sound in theology, correct in his views, and intense in his convictions." "Bold and fearless when he knew God was with him, yet tender and courteous at all times," Haynes was also "remarkably clear in his convictions, and he was unusually skilled in expressing them." James McGraw, "The Preaching of B. F. Haynes," *The Preacher's Magazine*, May 1956, pp. 4-7.

and convincing appeal on behalf of the need of the hour.” He was “a strong spiritual force” that was “being greatly missed from our ranks.” The Tennesseans concluded, “in loving appreciation we honor his memory,” and echoed the reference to a “prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel.”⁷

General treasurer, world mission secretary, and editor of the missions paper, *Other Sheep*, E. G. Anderson, declared that Haynes’s mind was “the most active” Anderson had encountered, and named him among the “greatest religious writers of this age.” Anderson particularly favored Haynes’s vision for world missions. Anderson related the story of Haynes’s last days and dying moments as told by his son, Bayliss, and wife, “Sister Haynes.” A great husband and father, He had died with “no shadow between him and his Lord.” C. A. McConnell’s 1931 tribute recalled the “patrician” Haynes evangelizing in “street meetings where the spirit of his Master so possessed him that the sidewalk crowd did not see the elegant, scholarly man, but saw his Christ holding out nail-pierced hands, offering them forgiveness and peace and love.”⁸

A resolution from Asbury College signed by six leaders of the Asbury community declared Haynes was “a man unafraid, brave and wholesouled.” The Asburians said “the memory of Doctor Haynes is precious. We pray that his mantle will fall upon some worthy Elisha and that his example shall be a lasting inspiration to our preachers for many years to come.” H. D. Brown said his close friend Haynes was “a great man...larger than the confines of any one denomination” whose “sympathies” and “conceptions grappled with the problems of life in a broad and comprehensive sense.” Haynes was a “clear and vigorous thinker” with a “strong

⁷ 1924 Tennessee District Journal.

⁸ E. G. Anderson, “The Passing of Dr. Haynes,” *Herald of Holiness*, October 24, 1923 p. 5. Anderson’s account included a reproduction of Bayliss’s warm letter. Charles Allen McConnell, “Early Nazarene Leaders: Rev. B. F. Haynes, D. D.,” *The Young People’s Journal*, June 1931, pp. 5-6.

and well balanced mind.” Possessing also a “judicious mind” that “well understood the nature and importance of law...he could weigh evidence and consider circumstances...to reach a just conclusion.” Haynes was “a great theologian” who “loved” to “teach and preach” the faith. Brown said Haynes “clearly understood and firmly maintained the great fundamental doctrines of Protestantism.” Brown concluded, “To me he was, indeed, a brother beloved.”⁹

⁹ “Resolutions from Asbury College,” *Herald of Holiness*, October 31, 1923, p. 5. “A Tribute to Dr. B. F. Haynes by His Friend, H. D. Brown,” *Herald of Holiness*, December 5, 1923, p. 5. Writing from Seattle, Washington, Brown ended with four lines of verse beginning “There’s a sad, strange look...” and ending “When a great man dies.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Material

Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.

Warren Akin Candler Papers.

Tennessee State Library and Archives (TSLA), Nashville, Tennessee.

Jeremiah Cullom Diary.

B. F. Haynes personal file.

Tennessee Conference, United Methodist Church, Commission on Archives and History, Nashville, Tennessee.

Tennessee Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Journal

B. F. Haynes personal file.

Nazarene Archives, Global Ministry Center, Church of the Nazarene, Lenexa, Kansas.

Hiram F. Reynolds Correspondence.

B. F. Haynes personal file.

Tennessee District Journal.

General Assembly Journal.

Publishing Board Minutes.

Asbury University Archives, Asbury University, Wilmore, Kentucky.

Presidential Files, B. F. Haynes Collection.

Olivet Nazarene University Archives, Olivet Nazarene University, Kankakee, Illinois.

Presidential Files, B. F. Haynes Collection.

Newspapers and Periodicals

Alabama Christian Advocate

Atlanta Constitution

Columbia Herald

Daily Tobacco Leaf Chronicle (Clarksville, TN)

Fort Worth Gazette

Kansas City Herald of Holiness

Lebanon Democrat

Memphis Commercial Appeal

Methodist (MECS) Quarterly Review

Nashville Banner

Nashville Christian Advocate (NCA)

Nashville Tennessee Methodist/American Outlook/Zion's Outlook (TM/AO/ZO)

Preacher's Magazine

Pulaski Citizen

St. Louis Christian Advocate

The Young People's Journal

Published Materials

Alexander, Gross. *A History of the M.E. Church, South*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1890.

- Andersen, Lisa M. F. *The Politics of Prohibition: American Governance and the Prohibition Party, 1869–1933*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Andersen, Nancy Keever. “Cooperation for Social Betterment: Missions and Progressives in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1894–1921.” Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1999.
- Andrews, Dee. *The Methodists and Revolutionary America, 1760–1800: The Shaping of an Evangelical Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Andrews, W. P. *Two Epistles: I. To Professors of Perfect Love. II. To Opposers of the ‘Second Blessing’*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1897.
- Ash, Stephen V. *Middle Tennessee Society Transformed, 1860–1870: War and Peace in the Upper South*, 2nd ed. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006.
- . *When the Yankees Came: Conflict and Chaos in the Occupied South, 1861–1865*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Ayers, Edward L. *The Promise of the New South: Life after Reconstruction 15th Anniversary Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Bangs, Carl. *Phineas F. Bresee: His Life in Methodism, the Holiness Movement and the Church of the Nazarene*. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1995.
- Barbee, J. D. *Sanctification*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1897.
- Bassett, Paul M. “Culture and Concupiscence: The Changing Definition of Sanctity in the Wesleyan Holiness Movement, 1867–1920,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 28:1, 2 (Spring-Fall 1993): 59–127.
- . “The Fundamentalist Leavening of the Holiness Movement, 1914–1940: The Church of the Nazarene—A Case Study,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, 13 (Spring 1978): 65–91.
- Beals, Ivan A. *Heralding Scriptural Holiness*. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1987.
- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880–1917*, with forward by Catherine R. Stimpson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Black, W. C. *Christian Womanhood*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1888.
- Boland, J. M. *The Problem of Methodism*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1889.
- Brasher, J. Lawrence. *The Sanctified South: John Lakin Brasher and the Holiness Movement*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994.

- Browning, Reed. *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Court Whigs*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.
- Brundage, William Fitzbugh. *Under Sentence of Death: Lynching in the South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Bucke, Emory Stevens. *History of American Methodism, Vol II*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964.
- Carney, Charity R. *Ministers and Masters: Methodism, Manhood, and Honor in the Old South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011.
- Carter, Cullen T. *History of Methodist Churches and Institutions in Middle Tennessee, 1787–1956*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1956.
- . *History of the Tennessee Conference and a Brief Summary of the General Conferences of the Methodist Church From the Frontier in Middle Tennessee to the Present Time*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1948.
- . *Methodist Leaders in the Old Jerusalem Conference, 1812–1962*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1961.
- Cartwright, Joseph H. *The Triumph of Jim Crow: Tennessee Race Relations in the 1880s*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976.
- Chapell, Colin Brett. “Recasting The Image Of God: Faith And Identity In The Deep South, 1877–1915.” Ph.D. diss., University of Alabama, 2011.
- Chapman, J. B. *A History of the Church of the Nazarene*. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1926.
- Christensen, Mason K. “The Saloon in Nashville and the Coming of Prohibition in Tennessee.” M.A. thesis, Middle Tennessee State University, 2013.
- Coker, Joe L. *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause: Southern White Evangelicals and the Prohibition Movement*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2007.
- Collins, Kenneth J. “The Soteriological Orientation of John Wesley’s Ministry to the Poor,” *Asbury Theological Journal*, 50:1, Spring 1995.
- Creech, Joe. *Righteous Indignation: Religion and the Populist Revolution*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006.
- Cunningham, Floyd, ed., with Stan Ingersol, Harold E. Raser, and David P. Whitelaw. *Our Watchword and Song: The Centennial History of the Church of the Nazarene*. Kansas City:

- Nazarene Publishing House, 2009.
- Dieter, Melvin E. *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 2nd. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1980, 1996.
- Doyle, Don H. *New Men, New Cities, New South: Atlanta, Nashville, Charleston, Mobile, 1860–1910*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- DuBose, Horace Mellard. *History of Methodism*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1916.
- Eighmy, John Lee. *Churches in Cultural Captivity: A History of the Social Attitudes of Southern Baptists*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1972.
- Farish, Hunter Dickinson. *The Circuit Rider Dismounts: A Social History of Southern Methodism, 1865–1900*. Richmond: Dietz Press, 1938.
- Ferguson, Charles W. *Organizing to Beat the Devil: Methodists and the Making of America*. New York: Doubleday, 1971.
- Fisher, Noel. *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics and Guerrilla Violence in East Tennessee, 1860–1869*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Fitzgerald, Oscar Penn. *Fifty Years: Observations, Opinions, Experiences*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1903.
- . *Dr. Summers: A Life Study*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1884.
- Flynt, Wayne, “The Persistence of Evangelical Denominationalism in the South and the Case for Denominational History: Alabama Baptists,” in *Religion in the Contemporary South: Changes, Continuities, and Contexts*, ed. Corrie E. Norman and Don S. Armentrout. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2005.
- Frank, Thomas E. *Polity, Practice, and Mission of the United Methodist Church*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006.
- Gaustad, Edwin Scott. *Dissent in American Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Giggie, John M. *After Redemption: Jim Crow and the Transformation of African American Religion in the Delta, 1875–1915*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Goen, C. C. *Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the Civil War*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.

- Goodspeed, Weston Arthur. *History of Tennessee From the Earliest Time to the Present*. Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1886.
- Granbery, Bishop J. C. *Entire Sanctification: The Second Blessing*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1896.
- Green, Elna. *Southern Strategies: Southern Women and the Woman Suffrage Question*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Hahn, Steven. *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Georgia Upcountry, 1850–1890* Updated Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Hall, Jacquelyn Dowd. *Revolt Against Chivalry: Jessie Daniel Ames and the Women's Campaign Against Lynching*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.
- Harmon, Nolan B., ed. *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*. Nashville: United Methodist Publishing House, 1974.
- Harper, Keith, ed. *American Denominational History: Perspectives on the Past, Prospects for the Future*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008.
- Harrison, Joshua H. *Unmethodistic Methodism: The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Light of Today*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1890.
- Harrison, W.P., ed. *Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1892.
- Hart, Roger L. *Redeemers, Bourbons, and Populists: Tennessee, 1870–1896*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1975.
- Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Haygood, Atticus Greene. *High Steeple and Its Official Staff*, reprinted from “Quarterly Review,” 1893.
- . *Growth in Grace*. Macon, GA: J. W. Burke & Company, 1885.
- Haynes, B. F. *Beauty for Ashes*. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1912.
- . *Facts, Faith and Fire or Chapters on the Situation*. Nashville: B. F. Haynes Publishing Co., 1900.
- . *The Sanctified Life*, n. d. 1896–1900.

- . *Tempest-Tossed on Methodist Seas; or, A Sketch of My Life*. Louisville, Ky: Pentecostal Publishing Company, 1921.
- Hendrix, Bishop E. R. *The Perfecting of the Saints*. 1894
- Heschel, Abraham Joshua. *The Prophets*. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Hill, Samuel S., Charles H. Lippy, Charles Reagan Wilson, eds. *Encyclopedia of Religion in the South, 2nd edition*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2005.
- Hill, Samuel S. *Southern Churches in Crisis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- . *Southern Churches in Crisis Revisited*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999.
- Hohner, Robert A. *Prohibition and Politics: The Life of Bishop James Cannon, Jr.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.
- Hudnut-Beumler, James. *In Pursuit of the Almighty's Dollar: A History of Money and American Protestantism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Hudson, Hilary T. *The Methodist Armor; Or, A Popular Exposition of the Doctrines, Peculiar Usages, and Ecclesiastical Machinery of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South* Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1882.
- Ingersol, Robert Stanley. "The Burden of Dissent: Mary Lee Cagle and the Southern Holiness Movement." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1989.
- Ingersol, Stan. *Past and Prospect: The Promise of Nazarene History*. San Diego: Point Loma Press, 2014.
- . "Methodism and the Theological Identity of the Church of the Nazarene," *Methodist History*, 43:1 (October 2004): 17–32.
- . *Nazarene Roots: Pastors, Prophets, Revivalists, and Reformers*. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 2009.
- Ingersol, Stan and Wesley Tracy. *Here We Stand: Where Nazarenes Fit in the Religious Marketplace*. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1999.
- Israel, Charles A. *Before Scopes: Evangelicalism, Education and Evolution in Tennessee, 1870–1925*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004.
- Isaac, Paul E. *Prohibition and Politics; Turbulent Decades in Tennessee, 1885–1920*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1965.

- Jernigan, C. B. *Pioneer Days of the Holiness Movement in the Southwest*. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1919.
- Jernigan, Johnny and Margaret Jernigan Ramsey. *Courageous Jernigan: Pioneer Nazarene Leader in the South*. Kansas City, Nazarene Publishing House, 1974.
- Jones, Charles Edwin. *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867–1936* 2nd. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1974, 2002.
- Jones, Sam P. *Why should a Church Member Belong to the W.C.T.U.?* (n.d.)
- Jortner, Adam. “Cholera, Christ, and Jackson: The Epidemic of 1832 and the Origins of Christian Politics in Antebellum America,” *Journal of the Early Republic*, Volume 27, Number 2, Summer 2007.
- Kelley, D. C. *Bishop or Conference? As Illustrated by the Trial of D. C. Kelley*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1891.
- . “Fraternity – Another View” in the *MECS Review* January 1882 pp. 92–103.
- Kenaston, Connor S. “Methodists and Lynching: Racial Violence and The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1880–1930,” *Methodist Review* 7 (2015): 21–43.
- Kerley, T. A. *Conference Rights; Governing Principles of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, As Found in the History, Legislation, and Administration of the Church. With suggestions as to hurtful tendencies, inherent defects, and needed changes*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1898.
- Key, Joseph S. *Heart Purity, and Our Reasons for Urging It*. Macon, GA: J. W. Burke & Company, 1887.
- Kirby, James E. *Episcopacy in American Methodism*. Nashville: Kingswood Books, 2000.
- Knight, Henry H. III, ed. *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street: Wesleyan, Holiness and Pentecostal Visions of the New Creation*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.
- Kostlevy, William. *Holy Jumpers: Evangelicals and Radicals in Progressive Era America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Larkins, Jessie Shuman. “John Wesley Among the Colonies: Wesleyan Theology in the Face of the American Revolution,” *Methodist History* 45:4 (July 2007), 232-243.
- Lears, T.J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880–1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981, 1994.
- Leete, Frederick D. *Methodist Bishops*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1948.

- Link, William A. *The Paradox of Southern Progressivism, 1880–1930*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Locke, Joseph, “Making the Bible Belt: Preachers, Prohibition, and the Politicization of Southern Religion, 1877–1918.” Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 2012.
- Lyerly, Cynthia Lynn. *Methodism and the Southern Mind*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- MacKenzie, Kenneth M. *The Robe and the Sword: The Methodist Church and the Rise of American Imperialism*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1961.
- Maddox, Randy L. “Respected Founder/Neglected Guide: The Role of Wesley in American Methodist Theology.” *Methodist History*, 37, (1999).
- . “Holiness of Heart and Life: Lessons From North American Methodist,” *Asbury Theological Journal*, 51.1 (1996).
- Mann, Harold Wilson. *Atticus Greene Haygood: Methodist Bishop, Editor, and Educator*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1965.
- Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture New Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Martin, Isaac Patton. *Elijah Embree Hoss: Ecumenical Methodist*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1942.
- Mathews, John. *Peeps into Life*. Nashville, 1904.
- McClain, Carl S. *I Remember: My Fifty-Seven Years at Olivet Nazarene College*. Kansas City: Pedestal Press, 1983.
- McDowell, John Patrick. *The Social Gospel in the South: The Woman’s Home Mission Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1886–939*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.
- Meeks, M. Douglas, ed. *The Portion of the Poor: Good News to the Poor in the Wesleyan Tradition*. Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1995.
- Methodist Hymnal: Official Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, The. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1905.
- Minnix, Kathleen. *Laughter in the Amen Corner: The Life of Evangelist Sam Jones*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1993.

- Mullin, Robert Bruce and Russell E. Richey, eds. *Reimagining Denominationalism: Interpretive Essays*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Newton, John C. Calhoun. *The New South and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*. Baltimore: King Brothers, 1887.
- Owen, Christopher H. *Sacred Flame of Love: Methodism and Society in Nineteenth Century Georgia*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1998.
- Ownby, Ted. *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865–1920*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Parrott, Leslie. *The Olivet Story*. Newburg: Barclay Press, 1993.
- Patterson, L. Dale. “The Ministerial Mind of American Methodism: The Course of Study for the Ministry of the MEC, the MECS, and the MPC, 1876–920.” Ph.D. diss, Drew University, 1984.
- Pegram, Thomas R. “Temperance Politics and Regional Political Culture: The Anti-Saloon League in Maryland and the South, 1907–1915,” *Journal of Southern History*, 63 (February 1997).
- Peters, John L. *Christian Perfection and American Methodism 2nd*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Press, 1956, 1985.
- Pickett, L. L. *The Blessed Hope of His Glorious Appearing*. Louisville, Ky.: Pickett Publishing Co., 1901.
- Pierce, Lovick. *A Miscellaneous Essay on Entire Sanctification Showing How It Was Lost from the Church, and How it May and Must be Regained*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1912.
- Pope, Liston. *Millhands and Preachers: A Study of Gastonia*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942.
- Price, R. N. *Holston Methodism: From Its Origin to the Present Time, Vol. 5*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1913.
- Richey, Russell E. *Early American Methodism*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Rivers, R. H. *Life of Robert Paine*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1884, 1892.
- Rosser, Leo. *A Reply to the ‘Problem of Methodism.’* Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1889.

- Schneider, A. Gregory. *The Way of the Cross Leads Home: The Domestication of American Methodism*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Schweiger, Beth Barton. *The Gospel Working Up: Progress and the Pulpit in Nineteenth Century Virginia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Shadron, Virginia A. "Out of Our Homes: The Woman's Rights Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1890–1918." M.A. Thesis: Emory University, 1976.
- Shea, Mary Lou. *In Need of Your Prayers and Patience: The Life and Ministry of Hiram F. Reynolds and the Founding of the Church of the Nazarene*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2015.
- Silber, Nina. *Gender and the Sectional Conflict*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Sledge, Robert W. *Five Dollars and Myself: The History of Missions in the MECS, 1845–1939*. New York: General Board of Global Ministries, 2005.
- . *Hands on the Ark: The Struggle for Change in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, 1914–1939*. Commission on Archives and History of the United Methodist Church, 1975.
- Smith, George G. *The Life and Times of George Foster Pierce*. Sparta, GA: Hancock Publishing Co., 1888.
- Smith, Hannah Whitall. *A Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*. Boston: Willard Tract Society, 1875.
- Smith, John Abernathy. *Cross and Flame: Two Centuries of United Methodism in Tennessee*. Nashville: Commission on Archives and History of the Tennessee Conference, 1984.
- Smith, Timothy L. *Called Unto Holiness, The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years*. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962.
- . "Righteousness and Hope: Christian Holiness and the Millennial Vision in America, 1800–1900," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (Spring, 1979).
- Stephens, Randall J. *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- . "The Convergence of Populism, Religion, and the Holiness-Pentecostal Movements: A Review of the Literature," *Fides et Historia*, Winter/Spring 2000, 51-64.
- . ed. *Sam Jones Own Book*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2009.

- Stowell, Daniel. *Rebuilding Zion: The Religious Reconstruction of the South, 1865–1877*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Strickland, William J. with H. Ray Dunning. *J. O. McClurkan*. Nashville: Trevecca Press, 1998.
- Strong, Douglas M. *Perfectionist Politics: Abolitionism and the Religious Tensions of American Democracy*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999.
- Szymanski, Ann-Marie. “Beyond Parochialism: Southern Progressivism, Prohibition, and State-Building,” *The Journal of Southern History*, 69, No. 1 (February 2003), pp. 107–36.
- Thacker, Joseph A., Jr. *Asbury College: Vision and Miracle*. Napanee, Indiana: Evangel Press, 1990.
- Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1963, 1966.
- . *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture*. New York: The New Press, 1993.
- Tigert, John James. *The Making of Methodism: Studies in the Genesis of Institutions*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1898.
- , ed. *The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*. Nashville: MECS Publishing House, 1902.
- Turley, Briane K. *A Wheel within a Wheel: Southern Methodism and the Georgia Holiness Association*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1999.
- Wacker, Grant. “The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Age in American Protestantism, 1880–1910,” *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 72, No. 1 (Jan, 1985).
- Weber, Timothy P. *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1925*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- . “Premillennialism and the Branches of Evangelicalism,” in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston. Downer’s Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1991.
- Wheeler, Marjorie Spruill. *New Women of the New South: The Leaders of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the Southern States*. New York and Oxford, 1993
- , ed. *Votes for Women! The Woman Suffrage Movement in Tennessee, The South and the Nation*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1995.

- White, Robert H. *Messages of the Governors of Tennessee*, Vol. 17. Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1967.
- Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order, 1877–1920*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.
- Wigger, John H. *Taking Heaven By Storm*. New York: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Williamson, Joel R. *The Crucible of Race: Black White Relations in the American South since Emancipation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Wilson, Charles Reagan. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865–1920*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980.
- Winstead, M. Brandon. *There All Along: Black Participation in the Church of the Nazarene, 1914-1969*. Lexington: Emeth Press, 2013.
- Winston, Diane. *Red-Hot and Righteous: The Urban Religion of the Salvation Army*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Woodruff-Tait, Jennifer. *The Poisoned Chalice Eucharistic Grape Juice and Common-Sense Realism in Victorian Methodism*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2011.
- . “‘Everything Arose Just as the Occasion Offered’: Defining Methodist Identity through the History of Methodist Polity,” in Keith Harper, ed. *American Denominational History: Perspectives on the Past, Prospects for the Future*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2008. p. 111.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Honor and Violence in the Old South*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- . *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Wynkoop, Mildred Bangs. *The Trevecca Story*. Nashville: Trevecca Press, 1976.